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1 Introduction

1.1 RESTATE: a general overview

Cities and their regions are the dynamos of the European economy, enabling the European Union (and potential member states) to maintain a strong position in the global economy. When these cities contain large areas that are not faring well, it is important to find out how best to change them so as to remove their dysfunctional characteristics. Large-scale housing estates built in the three or four decades after the Second World War are seen as problem areas in many cities all over Europe. Here, economic decline goes hand in hand with physical and social decline.

All over Europe massive numbers of people live in these post-WWII large-scale housing estates. They were carefully planned, but now they often manifest a multitude of problems. They house large numbers of low-income households, the unemployment rates are above average, and in some countries these estates have become concentration areas for ethnic minorities. Many estates are becoming increasingly associated with crime and social exclusion. The circumstances on the estates and policy initiatives associated with them are the focus of the RESTATE project. An important part of the project is the exchange of experiences and solutions between policymakers and academic researchers.

RESTATE is the acronym for Restructuring Large-scale Housing Estates in European Cities: Good Practices and New Visions for Sustainable Neighbourhoods and Cities. All the participants in this project share the basic underlying conviction: if the problems of these large-scale housing estates are not resolved, they will increasingly hinder the good economic functioning of cities. The study draws on estates in ten European countries: France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The project has the following objectives:
• to identify and to clarify the social and economic changes which have occurred on large post-WWII estates and in particular to identify general and specific factors triggering and influencing the emergence of problems and patterns of decline in these areas;
• to develop a checklist of items that have proved to be important in successful and less successful policy responses with respect to these estates;
• to draw conclusions about the potential for the cross-national transfer of knowledge and experience and for cooperation in strategic planning for these areas and in area and estate management;
• to produce a comprehensive and practical handbook in which forward-looking scenarios and new visions for large post-WWII estates in Europe are associated with examples of evidence-based best practice to achieve the sustainable future development of these areas;
• to build for practitioners and researchers a user-friendly database containing details of the nature, successes, and failures of present policies aimed at improving the position of large post-WWII estates and their inhabitants;
• to consider whether and in what ways European-level policy could contribute to more effective responses to problems associated with these estates.

The primary objective of RESTATE is to deliver evidence-based knowledge drawing on experiences in cities in all parts of Europe. The methods used include literature research, statistical overviews, interviews, a survey, and interviews of urban representatives. The proposed handbook that will be written at the end of the research period will set out best practices for future sustainable developments of these areas and for effective policy implementation. It is hoped that the results will be useful for policymakers seeking to discover the contexts in which measures have been, or can be expected to be, successful in improving large-scale housing estates in cities.

Case studies are the heart of the project. Each study:
• establishes general information about the estate: its characteristics, its history, and its demographic, social, economic, and physical development and problems;
• identifies the philosophy and aims of the policies that are being promoted in the estates, how policies have matured over time, what their effects have been, and how all these matters can be evaluated.

It is important to know precisely what we mean by a large-scale housing estate. Following Power (1997), we could define a large-scale housing estate as a group of buildings that is recognised as a distinct and discrete geographical area. We add one element to this definition: we see large-scale housing estates as developments planned by the state or with state support. With respect to size, we confine our attention to housing estates with at least 2,000 housing units. The focus on the project is on estates built in the second half of the 20th century. Taking these elements together, this project is concerned with large-scale housing estates built in the second half of the 20th century that can be defined as groups of at least 2,000 housing units that are recognised as distinct and geographical areas, planned by the state or with state support.¹

1.2 The contents of this report

In a first report of the RESTATE project (Murie et al., 2003) we concentrated on the structural and other factors that explain the differences between the success and failure of large post-WWII estates in Europe. A later series of reports dealt specifically with large housing estates in the ten countries previously mentioned. In these reports descriptions can be found of the estates

¹ In the rest of the report we refer to these estates as large housing estates.
in which the RESTATE research has taken place (see Aalbers et al., 2003 for the report on the Netherlands, also see our website (www.restate.geog.uu.nl) for an overview of the rest of the reports). In a third report the focus was on the policies and practices in the estates (see Aalbers et al., 2004 for the report on the Netherlands and the website for the other reports).

The basic question addressed in the present report reads as follows:

*Which inhabitants profit from the developments and policies in the estates? Which inhabitants experience clear disadvantages?*

This research question makes it clear that the inhabitants of the estates stand to the fore in this report. It seems logical to assume that current residents would profit from improvements made to their area. But favourable developments such as better housing, more employment opportunities, and better social cohesion may benefit some people or groups but may pass others by completely. Older people will not benefit from policies targeted at those of working age; childless households will not benefit from policies aimed at families; and residents will benefit differentially or at a different time or with different degrees of disruption depending on the part of the estate or the kind of housing in which they live. These patterns may mean that households from minority ethnic groups by and large gain less than others or the other way around. Young people may profit more than old people, households with children more than singles or two-person households. Moreover, developments and policies may have perverse effects: higher quality housing may lead to higher rents and these may force people to move out. Increased social cohesion for some groups may increase exclusion for others; increased employment for some may result in fewer chances for others.

Most results in this report are based on a survey carried out in our estates. The opinions and experiences of the inhabitants of the estates stand to the fore in this survey.

In the second chapter of this report, we give a brief description of the estates that feature in this report: Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord, both post-WWII housing estates in the city of Utrecht, the Netherlands. In Chapter 3 we say something about the survey and give some first impressions of the results of the survey. Chapter 4 focuses on the positive and negative aspects of the estates as seen through the eyes of the residents. Here we describe the kinds of people who are satisfied with their homes and with their environment and what they think about the social relationships on their estates. In Chapter 5 we concentrate on the effects of the policies, again according to the respondents. Chapter 6 concerns the future: do people think that the estate will be a better place to live in the future? Or do people want to move out as soon as possible? In Chapter 7 we present our general conclusions.

This report is concerned with the city of Utrecht in the Netherlands; the same kind of information for estates in Amsterdam and in other countries in the RESTATE project can be found in the parallel reports.
The estates: a brief overview

In this research project, a survey was carried out in two estates in the city of Utrecht, the Netherlands: Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. This brief chapter gives an impression of these estates to put the results of the survey in perspective. We give an overview of the main physical and social developments and the current situation within the two research areas. At the end of the chapter, the situation is placed in a European context.

2.1 Nieuw-Hoograven in Utrecht: a brief description

Nieuw-Hoograven is located in the southern part of the city of Utrecht and, together with three other areas, makes up the Hoograven neighbourhood (see Figure 1). Since railways, national highways, and water surround this neighbourhood, it is sometimes characterised as ‘isolated’. However, the northern part of Hoograven is located only one kilometre from the city centre.

When in 1954 two parts of the Hoograven neighbourhood (Nieuw- and Oud-Hoograven) were incorporated by the city of Utrecht, the entire Nieuw-Hoograven area had yet to be built on. However, owing to the enormous housing shortage after the Second World War, Utrecht was in a hurry to build new dwellings. Soon after the annexation, building plans were drawn up; by 1965 the Nieuw-Hoograven estate was a fact (Houben et al., 1983; Gemeente Utrecht, 1990).

Nowadays, the area consists of 2,535 dwellings and accommodates 5,933 people (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). Since Nieuw-Hoograven was constructed according to an efficient and thoroughgoing urban planning pattern, the housing stock is characterised by a series of clustered multi-family complexes with some single-family dwellings to the side; over 60 per cent of the estate consists of three- or four-storey apartment blocks without an elevator. Each complex surrounds a semi-public garden and public water and green areas are well represented. As in many other post-WWII neighbourhoods in Dutch cities, more than half the dwellings in Nieuw-Hoograven (80 per cent) belong to the social-rented sector. Although initially several streets accommodated some shops, at present these are spatially concentrated in only two shopping centres. Schools and medical services can still be found scattered throughout the neighbourhood.

These sections draw on Aalbers et al., 2003.
Since the estate was completed, the composition of the housing stock is probably the only thing that has not changed. The most striking changes are those concerning the neighbourhood population. First, the number of residents in Nieuw-Hoograven has decreased in the course of time, while the number of households has constantly increased. This reflects the second significant development: the increase in the number of small households. Besides the increase in single-parent households, nowadays almost half the neighbourhood population consists of singles (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). The national development of individualisation is thus exemplified here at neighbourhood level. Third, the share of the elderly in the population is gradually increasing. To some extent this trend refers to the people who have been living in Nieuw-Hoograven since the estate was built.

A fourth striking development is the enormous increase in people of non-Dutch ethnicity; from the mid 1980s, their share in the neighbourhood population has increased and at present almost half the population (45.0 per cent) belong to an ethnic minority group (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). Most of them have a Moroccan or Turkish background. To some extent this development is connected to the present local allocation system; as a result of their household size (on average more children than in Dutch households) and low incomes, non-Dutch households benefit from their right to live in large, affordable dwellings, which are well represented in Nieuw-Hoograven.

Initially, Nieuw-Hoograven functioned well on the local housing market. Since the 1990s, however, the estate has been confronted with such problems as unemployment, criminality, decreasing social cohesion, and a decrease in the number and quality of services. Nowadays, a large share of low-income households is housed in dwellings of relatively poor quality. Related to these developments, the estate takes a very low position (25th) on the urban ranking list of 28 neighbourhoods. The area has slowly but surely turned into a neighbourhood for the underprivileged (for more information see Aalbers et al., 2003, Chapters 9 and 10).

To cope with these unfavourable developments, several social projects aimed to improve the situation, have been launched. Other projects focus on reducing the extent of registered unemployment, increasing the number of jobs, or stimulating starting businesses. Some projects have also been implemented in order to increase safety. Other projects concentrate on young people to reduce educational dropout and arrears and stimulate a continuous educational career. Furthermore, some changes in the housing stock have already resulted in an increase in the number of owner-occupied dwellings and the arrival of households with a stronger socio-economic background (for more information see Aalbers et al., 2004).

2.2 Kanaleneiland-Noord in Utrecht: a brief description

Kanaleneiland-Noord is located in the southwest of the city of Utrecht and, together with three other estates, dorms the Kanaleneiland neighbourhood (see Figure 3). To resolve the urban (and national) housing shortage, Utrecht started in 1956 with the ‘Kanaleneiland expansion plan’; a building plot of 258 ha had to be turned into a large housing estate. By 1965, 7,500 dwellings had been built, 2,259 of which were in Kanaleneiland-Noord (Gemeente Utrecht, 1990; 1999).

Nowadays, the area consists of 2,674 dwellings in which 7,808 people live (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). This estate is similar to the Nieuw-Hoograven estate in terms of demographic changes and the onset of various problems. First, we pay attention to the similarities in the
design and the initial functioning of the estate. As in Nieuw-Hoograven, the emphasis is on multi-family dwellings with an over-representation of four-room apartments (82 per cent of the total housing stock). Most complexes were built as three- or four-storey apartment buildings so that an elevator was not legally required. Another similarity with Nieuw-Hoograven is the design: similar complexes with some single-family dwellings to the side (blueprints). Furthermore, with respect to ownership, the (affordable) social-rented sector is over-represented in Kanaleneiland-Noord as well; at present, housing associations own 78 per cent of the stock. A green and open living environment also characterises both estates. So many flowerbeds were planted with roses, Kanaleneiland-Noord was dubbed: 'Island of Roses' (Gemeente Utrecht, 1990). Finally, as in Nieuw-Hoograven, shopping services in Kanaleneiland-Noord are spatially concentrated. Over the years, the area has been extended by a small community centre and another complex of shops has been upgraded to a district centre catering for both everyday and non-daily goods. As in Nieuw-Hoograven, schools and medical services are scattered throughout the neighbourhood.

A second striking similarity with Nieuw-Hoograven is the changing population composition. Several developments can be mentioned. First, changes can be seen with respect to age distribution. Until 1985, the share of residents who were over 65 years of age increased, while the number of young people (under 29 years of age) decreased. Apparently, many households had lived in Kanaleneiland-Noord for a long time (parents stayed on when their children left home). However, from the mid 1980s on, a reverse development occurred; the share of elderly residents started to decrease while the group of young residents increased. The decreasing share of elderly people can partly be explained by the fact that their dwellings had become too large for them, so they moved to smaller dwellings. The absence of an elevator also obliged some of the older residents to move. And of course, some of the elderly died.

Another significant development with respect to the population composition is related to ethnicity. Originally, native Dutch households inhabited Kanaleneiland-Noord. However, as the housing stock in the area became less popular among Dutch families and there was competition from new-building projects elsewhere, many of the original residents no longer wished to continue their housing career in Kanaleneiland-Noord. After they left, households with a non-Dutch background often took their place. As in Nieuw-Hoograven, the composition of the housing stock and, related to this, the allocation system, can be seen as important factors bringing this process about. From a result, during the 1980s the share of non-Dutch households in the neighbourhood population increased. While in 1980 only 3.6 per cent of the population of Kanaleneiland-Noord were of non-Dutch ethnicity, this percentage had increased to 78.0 per cent by 2005. Most residents who belong to this group (68.0 per cent) have a Moroccan or Turkish background (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). Finally, the significant increase in the total number of residents after 1985 derives from the fact that the Moroccan and Turkish newcomers often have more children than Dutch households do.

In addition to the similarities in the physical and social environment, the third set of similarities lies in the raft of problems confronting both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord (unemployment, criminality, social polarisation, a decrease in the quality of the housing stock, and a decrease in the number and quality of services). Kanaleneiland-Noord ranks last (28th) on the urban ranking list of 28 neighbourhoods. The problems are diverse and appear in different fields, so they must be the result of a combination of different developments (for more information see Aalbers et al., 2003, Chapters 11 and 12). The housing associations and the
local government were confronted with financial difficulties, for example. As a result, the maintenance of the public spaces did not receive adequate attention. The combination of the factors referred to resulted in the accumulation of problems. As in Nieuw-Hoograven, however, several policy initiatives have been launched to deal with the multi-ethnic population composition; although measuring the effects is sometimes difficult, in some cases there seems to be a slow but sure increase of the integration of the ethnic minorities. Several projects focus attention on improving the Dutch language skills of adults and of children in primary school, for example. Several courses designed to meet the needs of residents have been organised. Residents can obtain career advice or learn to use a computer or the internet (for more information see Aalbers et al., 2004). With respect to the physical restructuring of the housing stock, somewhat like in Nieuw-Hoograven, a new-building project is being carried out, and a far-reaching demolition new-building plan is about to start to increase the number of owner-occupied dwellings. These should attract households with a stronger socio-economic background.

2.3 Conclusions

Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord share similar demographic and physical developments. During the last two decades, both the physical and the social environments have been confronted with problems that are not typical of Utrecht as a whole; in the rest of the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe, large post-WWII housing estates have often been confronted with such problems (see Andersson et al., 2003; Hall et al., 2003; Mezzetti et al., 2003 and Węcławowicz et al., 2003 for more information about the situation in Sweden, the United Kingdom, Italy and Poland). Although every neighbourhood and every situation is different, the large housing estates often display `classic' problems such as vandalism, drug abuse, unemployment, increased social tensions, educational arrears, obsolescence of the housing stock, and a poor image. The extent to which these problems occur differs from one situation to another. In many large housing estates, problems arise in both the social and the physical environments; a lack of maintenance of both the housing stock and the living environment may coexist with problems concerning young people, unemployment, or social tensions. There are some estates, however, where the physical environment is not considered to be a significant problem, whereas social deficiencies are (Andersson et al., 2003).

Furthermore, problems did not start everywhere at the same period in time. Like Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord in the first years after their construction, other large housing estates, including La Ville Nouvelle and Les Minguettes in Lyon (France), were popular places in which to live. Problems arose when other housing estates became more attractive and the original inhabitants started to move out. Related to the local allocation system these households were often replaced by low-income families, in many cases from the ethnic minorities (Chignier-Riboulon et al., 2003). These socio-cultural and socio-economic changes resulted in decreasing social cohesion and even some conflicts. Next to some successful starts however, other large housing estates were less fortunate. The Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam, Comasina in Milan, and Sant Roc in Barcelona are some examples of estates that were saddled with problems almost immediately after they had been completed (Aalbers et al., 2003; Mezzetti et al., 2003; Pareja Eastaway et al., 2003). Some were less popular than had been expected and
were immediately confronted with many vacancies or were occupied by households who were
difficult to place elsewhere (that is, households other than those for whom the new dwellings
had been intended in the first place). In other cases, it was the construction of the buildings that
caused problems from the start. In order to keep costs low, many post-WWII apartment blocks
were built with factory-produced pre-cast concrete panels; these varied in quality. As a result,
several apartment complexes in various European cities have been plagued by design or
construction faults, with defects appearing either soon after construction or in the course of time
(Pareja Eastaway et al., 2003; Hall et al., 2003; Knorr-Siedow and Droste, 2003).

Apparently, many factors and developments play a part in the explanation of the
developments of large housing estates. Murie and colleagues (Murie et al., 2003) indicated that
a satisfactory explanation of the development of large housing estates should include many
factors, on many different spatial levels, in different fields, and in different time periods. In spite
of unfavourable developments, however, efforts have been made on many estates to improve the
situation. All kinds of physical and social programmes and actions have been concentrated on
improving the situation in education, unemployment, social exclusion, physical decay and
maintenance arrears, and so forth. The effects of these actions and programmes in Utrecht are
featured centrally in the rest of this report.
Photo gallery
Nieuw-Hoograven estate in Utrecht

Picture 1 – A main street on a Saturday afternoon (Photo: Karien Dekker, 9-10-2004, 16:00 hrs.)

Picture 2 – A playground (Photo: Karien Dekker, 9-10-2004, 16:00 hrs.)

Picture 3 – A shopping centre (Photo: Karien Dekker, 9-10-2004, 16:00 hrs.)

Picture 4 – A main street on a working day (Photo: Ellen van Beckhoven, 2003)
Picture 5 – Typical entrance of an apartment complex from the outside (Photo: Karien Dekker, 6–10–2004, 12:00 hrs.)

Picture 6 – Conditions of the entrance area from the inside: mailboxes (Photo: Karien Dekker, 6–10–2004, 12:00 hrs.)

Picture 7 – Apartment complexes in Nieuw-Hoograven do not have lifts but stairs (Photo: Karien Dekker, 6–10–2004, 12:00 hrs.)

Picture 8 – A garbage collection point (Photo: Karien Dekker, 9–10–2004, 16:30 hrs.)
Figure 1 – Location of Hoograven within the city of Utrecht (A) and the location of Nieuw-Hoograven within the Hoograven neighbourhood (B) in relation to the city centre (C)

Picture 9 – These white children receive no extra attention in school (they count only as 1.0) and thus do not profit from the national Educational Arrears Policy, that focuses on diminishing educational arrears on primary schools. (Photo: Karien Dekker, 9-10-2004)

Picture 10 – Big Cities Policy (BCP) money is additional money and is therefore used for the extra’s. Thus, the painted flowers on the floor were paid for by the BCP, while the owner of this building does not pay enough attention to general maintenance of the building. (Photo: Karien Dekker, 6-10-2004)
Kanaleneiland-Noord estate in Utrecht

Figure 2 – Location where the photo’s were taken on the estate

1: Picture 1 - 't Goylaan
2: Picture 2 - Bazuinhof
3: Picture 3 - 't Goylaan
4: Picture 4 - 't Goylaan
5: Picture 5 - Wickenburglaan
6: Picture 6 - Wickenburglaan
7: Picture 7 - Wickenburglaan
8: Picture 8 - Musketierlaan
9: Picture 9 - IJsselsteinlaan
10: Picture 10 - Oudegeinlaan

Picture 11 – A main street in the early evening
(Photo: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 19:00 hrs.)

Picture 12 – A playground (Photo: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 19:00 hrs.)
Picture 13 – A main public transport station
(Photographer: Ellen van Beckhoven, 30-9-2004, 19:00 hrs.)

Picture 14 – A main street in the early afternoon
(Photographer: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 13:00 hrs.)

Picture 15 – Typical entrance of an apartment complex from the outside
(Photographer: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 13:00 hrs.)

Picture 16 – Conditions of the entrance area from the inside
(Photographer: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 13:00 hrs.)
Realisation of a Forum School. Within the framework of a far-reaching restructuring project in Kanaleneiland-Noord, called 'Hart van Noord' [Northern's Heart], a so-called Forum School will be realised. The three existing primary schools in Kanaleneiland-Noord have been demolished and will be replaced by a new building, in which all three primary schools, the library, day-care, youth welfare and adult education will be accommodated. Also new dwellings will be realised (Photo: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 13:00 hrs.)

Narrow pathways, often caused by insufficient upkeep of greenery, form one of the problems in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. They cause feelings of unsafety. In order to deal with this, residents have pointed this out to the housing corporations and the local government. As a result, in both areas greenery is being embellished on several places. This way, both the quality of the public space and feelings of safety should increase. (Photo: Ellen van Beckhoven, 28-9-2004, 13:00 hrs.)
Figure 3 – Location of Kanaleneiland within the city of Utrecht (A) and the location of Kanaleneiland-Noord in the Kanaleneiland neighbourhood (B) in relation to the city centre (C)

Figure 4 – Location where photos were taken on the estate

1: Picture 11 - Marshallaan
2: Picture 12 - Bevinlaan
3: Picture 13 - Beneluxlaan
4: Picture 14 - Marshallaan
5: Picture 15 - Gasperilaan
6: Picture 16 - Gasperilaan
7: Picture 17 - Eisenhowerlaan
8: Picture 18 - Bernadottelaan
9: Picture 19 - Peltlaan/Eisenhowerlaan/Trumanlaan
10: Picture 20 - Gasperilaan
The survey: methodological issues and some characteristics of respondents and dwellings

3.1 The survey in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord

What do the inhabitants of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord think of their neighbourhood? Do they have any confidence in the future? Do they want to stay in the area, or move out as soon as possible? Do they have the impression that policies are working out well for their neighbourhood? In order to learn more about residents' opinions and about how they live on the estates, a survey was carried out in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord (see the Appendix for the survey). The theme of this survey was the idea, opinion, and experience of the residents of the two areas. The sample consisted of 1,500 addresses: 27.5 per cent of the housing stock in Nieuw-Hoograven (of the 2,541 dwellings in this area) and 33.7 per cent of the stock in Kanaleneiland-Noord (2,674 dwellings).

In April and May 2004, a survey team was hired by the Utrecht University to visit the respondents. Potential respondents were first sent a letter to announce the visit. Those who were capable of answering the questions by themselves received a questionnaire, which they could complete in their own time. The survey team then collected the questionnaires again. When respondents agreed to cooperate but were not capable of answering the questions by themselves, the questionnaire was conducted by interview. In cases where difficulties arose through language problems, survey team members with skills in the specific language (usually Arabic or Turkish) interviewed the respondents.

In total, 523 questionnaires were collected; 270 in Nieuw-Hoograven (response rate of 38.6 per cent) and 253 in Kanaleneiland-Noord (response rate of 31.6 per cent). With respect to the non-response, there seems to be a difference between both the estates. Many respondents were not at home (even after calling several times), and some residents refused to cooperate (58.5 and 39.6 per cent in Kanaleneiland-Noord and Nieuw-Hoograven respectively). When respondents were asked why they did not wish to cooperate, 56.7 per cent said they did not feel inclined to do so; several said that they were tired of all these questionnaires.

The results of the survey feature centrally in the remaining part of this report. In the present chapter, the main characteristics of the respondents (that is, their socio-economic and socio-cultural situation) and their dwellings are discussed (Sections 3.2 and 3.3). On the basis of these data, we are able to say something about the representativity of the sample.
3.2 Characteristics of the respondents

When the estates were built, most of the households who came to live in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord did so because they liked the area and the dwellings. Compared with the older parts of the city, the dwellings were more spacious and were more comfortably appointed. The new estates were characterised by more green areas than other estates. Many households started to live in Nieuw-Hoograven or Kanaleneiland-Noord with the intention of staying there for a long time.

This situation has changed, however. When respondents were asked why they had moved to the area, over 30 per cent on both estates replied that there were no other dwellings available. In Nieuw-Hoograven the relatively low rents were also an important reason (16.7 per cent). In the 1960s and 1970s the system of Individual Rent Subsidy did not yet exist, so these low-income households could not live in more expensive dwellings. Furthermore, Nieuw-Hoograven, for example, is used as a spring-board by a growing number of households; they start their housing career there and leave as soon as they have the (often financial) opportunity (interview with assistant neighbourhood coordinator for Utrecht South). At the same time, however, households who lack this opportunity are unable to leave the area and are more or less locked in.

It can be seen from Table 3.1 that, on both estates, more than half the respondents have lived in their dwellings for less than ten years. Before they moved to their present dwelling, a majority of this group lived somewhere else in the city and were therefore just new to the area. When looking at the number of households who have lived in the area for a fairly long time (that is, they arrived between 1981 and 1995), a difference can be seen between the estates; on average the respondents in Kanaleneiland-Noord have lived longer in their present dwelling than those in Nieuw-Hoograven. They may be more satisfied, or have a stronger bond with the neighbourhood. However, they may also have fewer opportunities to move. Another explanation for this difference can be found in the fact that in Nieuw-Hoograven between 1983 and 2002 several demolition and new-building projects have been carried out, which have resulted in 112 new apartments and 162 single-family dwellings. Of course, these residents have only lived in these dwellings for a rather short time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 – General characteristics of the respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period when arriving in their dwellings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age category**

| | Nieuw-Hoograven | Kanaleneiland-Noord |
| 18-30 years | 19.4 | 17.6 |
| 31-44 years | 40.0 | 39.2 |
| 45-54 years | 13.1 | 20.0 |
| 55-64 years | 11.6 | 9.2 |
| 65+ years | 16.0 | 14.0 |
| Total abs. (100%) | 268 | 250 |

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
With the figures corresponding with the local statistics, the table shows that most respondents are aged between 31 and 44 years, while at the same time, both areas accommodate a large share of older respondents (more than 65 years of age). With respect to household composition, most respondents live with a partner and one or more children. In addition, in both areas many of the respondents live alone. It seems that a majority of this group has been living on the estate since or before 1980 and, probably connected to this, are over 65 years of age (61.5 per cent). In Nieuw-Hoograven two-person households are also well represented. These respondents have also been living on the estate for a long time. They are however a little younger than those in Kanaleneiland-Noord; 50 per cent of them have lived in the estate since 1980 or before and are between 45 and 54 years of age. When comparing the numbers related to household composition with the local statistics, some differences can be seen. The most striking is the fact that the local government statistics show that, in both areas, over 40 per cent of the households consist of one person living alone (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). These households are under-represented in the sample.

With respect to ethnicity, most respondents see themselves as Dutch. Furthermore, the number of respondents with a Moroccan or Turkish background is considerably higher in Kanaleneiland-Noord than in Nieuw-Hoograven (30.2 and 14.3 per cent respectively). These figures are not as high, however, as the local statistics show, namely that 45.0 per cent of the residents of Nieuw-Hoograven and 78.0 per cent of Kanaleneiland-Noord are of non-Dutch ethnicity (Gemeente Utrecht, 2005). The difference may be related to the fact that many individuals from the non-Dutch communities did not wish to take part in the research.

Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord are often referred to nowadays as ‘neighbourhoods for the underprivileged’; the neighbourhood population is characterised as being rather homogeneous, with a low average level of education, a low income, and a high level of unemployment. Table 3.2 indeed shows that in both areas almost half the respondents have no job. It is also shown however that work is the main source of income for over 60 per cent of the households in both areas. This figure corresponds to the figures for Utrecht as a whole. Further-

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Table 3.1 – General characteristics of the respondents (\%) (continued)} \\
\hline
\text{Household composition} & \text{Nieuw-Hoograven} & \text{Kanaleneiland-Noord} \\
\hline
\text{Living alone} & 27.8 & 34.0 \\
\text{Living with partner} & 28.9 & 20.7 \\
\text{Living with partner and children} & 32.0 & 36.5 \\
\text{Single parent} & 6.5 & 5.0 \\
\text{Other} & 4.9 & 3.7 \\
\text{Total abs. (100\%)} & 263 & 241 \\
\text{Ethnicity} & & \\
\text{Dutch} & 74.7 & 46.9 \\
\text{Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian} & 13.8 & 30.2 \\
\text{Turkish} & 3.1 & 14.3 \\
\text{Other} & 8.4 & 8.6 \\
\text{Total abs. (100\%)} & 261 & 245 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
more, almost 20 per cent of the respondents are over 65 years of age and are therefore no longer dependent on a job for income.

With respect to income, most respondents reported having an average (between EUR 1,400 and EUR 4,700 per month) or medium-low income (between EUR 630 and EUR 1,400 per month). These figures correspond with local statistics, according to which the inhabitants of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord have an average income of EUR 1,291 and EUR 1,166 respectively.

Not all residents are in a weak socio-economic position, however. The table shows, for example, that almost a third of the respondents in Nieuw-Hoograven have had 15 years or more of education. This share is almost twice as high as in Kanaleneiland-Noord, where in general, the respondents are less well educated: a quarter of them have had between six and ten years education and almost ten per cent have had no formal education at all. This reported difference in education levels (which corresponds with the local statistics) is of influence on the household income (Gemeente Utrecht, 2002); although in Kanaleneiland-Noord more respondents than in Nieuw-Hoograven have a job and report that work is their main source of income, the income level is lower than in Nieuw-Hoograven (see previous paragraph).

Table 3.2 – Socio-economic background of the respondents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid job yes/no</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of income</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits*</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross household income (per month)</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt; EUR 8,100)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium high (EUR 4,700-8,100)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (EUR 1,400-4,700)</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium low (EUR 650-1,400)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (EUR &lt; 650)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of education</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 years</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 years</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14 years</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* Social benefits include benefits for unemployed and disabled individuals and social security payment.
3.3 The respondents’ dwellings

Most dwellings in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord were built between 1945 and 1970. As is typically the case for the Dutch post-WWII housing stock, on both estates most residents live in an apartment, which they rent from a housing association. Table 3.3 shows that most of the respondents live in a multi-family dwelling and over 70 per cent of the dwellings belong to the social-rented sector. For most respondents this type of tenure is not new; many of them rented their previous dwelling (88.5 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven and 87.8 per cent in Kanaleneiland-Noord).

Table 3.3 – Characteristics of the respondents’ dwellings (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building period</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1960</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1990</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social rent</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent from private person</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own with mortgage</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outright owner</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of dwelling</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat/apartment</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family dwelling</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of floors (excluding single-family dwellings)</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 floors</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 floors</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of dwelling</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 m²</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 m²</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 m²</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 m²</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80 m²</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100 m²</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100 m²</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
The table also shows that there are more apartment-complexes over 10 storeys high in Kanaleneiland-Noord than in Nieuw-Hoograven. This difference is probably related to the different periods of construction; since Kanaleneiland-Noord is younger, building methods had developed since the construction of Nieuw-Hoograven. As a result there are more floors per complex (that is, higher buildings). Also, in general the apartments have more space; there are more apartments in Kanaleneiland-Noord with a surface area between 61 and 100 m².

Although Nieuw-Hoograven was developed earlier than Kanaleneiland-Noord, the table shows two unexpected differences between the estates. First, it can be seen that the share of large dwellings (>100 m²) is greater on the older estate (Nieuw-Hoograven). Second, in Nieuw-Hoograven, the share of respondents living in single-family dwellings is twice as high as in Kanaleneiland-Noord. The differences mentioned here probably relate to the demolition and new-building projects that have taken place in Nieuw-Hoograven. These have resulted in larger dwellings (see previous section). This development also explains the fact that, in Nieuw-Hoograven, 15.5 per cent of the respondents live in dwellings that were constructed after 1990. This share is three times as high as in Kanaleneiland-Noord.

Finally, it can be seen that a majority of the respondents on both estates spend between 11 and 30 per cent of their income on housing costs (rents/mortgage, electricity, water, and so forth). The share of households who spend more than 50 per cent on housing costs is also rather large (about 15 per cent on both estates). In spite of the Individual Rent Subsidies, which support low-income households by helping them pay their rents and enabling them to live in more expensive dwellings than would otherwise be the case, living in Nieuw-Hoograven or Kanaleneiland-Noord still seems to be too expensive for some households.

### 3.4 Conclusions

This chapter has revealed several key characteristics of the residents and their dwellings in the research areas of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord in Utrecht. It has become clear that both estates are characterised by an over-representation of multi-family dwellings in the social-rented sector. As a result of differences in the period of construction (Kanaleneiland-Noord is a little younger than Nieuw-Hoograven), several apartment complexes in Kanaleneiland-Noord consist of more floors and the apartments there are in general a little more spacious.
Besides these physical characteristics, we have also shown that, during the last two decades, the population composition has changed drastically on both estates. Although the sample here is not representative, the share of non-Dutch households has increased enormously; nowadays on both estates more than half the inhabitants have a non-Dutch background. At the same time, the areas have become residential areas for the underprivileged. Many respondents report having an average or medium-to-low income and, particularly in Kanaleneiland-Noord, the educational level is low. Also a large share of residents has no paid job.

However, not everyone is in a weak socio-economic position. In Nieuw-Hoograven, the share of residents with a high level of education and a high or medium-high income is larger than in Kanaleneiland-Noord. The socio-economic position of the residents in Nieuw-Hoograven seems to be a little more differentiated than in Kanaleneiland-Noord. Possibly the residents of Nieuw-Hoograven use the area as a spring-board; they start their housing career with low housing costs and leave as soon as the financial opportunity arises. In Kanaleneiland-Noord this seems to be the case to a lesser degree. Whether people indeed have serious plans to move in the near future is discussed in the following chapters of this report. Also, the residents’ opinions about the policy conducted are reviewed. In the next chapter, we first consider what the respondents think about their dwelling and the estates on which they live.
Positive and negative aspects of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord

One of the major goals of the RESTATE-project is to find out how to improve the quality of life on large post-WWII housing estates. Before we can formulate suggestions, it is important to know what the inhabitants of the estates themselves think about their situation. In this chapter we therefore turn our attention to the respondents’ opinions about their dwellings and the estates where they live. Physical as well as social aspects are discussed. Who has a positive attitude and who is more negative about these specific aspects? Are there differences between different types of households? Before discussing these matters, we first discuss the importance of the neighbourhood for the respondents. How much time do they spend there? What kinds of activity are there in the neighbourhood? People who do not spend much time in the neighbourhood might also be less negative about it; or are they just indifferent about the area in which they live?

4.1 What do people do in the neighbourhood?

Distressed neighbourhoods can undergo a decline in the quality and quantity of all kinds of facilities, such as shops for daily goods and public services. This decline has been observed in American ghettos (Waquant, 1998), but also on Dutch post-WWII housing estates (Schutjens, 1993; Aalbers et al., 2003). Since the questionnaire did not pay any attention to long-term developments, it cannot be said on the basis of the survey whether this decline also holds for Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. What can be said, however, is that the residents of both estates still seem to have many facilities at their disposal close to their dwellings. Table 4.1 shows that most respondents can find a grocery shop, a bank, a post office, a bus stop, a public park, and a primary school within a 10 minutes’ walk from their home. There are however two exceptions. First, the supply of jobs within both areas is rather low, although in Kanaleneiland-Noord the supply seems to be a little greater than in Nieuw-Hoograven. Only 24.1 and 37.2 per cent of the respondents in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord have a job in the area where they live.

The second exception shown by the table is the supply of medical services. Since many dentists and general practitioners have left these areas in the past decade, the residents have longer journeys if they need to use one of these services (Aalbers et al., 2003).

From Table 4.2 it can be seen that in Nieuw-Hoograven more than a third of the respondents report spending on average three hours or less per day outside the estate (35.8 per cent).

3 The percentages refer to respondents who have a job.
The corresponding figure for Kanaleneiland-Noord is 43.5 per cent of the respondents. Apparently, many respondents spend a large part of the day within the estate. This group of residents might be particularly affected by things that happen in the neighbourhood.

Table 4.1 – Facilities that can be reached within ten minutes from the respondents’ dwelling (%) (Yes, according to respondents) (total abs. 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery shop</td>
<td>91.8 (268)</td>
<td>98.8 (249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>61.4 (249)</td>
<td>93.8 (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post office</td>
<td>90.9 (264)</td>
<td>95.6 (248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practitioner</td>
<td>79.9 (254)</td>
<td>75.2 (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public park</td>
<td>92.1 (254)</td>
<td>87.6 (241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>98.9 (266)</td>
<td>99.2 (249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>96.7 (241)</td>
<td>95.3 (215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>44.0 (201)</td>
<td>51.8 (228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of work*</td>
<td>24.1 (133)</td>
<td>37.2 (129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* The percentage refers to respondents who have a job.

Table 4.2 – Activities of respondents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent outside the estate on daily basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 hour</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 hours</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 hours</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active to improve the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of activity to improve the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active in residents’ organisation</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting meetings organised by residents’ organisation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning actions</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts club</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in association or organised activity in the estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

[36]
The characteristics of the residents who do not leave the neighbourhood differ markedly between the two neighbourhoods (see Table 4.1A in the Appendix). In Nieuw-Hoograven elderly people spend a particularly large amount of time within the neighbourhood. The same holds for residents with a non-Dutch background and people without a job. In Kanaleneiland-Noord on the other hand, residents with Dutch ethnicity more often spend much of the day on the estate. Also, respondents with a paid job spend a lot of time in the neighbourhood; this probably reflects the larger supply of jobs in Kanaleneiland-Noord than in Nieuw-Hoograven. It has to be said that these two groups (the respondents with Dutch ethnicity and respondents with a paid job) are not the same respondents; in Kanaleneiland-Noord particularly non-Dutch respondents report that they have a job.

It could be expected that many of the people who spend a lot of time within the neighbourhood are involved in various social activities. From Table 4.2 it becomes clear, however, that in Nieuw-Hoograven and in Kanaleneiland-Noord only 20 and 29 per cent of the respondents respectively participate in such an organisation or activity within the estate. Furthermore, only about 10 per cent of the respondents are active in organisations that aim to improve the neighbourhood. It is important to note, however, that people who say they do not participate in an organisation should not automatically be deemed inactive. In both areas it was seen for example that respondents (often elderly Dutch women) undertake activities on a very small scale on their own initiative: ‘I take care of the surroundings of the flat, by taking away all the rubbish once a week’ or ‘I clean the galleries of the flat myself.’

With respect to actual involvement in organisations, there are some differences between the estates. In Nieuw-Hoograven most of the active residents are over 55 years of age. In Kanaleneiland-Noord on the other hand, younger respondents also seem to be active improving the situation in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, although in both cases respondents with a Dutch background are the most active, in Kanaleneiland-Noord residents with a non-Dutch background, Moroccans in particular, seem to be quite active as well. Also, in Nieuw-Hoograven, people who came to live on the estate between 1981 and 1995 are more active than the residents who arrived more recently. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, on the other hand, the opposite is the case; people who have lived in the area for a rather short time are more active than the ‘original’ residents. Possibly the residents in Kanaleneiland-Noord are better informed or have more opportunities to become involved. Whether this is the case is discussed in the next chapter.

### 4.2 Satisfaction with the dwelling

Figure 4.1 shows that in both cases more than half the respondents rate their dwelling with a five, six, or seven on a scale of 1 to 10; residents therefore seem to be fairly satisfied. This is particularly true for Nieuw-Hoograven, where many people even report that they are very satisfied with their dwelling (rating in the category 8-10). This is almost 10 percentage points more than in Kanaleneiland-Noord. Since more than half the ‘very satisfied’ people in Nieuw-Hoograven arrived in their dwellings after 1996, it is possible that their satisfaction is related to the fact that they live in the new part of the housing stock. At the same time, and possibly because in Kanaleneiland-Noord no new dwellings have been occupied yet, ten per cent of the respondents in Kanaleneiland-Noord are really dissatisfied and rate their dwellings between 1 and 4. This proportion is almost twice as many as in Nieuw-Hoograven. When people were
asked whether their satisfaction with their dwelling had changed in the last five years, we found that the opinion of most residents had not changed (Table 4.3). However, on both estates, more than a quarter of the respondents are less satisfied than they were five years ago. This phenomenon corresponds with local statistics, according to which residents’ appreciation of their dwellings has been seriously decreasing since the beginning of the 1990s; 13 and 15 per cent of the residents in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord respectively report that they are dissatisfied with their dwellings compared with 6 per cent of the residents in the city as a whole (Gemeente Utrecht, 2002) (see for more information Aalbers et al., 2003, Chapters 9 and 11).

Who is satisfied and who is not? First, on both estates residents with a non-Dutch background are less satisfied than native Dutch residents (see Table 4.2A in the Appendix). Connected with this, it can be said that the people who have lived on one of the estates since 1980 or before (they often have a Dutch background) are more satisfied than those who arrived more recently (often non-Dutch residents); in Nieuw-Hoograven the respondents who arrived in their present dwelling between 1981 and 1995 are the least satisfied and in Kanaleneiland-Noord this holds for respondents who came to live in their dwelling after 1996. Furthermore, in both areas the elderly are the most satisfied with their dwelling. Their satisfaction is probably connected to the fact that they have lived for a long time not only in the same area but also in the same dwelling. Related to this, several employees of housing associations claim that some

Figure 4.1 – Respondents’ satisfaction with their dwelling (%)*

* Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with a number between 1 and 10: 1 when they are very dissatisfied and 10 when they are very satisfied. Total abs. (100%): Nieuw-Hoograven 260; Kanaleneiland-Noord 241

Table 4.3 – Has the respondent’s satisfaction with the dwelling increased or decreased in the past five years? (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
people have invested a lot of money in their dwellings and have made it: ‘their own little palace’ (interview with district administrator of housing association). At the same time, since many of the elderly have also witnessed all the (often unfavourable) changes in the neighbourhood, it might seem somewhat surprising that they are still overwhelmingly positive about their dwelling. Probably, the negative developments in the neighbourhood do not affect their positive opinions of their dwelling.

When considering household composition, we see that one- and two-person households in particular are very satisfied. Again there is a possible connection with the length of time spent living on the estate and with the age of the respondent; these one- or two-person households can consist of people whose children have left home and/or whose partners have deceased after a long time of living in the dwelling. Finally, and perhaps not very surprisingly, the improvement of the dwelling is of influence on the respondents’ opinion; residents whose dwelling has been improved in the last few years are more positive about this aspect than residents whose dwelling has not been refurbished. Whether these and other things are of influence on the residents’ opinion about the estate is discussed in the next section.

4.3 Satisfaction with the estate

The inhabitants of Kanaleneiland-Noord are more negative about their estate than are the people living in Nieuw-Hoograven. Figure 4.2 shows that in Nieuw-Hoograven the share of people who are negative about the estate is less than 10 per cent, while the comparative share in Kanaleneiland-Noord on the other hand is almost a third. It is striking to note that on this estate, more than in Nieuw-Hoograven, people are dissatisfied with both their dwelling and the estate (90 per cent in Kanaleneiland-Noord compared with 37.5 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven). At the same time, the respondents who are satisfied with their dwelling seem to be satisfied with the estate as well. Again there is a difference between the estates. The majority of people aged between 55 and 64 and households who arrived on the estate before 1980 seem to be satisfied with their dwelling, but dissatisfied with the estate where they live (55.6 and 57.1 per cent respectively in Kanaleneiland-Noord compared with 18.8 and 16.7 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven). As stated in the previous section, people who have lived on the estates for a long time, and have experienced the (often unfavourable) changes, are still positive about their dwelling.

When respondents were asked whether their satisfaction with the estate had changed in the last few years, Table 4.4 again shows a difference between the areas; more than half the respondents in Kanaleneiland-Noord were less satisfied with the estate than five years ago, while in Nieuw-Hoograven this holds for less than a third of the respondents. Here, the opinion of most residents has not changed.

---

4 In Kanaleneiland-Noord there is no difference between age, ethnicity, household-composition or duration of living in the estate, in all categories, a majority of the respondents is unsatisfied with their dwelling and the estate. In Nieuw-Hoograven on the other hand, this holds in particular for a majority of the people who arrived between 1981 and 1995, one- and two-person households and people aged between 55 and 64.

5 There is no difference between age, ethnicity, household-composition or duration of living in the estate.
It has become clear that we are dealing with two different kinds of estates. The opinions of the Kanaleneiland-Noord residents are the more negative; they seem to have lost confidence in their estate. In contrast with Nieuw-Hoograven, where elderly people seem to be less satisfied with the estate, in Kanaleneiland-Noord this holds for young respondents (see Table 4.3A in the Appendix). Another difference, probably connected with age, relates to the hours spent outside the neighbourhood. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, people who are away from it for more than five hours a day (often young people), are less satisfied than those in Nieuw-Hoograven, where respondents who do not leave the area very much are the least satisfied (often the elderly).

With respect to the household composition, in Kanaleneiland-Noord single parents seem to be negative about the estate, while in Nieuw-Hoograven this group is positive about the area in which they live. Here, singles are less happy with the situation.

What are the reasons for these differences? Are they related to social aspects or are physical aspects more important? In Figure 4.3 the four least appreciated aspects of both areas are ranked. With regard to the most negative aspect, more than half the residents mention the population composition. Other problems, such as the maintenance of green spaces, youth facilities, playgrounds for children, and vandalism are also rated in negative terms. It is clear, however, that the population structure is seen as the most problematic issue on both estates. The change from a homogeneous neighbourhood with a majority of Dutch family households into an area with a very heterogeneous and culturally mixed population might be an important reason for this.
negative assessment. There is no significant difference between ages, household types, or ethnicity. In Kanaleneiland-Noord respondents with a Turkish or Moroccan background also state: ‘the concentration of many non-Dutch families is not a good thing’.

Despite these negative ratings, people are generally also able to mention some positive aspects of the area where they live (Figure 4.4). Although green spaces are sometimes considered as a negative aspect, in Nieuw-Hoograven a relatively large number of respondents do value them. This holds especially for those over 30 years of age, family households, and native Dutch. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, young people (under 30 years of age), small households, and ethnic minorities see the accessibility of services most frequently as the most positive aspect. This is probably a reflection of the presence of a large shopping centre in this area. Also, tenants in the high-rise apartment blocks in Kanaleneiland-Noord are particularly positive about their view; since the flats are situated along a canal, several people stated that they ‘never ever want to leave again because of the view’.

When respondents were asked whether they had personally experienced any problems in the neighbourhood with respect to the various aspects listed, in addition to several physical aspects

Figure 4.3 – Least appreciated neighbourhood aspects of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord (%)

* The large ‘other’ categories consist of numerous aspects that were mentioned by a very small percentage of respondents.

Total abs. (100%): Nieuw-Hoograven 174; Kanaleneiland-Noord 183
4.4 Social aspects in the area

In the previous section it was shown that many inhabitants of both research areas were negative about the population composition in their estates. In this section further attention is paid to how residents think about several social aspects on their estate. Most of these aspects have to do with social cohesion (mutual support, contacts with others in the neighbourhood, and neighbourhood bonding) (Forrest and Kearns, 2001).

First we looked at the level of mutual support in the area. Do people help each other when help is needed? Not many respondents gave a clear affirmative answer to this question (Table 4.5). Although it might be expected that residents in distressed neighbourhoods, or
members of ethnic minority groups, need each other more than elsewhere (Fong and Gulia, 1999), the general urban idea that people just look after themselves is more likely to be typical of both areas.

Table 4.5 – Respondents’ opinions about some general social aspects in their estate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do people help each other?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total abs. (100%)</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contacts with co-residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total abs. (100%)</strong></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends or relatives in the neighbourhood?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both relatives and friends</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only friends</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only relatives</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relatives, no friends</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total abs. (100%)</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood bonding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total abs. (100%)</strong></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Although many people are not very positive about their co-residents, they definitely do not have exclusively negative feelings about the population of the neighbourhood. A majority of the inhabitants rate their contacts with other residents within the neighbourhood as ‘moderate’ or
even as ‘good’. So, despite the fact that more than half the respondents have negative feelings about the population structure within the area as such, many people can still find contacts there. There is of course a major chance that these positive contacts are with certain individuals or certain groups, while the negative opinion about the population structure on the other hand may refer to the rest of the neighbourhood population. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, the share of respondents with on average poor contacts with co-residents is higher than in Nieuw-Hoogerven. In this area more people apparently do not see any reason at all for some kind of contact. In general, good contacts with co-residents are more typical of older than of younger people. This has probably to do with the fact that the young people have many activities and social contacts outside the neighbourhood. At the same time, family households seem to evaluate their contacts with co-residents more positively than singles and two-person households. The presence of children seems to be of influence here (see also Van Beckhoven and van Kempen, 2003). Good contacts are also more typical of ethnic minorities than of the native Dutch. This partly corresponds to the literature according to which individuals belonging to an ethnic group might find support from people of the same group living in the same neighbourhood (Van Kempen, 2001). They expect to find social, economical and emotional support there (Fong and Gulia, 1999). This assertion has to be treated with caution, however. According to several key persons, good contacts between members of ethnic minority groups cannot be taken for granted; although people within several groups have good and strong mutual contacts, contact between these groups is often absent. This can be seen for example with respect to the ethnic organisations in Kanaleneiland-Noord: ‘It is a good thing that they exist, but there is no good contact between them. This makes realising social cohesion within the neighbourhood very difficult’ or ‘there are eleven ethnic organisations [in Kanaleneiland-Noord]. There is no mutual cooperation however. To realise this, trust with their adherents has to be established first’ (interview with social workers in Kanaleneiland-Noord; employees of neighbourhood centre Utrecht Southwest).

With respect to the good or moderate contacts among the neighbourhood population, these may be on a superficial level. Despite the fact that so many people claim to have these kinds of contact, in Nieuw-Hoogerven the majority of people do not seem to have any friends or relatives in the area. In Kanaleneiland-Noord this holds for almost 45 per cent of the respondents. Although contacts are all right, they rarely lead to (close) friendships. Older residents might have been expected to have more friends and relatives in the area than younger residents, but this however is not the case. Middle-aged people in particular more often have friends and/or relatives in the area. A higher score for this group than for the young probably results from the fact that young people have many of their contacts elsewhere. The relatively low number of older people with family and relatives in the area may have to do with the fact that people have moved or died. Ethnic minorities report significantly more often that they have friends and relatives in the area than do the Dutch respondents.

At the same time, a positive opinion about contacts with co-residents does not automatically result in a strong bond with the neighbourhood; Table 4.6 reveals that a majority of the respondents rate their bonding with the neighbourhood as neutral or weak. Bearing in mind the aspects discussed in the previous sections, this is not very surprising; weak bonding corresponds with the reported level of participation in (social) organisations, whether people help each other or not, and problems with respect to different values, norms, and lifestyles. Also, it comes as no surprise that young people (under 30 years of age) report the weakest bonds with the area and
the elderly (over 65 years of age) have the strongest bonds. Furthermore, on average ethnic minorities report stronger bonds with the neighbourhoods than respondents with a Dutch background. This might be a consequence of the greater importance of social networks in the area for ethnic minorities.

Table 4.6 – Respondents’ opinions about the effects of a high level of social mix in the estate for the interaction between residents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

What do people think about living on an estate that is socially mixed? In addition to the negative opinion about the co-residents, we asked respondents the following question: ‘In your opinion, is a high level of social mix in the estate good or bad for the interaction between residents?’ Table 4.6 shows that about half the residents think that a social mix is positive. Only about 10 per cent think that a social mix is bad for the interaction between residents. An interesting question is how the two results, a negative assessment of the population structure in the area and a positive assessment of a social mix in the area, could be related to each other. Probably, the evaluation of the population structure has to do with a clear opinion about the present state of the estate, while the question about the social mix refers to a situation that is not the current reality. In other words: people like a social mix in the area, but they do not feel that the present situation in the area is a social mix, or a desirable form of social mix.

4.5 Conclusions

In this chapter we have identified the positive and negative aspects of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. In order to do so, we first discussed the importance of the neighbourhood in the lives of the residents. Since people spend a lot of time in the two areas in which they live, they would indeed seem to be important. At the same time, however, residents are not very active in social organisations or activities aiming to improve the situation in the area.

The fact that only a few people participate in such organisations is not an indication of a high level of satisfaction with the estates. On both of them the population composition is seen as the most negative aspect by a large share of residents. Many residents also have problems with other social issues, such as burglaries, drug abuse, and graffiti or the co-existence of different values, norms and lifestyles on their estate. However, while discussing how people think about the various social aspects of the estates, it became clear that contacts with other residents were rated quite high. There is a possibility that people have contacts with the residents they prefer and avoid contacts with those who are ‘different’ in some respect.

Furthermore, residents seem to be particularly dissatisfied with the estate in Kanaleneiland-Noord. In many cases this dissatisfaction is connected to a negative opinion about the dwelling
as well. People in the age range between 55 and 64 and households who arrived on the estate before 1980 form an exception, however; most of the people in this group are indeed dissatisfied with the estate on which they live, but they seem to be satisfied with their dwelling. The (often unfavourable) changes that have taken place on the estate have apparently only influenced their opinion about the estate. So, perhaps it would be more effective for policymakers to focus their interventions on the environment than on the housing stock. Whether this is indeed the case is discussed in the next chapter.
5 Effects of policies

In this chapter, an overview is given of the residents’ opinion about the effects of the policies and actions that concentrate on Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. The aim of the chapter is to clarify who profits from the policies and who feels disadvantaged by them. Are there differences between the different types of household? Do the opinions of the elderly differ from those of the young respondents? And are there any striking differences between the estates? Before presenting our answers to these questions, we must first say something about the policies that relate to the research areas in general. What are the main aims of these policies? And what activities, actions, and programmes have been implemented within the framework of these policies?

5.1 Brief overview of policies and actions in the estates

In the Netherlands, in 1995 the national government inaugurated the Big Cities Policy (BCP). The main objective of this policy is to create ‘complete cities’ by integrating three policy fields (‘pillars’); integral policies in physical, economic, and social fields are expected to lead to the best solution to resolve the problems that arise at different geographical levels such as the city and the neighbourhood. Lately, the policy has been extended by adding safety as a fourth pillar. In the framework of this national policy, Dutch cities could designate specific neighbourhoods that need extra attention. In Utrecht, Kanaleneiland and Nieuw-Hoograven are among those that have been so designated.

The restructuring task for the city of Utrecht (physical pillar) mainly aims at realising more differentiation in the housing stock. This differentiation will be achieved by the construction of new dwellings (both social-rented and owner-occupied), projects involving demolition and new-building (so that social-rented dwellings will be replaced by new dwellings in both the social-rented and the owner-occupied sectors), and the renovation and sale of social-rented dwellings. A considerable part of this task is concentrated in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland. In Kanaleneiland, in addition to several renovation projects, eleven single-family dwellings in the owner-occupied sector have been constructed, and a new-building project is being carried out. Furthermore, a far-reaching demolition new-building project is planned. In

---

6 This section draws on Aalbers et al., 2004.
7 Many policies and actions focus on the Kanaleneiland neighbourhood as a whole.
Nieuw-Hoograven on the other hand, some apartment complexes (345) have been replaced by 112 dwellings in the social-rented sector. The number of single-family dwellings in the owner-occupied sector has also been increased (by 102). Furthermore, several social-rented single-family dwellings have been renovated and other demolition and new-building projects are planned. Next to interventions in the housing stock, physical restructuring concentrates on improving access to services within both neighbourhoods.

In connection with the economic pillar of the national Big Cities Policy, local programmes aim to strengthen the position of residents in several neighbourhoods, including Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord (by raising the educational level or professional skills; improving access to and use of the internet, for example). Furthermore, in Nieuw-Hoograven the local government is stimulating starting businesses; matching the demand and supply of business space in the area is considered to be important.

Another policy that is focused on both the research areas is concerned with education. To reduce the educational arrears of several groups of pupils, the national government developed the *Educational Arrears Policy*. This policy focuses on schools with a large number of 1.25 and 1.9 pupils. Since primary schools in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord have many children in this category, both areas are involved in this national policy, which aims to create a situation in which more pupils finish their education and find a suitable job (www.minocw.nl/achterstanden, visited in October 2005). Under this policy, the city of Utrecht developed several projects in order to (1) improve pre- and post-school education; (2) stimulate a continuous educational career; (3) improve Dutch language skills, and (4) reduce educational dropout.

With the advancement of the Big Cities Policy, the issue of safety has become important; hence, in the last few years some projects have been implemented to increase safety. In addition to regular programmes and policies aiming at increasing feelings of safety in (semi-) public spaces, and combating youth crime, in 2003 the city of Utrecht introduced a specific programme: *Utrecht Veilig! Dat doen we samen* [Utrecht Safe: We'll do it together!]. This is a project of the local government, which concentrates on Kanaleneiland and Nieuw-Hoograven. The aim of the project is to reduce crime figures and improve feelings of safety within both areas.

---

8 In the framework of this plan 451 apartments and 41 single-family dwellings will be replaced by 1,300 new dwellings (90 per cent multi-family dwellings and more than half in the owner-occupied sector) (interview with managing director of property development company).
9 319 apartments have to be replaced by 435 new dwellings (both social-rented and in the owner-occupied sector) (interview with assistant neighbourhood manager for Utrecht South).
10 Pupils whose parents are poorly educated (both Dutch and non-Dutch) as well as all pupils in special (both primary and secondary) education.
11 The *New Chances* programme concentrates on young people with behavioural problems by providing them with a future perspective through schooling and job training. *Court of Justice in the Neighbourhood* (only in Kanaleneiland) contributes to the overall (feelings) of safety by dealing with young people with behavioural problems. Also organisations are encouraged to work together in tackling these problems more swiftly and at the neighbourhood level. The *Neighbourhood Fathers* project: in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord, Moroccan fathers walk through the neighbourhood in the evening and talk to the (Moroccan) young people about their behaviour. In this way they aim at increasing feelings of safety as well as at improving inter-generational integration.
The local government, police, and justice departments are cooperating to achieve this aim. Increasing the involvement of residents is also important. Ethnic organisations have an important role in this. Next to improving existing projects in this field, in both areas the programme concentrates on young people;¹² cleanliness and maintaining cleanliness; safe shopping centres (in particular the shopping centres Rijnbaan in Kanaleneiland and Goylaan in Nieuw-Hoograven); supporting parents in bringing up their children.

In addition to these programmes and projects, which feature particular physical, economic, or social matters, there are many programmes and policies that concentrate on the well-being of individuals and communities. These projects are concerned with issues such as liveability, the community, empowerment, and sports. The national government project Neighbourhood’s Turn, which promotes residents’ initiatives is of interest here; within the framework of this project, which ended in December 2004, appropriate plans initiated by residents were funded and the residents were encouraged to implement these plans themselves.

5.2 What has been improved?

In the previous section it was stated that parts of the housing stock in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland had been renovated in the past five years. According to Table 5.1 this renovation holds for the dwellings of almost a quarter of the respondents. In many cases they report that the improvement concentrated on their kitchens. Although these renovations in the housing stock aim at improving the situation in the estates as a whole, not everyone sees them in this way. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, for example, where most renovation activities have concentrated on the inside of respondents’ apartments (kitchen, bathroom, floors, and the entrance of several apartment complexes), more than a third of the respondents whose dwellings have been renovated say they are dissatisfied with the estate (35.6 per cent). In Nieuw-Hoograven, this share is less than 10 per cent. Here, in addition to the interior, attention has been paid to the exterior of several complexes as well (the renovation of the outside walls and the renewal of windows).¹³ Interventions that concentrate on the exterior of an apartment complex presumably have a positive impact on the opinion of the residents about the estate as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1 – Has the respondent’s dwelling been renovated in the past five years? (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

When people were asked whether they knew about any policy intervention aiming to improve the situation in the neighbourhood, in both cases a majority of the respondents indeed seemed to be well-informed: 68.9 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven and 50.3 per cent in Kanaleneiland.

¹² For example, by giving more attention to sport.
¹³ In many cases this intervention consisted of installing insulating glass.
Noord. Elderly people and young respondents are particularly well-informed (see Table 5.1A in the Appendix). With respect to ethnicity, it can be said that on both estates the native Dutch in particular know about the policies and actions targeted at the area in which they live. In general, however, the respondents with a non-Dutch background are ignorant of such interventions, although in Nieuw-Hoograven, Moroccan respondents are also quite well informed, and in Kanaleneiland-Noord so are the respondents with a Turkish background. Perhaps these groups make use of their own social networks to spread information. According to the assistant neighbourhood manager for Southwest Utrecht: ‘Although it can be hard to reach several groups, sometimes we are surprised to see how many people know about a particular project or programme! … Apparently information spreads quickly through their own networks.’

Furthermore, many of the residents who know about the policies or actions that aim at improving the situation on their estate have already lived there for a fairly long time (arrived between 1960 and 1980). With respect to people who arrived between 1981 and 1995 there is a significant difference between the estates; in Nieuw-Hoograven almost two-thirds of the residents know about some of the policy interventions, while only one-third do so in Kanaleneiland-Noord (32.3 per cent). Finally, and probably connected to the duration of residence and age, particularly in Kanaleneiland-Noord, one- and two-person households have more knowledge about what is happening on the estate than residents who live with a partner and their children.

To what extent is knowledge about the interventions of influence on the residents’ opinions about the estate? In Nieuw-Hoograven a majority of respondents who belong to the group of well-informed people are satisfied or very satisfied with the neighbourhood (90 per cent). In Kanaleneiland-Noord this share is considerably lower (64.4 per cent); here more than a third of the respondents who have some knowledge about some policy intervention are dissatisfied with the estate (35.6 per cent). Apparently, the quantity of information acquired about policy interventions does not automatically improve the opinion about the estate. Although the share of well informed as well as satisfied residents is smaller in Kanaleneiland-Noord than in Nieuw-Hoograven, more residents participate in organisations that focus on improving the situation in the neighbourhood (29.2 and 20.5 per cent respectively). For many of the respondents their participation arises from their dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood (33.3 per cent compared with 19.0 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven).

When respondents were asked what in their opinion has improved most as a result of particular interventions, a majority mentioned the improvements in Kanaleneiland-Noord connected with safety and the physical environment (Figure 5.1). In Nieuw-Hoograven, most respondents refer to the interventions in the housing stock; this holds especially for respondents with Dutch ethnicity. This difference between the estates is not very surprising, considering the fact that in Kanaleneiland-Noord no demolition and new-building projects have been finished as yet.

As stated before, interventions affecting the outside of the complexes can have a positive effect on the neighbourhood as a whole. In addition to the physical improvements, the effects of social interventions in Nieuw-Hoograven are also noticed to some extent; several respondents have referred to the increasingly active participation of residents.

Several of the projects or programmes discussed in the previous section indeed seem to have been effective to some extent: activities that aim at improving feelings of safety and reducing the level of crime, for example Utrecht Safe: We’ll do it together! Maintenance activities applied to
green spaces are also noticed and considered to be effective. Apparently, physical interventions are noticed more than interventions that aim at improving social interaction or strengthening the position of ethnic minorities or unemployed residents. However, the fact that people have not referred to every action or programme does not mean that these are not successful. For example, policymakers are very positive about the national government’s Education Arrears Policy. Through this programme, pupils who would otherwise receive too little attention now have all the attention they need. Also, in Kanaleneiland the educational performances of pupils with a non-Dutch background have improved through the efforts of an ethnic organisation. With financial help from the national government (in relation to the Neighbourhood’s Turn project) this organisation provides homework assistance for pupils who have accumulated educational arrears (Gemeente Utrecht, 2004a). Respondents do not mention this either.

Figure 5.1 – Most positive improvements resulting from policy interventions as mentioned by respondents (%)

* The large ‘other’ categories consist of numerous aspects that were mentioned by a very small percentage of respondents.

Total abs. (100%): Nieuw-Hoograven 88; Kanaleneiland-Noord 64

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
5.3 Spill-over effects: effects of the policies on other areas

The residents as well as the local government seem to be enthusiastic about the reduced crime rates in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. It therefore seems that programmes and policies such as *Utrecht Safe: We'll do it together!* that concentrate on this aspect have been successful. Caution is needed here, however; according to several key-actors the results are somewhat ambiguous. A local government representative who is involved with Nieuw-Hoograven both in her private and professional life reported that the situation in Nieuw-Hoograven has improved. At the same time, however, she has experienced an increase in the problems in adjacent neighbourhoods: ‘For the neighbourhoods involved in the programme [Utrecht Safe: We’ll do it together!], it is said to be effective. I happen to live in the adjacent neighbourhood however… Since groups of young people were forced to leave Nieuw-Hoograven they now meet in our neighbourhood. Last summer, the problems with young people increased’. This unfavourable effect is also shown by the local statistics: vandalism and violence have decreased in Nieuw-Hoograven, but in two adjacent estates an increase can be seen (Gemeente Utrecht, 2004b).

Another situation in which a problem spills over to other areas is related to the demolition and new-building project in Nieuw-Hoograven that took place at the end of the 1990s. In the previous section it was reported that a large share of the current residents were positive about the results of this project. The same holds for the other actors who have been involved (the local government and the housing associations); the increased share of single-family dwellings in the owner-occupied sector has resulted in an increase in the share of higher-income households. However, other voices can also be heard. Kleinhans and Kruythoff (2002) showed for example that, as a result of the intervention, many households who used to live in Nieuw-Hoograven are now concentrated in other parts of the city where social-rented housing is over-represented.

According to the social plan\(^{14}\) that was included in the project, after the intervention every household should have had the opportunity to move into another dwelling (owner-occupied or social-rented) in the same neighbourhood. Apparently, this opportunity could not be realised; the newly-built dwellings in the owner-occupied sector were often too expensive and new building in the social-rented sector was not completed on schedule. As a result, the residents’ opportunities to move to a dwelling in the existing stock were limited. Many people have moved to other parts of the city where social-rented dwellings are over-represented (Kleinhans and Kruythoff, 2002). It is now clear that caution is needed when making promises to residents with respect to their housing situation. It is important to avoid situations in which households have to move from one restructuring area to another. However, it should also be said that people who have to leave a neighbourhood because of restructuring interventions are not automatically ‘losers’; when a ‘social plan’ is carried out well, people should end up in a better situation.

\(^{14}\) A *social plan* should be included in each restructuring project. This plan guarantees residents that they will be re-housed after the interventions in either a newly-built dwelling in the same neighbourhood or in a dwelling that is at least similar to their present dwelling (with respect to size and monthly rent) somewhere else in the city, according to their preferences. If they prefer the second opportunity, they will obtain priority on the local waiting list for social-rented dwellings.
5.4 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have concentrated on what residents think about the policies and actions targeted on Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. Most of the residents know about several of these policies that aim to improve the situation on the estates. It is striking to note, however, that this awareness holds particularly for residents with a Dutch background; most of the ethnic minority residents are less well-informed. This is particularly striking because many of the interventions focus on this group of residents: aiming to increase their participation in society and increase interaction among the neighbourhood population as a whole, for example. In this respect, not all the policies seem to have been as effective as had been hoped.

However, this lack of visibility mainly holds for policies that focus on improving the social situation (efforts that aim to reduce unemployment, educational arrears, or social polarisation, for example). More notice is taken of interventions that focus on the physical environment or on crime rates. Although some respondents are aware of increased resident participation, most of them refer to interventions in the housing stock. Since the chapter aims to show who profits from the policies and who experiences disadvantages, it must be said here that interventions on the outside of the apartment blocks together with the demolition and new-building projects (as in Nieuw-Hoograven) can have a positive effect on the neighbourhood as a whole. At the same time, however, these kinds of intervention can bring disadvantages to some people. Residents whose dwellings have been or will be demolished through restructuring interventions run the risk of finding themselves in a similar situation elsewhere in the city. Whether policies can influence the opinion of the residents about the future of their estate is discussed in the next chapter.
In this chapter we say something about the future of the estates. Again the residents’ opinions stand to the fore. What do people think about the future of their estates? Will they be better places to live? Or do people want to move out of them as quickly as possible? And do policies or actions influence residents’ opinions? As in the rest of the report, we also point out differences between the different population groups and between the estates.

6.1 The future of the estates

In the previous chapter it was made clear that many policies and actions refer particularly to Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. The general aim of these actions is to make these areas enjoyable places in which to live again. To find out whether residents share the confidence of the policymakers, they were asked what they think about the future of the area where they live. On both estates most residents seem to be neutral or positive about this, which does not correspond with local statistics (Gemeente Utrecht, 2002) (Table 6.1). This neutral or positive feeling holds in particular for people between 18 and 30 years of age (see Table 6.1A in the Appendix). The elderly are the least positive on both estates, but particularly so in Kanaleneiland-Noord. Their attitude is possibly connected to the duration of residence; people who have lived on the estates for a relatively long time (over 20 years) seem to be less positive than people who have arrived more recently. The earlier residents have probably experienced enormous changes in the last few decades and have lost confidence in the future of the area. However, in Section 4.3 it was reported that the elderly were more satisfied with the estates than other age categories. Also, and again probably connected to the previous comment, people who have lived in the estates for a fairly long time are more positive about the area than those who arrived more recently.

It is strange to see therefore that this group is so negative about the future of the estate. Possibly the level of satisfaction somehow influences the level of fear of decay; the (very) satisfied people have more to worry about since, in their eyes, more can go wrong. Several respondents in Kanaleneiland-Noord supported this thought. They were positive about the future mainly because ‘it can’t get any worse’.

15 According to local statistics, 29 per cent and 56 per cent of the residents in respectively Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord have lost confidence in the future of the estate.
Although many residents remain unaware of many of the actions or programmes designed to improve the situation in their neighbourhood (Section 5.2), people seem to be rather positive about the future of the estates. In most cases this positive opinion is related to the planned new-building or renovation projects, on both estates a large share of people expect these interven-

![Table 6.1 – Respondents’ future perspectives (%)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Figure 6.1 – Reasons mentioned why the future will be brighter according to respondents who foresee a better future for their estate (%)

* The large ‘other’ categories consist of numerous aspects that were mentioned by a very small percentage of respondents.

Total abs. (100%): Nieuw-Hoograven 62; Kanaleneiland-Noord 51

16 In both areas a far-reaching long-term restructuring project is planned.
tions to be good for the future of the area (Figure 6.1). As shown in the figure, several respondents even mentioned ‘government activities’.

People who foresee a worse future for the estate were asked how such a situation could be avoided and how the future could be turned in a more positive direction. Although as reported in Section 4.3 the composition of the neighbourhood population was the least appreciated aspect on both estates (Figure 4.3), the respondents in Nieuw-Hoograven also see pollution as an aspect that should be countered (Figure 6.2). In Kanaleneiland-Noord many respondents indeed prefer a residential and therefore a social mix. The figure also shows that people have negative opinions related to feelings of lack of safety; in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord respondents would like to see more police on the streets and an increase in safety.

Figure 6.2 – Interventions needed in order to realise a brighter future according to respondents who foresee a worse future for their estate (%)

* The large ‘other’ categories consist of numerous aspects that were mentioned by a very small percentage of respondents.

Total abs. (100%): Nieuw-Hoograven 62; Kanaleneiland-Noord 57

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
It can now be said that most of the policies and actions discussed in the previous chapter (Section 5.1) seem to be targeted at aspects which residents consider as important; interventions in the housing stock and the living environment, for example, concentrate on increasing (feelings of) safety and realizing a heterogeneous housing stock in order to create a mixed neighbourhood population.

6.2 Staying or leaving?

Many respondents in both areas have serious plans to move within two years (Table 6.2). Although a majority of this group foresees a neutral or positive future for the estate, many of these people are negative about the future: 23.0 per cent and 34.4 per cent in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord respectively. It is not very surprising to note that most people who want to move really want to leave the area; about two-thirds of the residents in both Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord want to move to another area in the city or even to leave the city altogether.

Table 6.2 – Do respondents have serious plans to move within two years? (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Few older respondents have plans to move (see Table 6.2A in the Appendix). Also, and probably related to age, people who have lived on the estate for a long time are less eager to leave the area than those who arrived more recently. Despite the unfavourable developments of the past few decades and an overall negative opinion about the future of the estate, there seems to be a certain bond with the area. Age and duration of living are broadly related to ethnicity, which may account for the difference between the native Dutch and non-native Dutch respondents. It is interesting to note, however, that some of the older respondents who state that they do not want to leave in fact cannot leave. As mentioned earlier (Section 4.2), many residents have invested a lot of money in their social-rented homes without a moment’s thought that some day they might want to leave. A respondent in Kanaleneiland-Noord said that he was not able to move because he had changed a lot in the dwelling internally. As a result, ‘there isn’t the money to put the dwelling back in its original state’ (a requirement when leaving a social-rented dwelling). When the elderly do want to leave the area, different reasons are given on the two estates. In Nieuw-Hoograven respondents mainly want to leave because they consider their dwelling is too small. Also, they want to live closer to family and friends. In Kanaleneiland-Noord, on the other hand, many of the older people refer to the environment; they want to live in a quieter and safer place.

Unlike the elderly, young people (aged between 18 and 30) are particularly keen to leave the area. Again, the estates differ with respect to the reasons put forward. These seem to be the exact
opposite of those given by the older respondents; in Nieuw-Hoograven, respondents refer to the environment (quieter and safer), while in Kanaleneiland-Noord, the size of the dwelling is stated to be the major problem.

To clarify these responses, Figure 6.3 shows the reasons for moving mentioned by the respondents. As we have said, in Nieuw-Hoograven many of the prospective moves are related to the dwelling. Despite the fact that many respondents are positive about the (planned or executed) new-building projects, these interventions do not amount to a reason for staying in the area. Another important reason for moving (also previously mentioned) is related to dissatisfaction with the living environment. Despite differences between the age categories, in Kanaleneiland-Noord, for example, the environment seems to be the main reason for moving.

6.3 Spill-over effects: effects on other areas

Quite a lot of residents who (want to) leave the area in which they currently live may end up in a similar neighbourhood elsewhere in the city (with respect to population composition and composition of the housing stock). This likelihood stems from the fact that, within the city of Utrecht (as in many other cities in the Netherlands), social-rented dwellings are mainly concentrated in particular neighbourhoods, amongst them Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. Since the residents of such areas often have little choice on the local housing market, there is a chance that they will move from one such area to another.

In order to counteract these situations, current housing policy concentrates on creating mixed neighbourhoods in terms of ownership (Section 5.1). In this respect, in (demolition and) new-building projects, both within existing neighbourhoods and on new-building plots, dwellings are constructed in the owner-occupied sector as well as in the social-rented sector (ratio: 70/30). However, in many cases the new dwellings in the social-rented sector turn out to be

Table 6.3 – The three most important reasons for moving mentioned by respondents (%) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling too small</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment not safe</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment not quiet</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The large ‘other’ category consists of numerous aspects that were mentioned by a very small percentage of respondents

Total abs. (%): Nieuw-Hoograven 73; Kanaleneiland-Noord 78

[17] For example, 30 per cent of dwellings in Leidsche Rijn, the largest new-building area in the Netherlands to be constructed adjacent to the city of Utrecht, will be in the social-rented sector.
too expensive for the residents of estates such as Kanaleneiland-Noord (see Lucassen, 2002, for example). As a result, opportunities for those with little money to spare are limited to the existing stock of social-rented dwellings. They therefore run the risk of ending up in the same situation but on a different estate (Andriessen, 2002). Several respondents expressed this fear: ‘A disadvantage of the plan [the large restructuring project in Nieuw-Hoograven] is the small quantity of affordable social-rented dwellings that will be built after the demolition.’ Also, in Kanaleneiland-Noord, some residents disagree with the plans to demolish a large share of the housing stock; they fear that they will have to leave the area, so they would prefer renovation.

6.4 Conclusions

In this chapter we have reported residents’ opinions about the future of the research areas. In general most people foresee a brighter future for Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord. In many cases this positive attitude seems to be directly related to various policy interventions; new-building interventions in particular are expected to have a positive influence on an estate’s future. Many residents also appreciate interventions designed to increase safety.

In spite of these positive thoughts about the future, many residents nevertheless have clear plans to leave the area. In Nieuw-Hoograven, this feeling is often related to dissatisfaction with the size of the dwelling. In Kanaleneiland-Noord on the other hand, respondents are looking for a quieter, safer environment. These reasons seem to strike a chord with earlier comments; although the effects of policy interventions are considered positively, they do not seem to be able to retain residents on the estates as a matter of course. Perhaps more social interventions are needed to achieve this. It is also interesting to note that people who have lived in the area for a long time, seem to be quite attached to the area; although this group seems to have negative feelings regarding the future of the estate, they are the least willing to move. This apparent reluctance may however reflect the fact that not many alternative dwellings are available to them.
The opinions and prospects of inhabitants of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord in Utrecht have taken centre stage in this report. We asked residents by means of a survey what they think of various aspects, such as their dwelling, the estate on which they live and the (effects of the) policies carried out. At the beginning of this report the following questions were cited:

*Which inhabitants profit from the developments and policies on the estates? Which inhabitants experience clear disadvantages?*

Numerous policy interventions have been aimed at improving the situation in the ‘priority-neighbourhoods’, which include Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord.18 Several programmes and interventions within the framework of the national Big Cities Policy are designed to improve the physical, economic, and social situations in the areas. It would seem self-evident that current residents should profit from improvements made to the area in which they live. However, interventions can concentrate on other categories of residents as well. Not every new-building project focuses on the present neighbourhood population; the main aim of a project may be to attract new households to the area (with a stronger socio-economic background, for example). Consequently the current residents are not automatically the people who profit most.

With respect to the neighbourhoods under research, most respondents in both areas find the neighbourhood population their greatest cause of dissatisfaction. In addition to the quality of green spaces and the quality and quantity of youth facilities and playgrounds, the ‘people who live here’ are the least appreciated aspect. How does policy respond to this dissatisfaction? And are the actions and programmes capable of resolving the problem?

Several policy programmes aim specifically to increase the participation of residents or the social interaction between different ethnic groups within a neighbourhood. However, many programmes seem to be ineffective. Not all residents are equally well informed about the various policies and plans, for example.19 The most striking and significant difference is that between the different ethnic groups; respondents with a Dutch background are better informed about the interventions that concern their estate than their non-Dutch fellow residents. Also, a finding

18 Under the national Urban Renewal Policy, 56 estates receive extra attention and resources in order to improve the situation; Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord are included.

19 This holds not just for policies that focus on the social situation.
that to some extent may be related to ethnicity, one- and two-person households and people who have lived in the area for a long time are more aware of the interventions than households with children or people who have arrived more recently. Although it cannot be said that the best informed profit more than other residents, this difference in awareness does say something about the social situation; apparently, some residential groups (ethnic minorities in particular) are still hard to reach. However, some respondents, particularly those with a Moroccan background living in Kanaleneiland-Noord, have noticed an increase in residents’ participation. Although the approaches and programmes concerning this aspect are much the same in both estates, the ethnic minority groups in Kanaleneiland-Noord seem to be easier to reach than those in Nieuw-Hoograven. This disparity may relate to the fact that the strength of social cohesion within the various ethnic groups differs.

Although the residents do not seem to be very well aware of the effects of actions directed towards improving the social situation (efforts aiming to reduce social polarisation and increase social cohesion and participation, for example), they do notice the results of other interventions. When respondents were asked what were the most positive results of other policies, improvement of the housing stock, reduced crime rates, and increased (feelings of) safety were mentioned the most. Interestingly, the native-Dutch respondents mainly mentioned interventions in the housing stock, while the ethnic minorities referred to improvements with respect to safety. Apparently, the native Dutch residents appreciate the refurbishing or new-building interventions more than the ethnic minorities do; they in contrast are particularly positive about safety measures. Both items are well represented in many policy actions, so that both groups should be able to profit from a range of programmes and actions. At the same time, these interventions can, to some extent, change the neighbourhood population or at least have a positive effect on how people think about the other residents.

It is still difficult to conclude who profits most and who experiences disadvantages from the policies. This may be because the people who were disadvantaged by the policies have already left the area. In addition to the positive effects that the respondents notice, several interventions can also have negative side effects: restructuring measures aimed to create a heterogeneous housing stock both within the existing estates and in new-construction areas, for example. However, many of the newly-built dwellings, with a certain amount built in the social-rented sector (about 30 per cent) still seem to be too expensive for the residents of such estates as Kanaleneiland-Noord and Nieuw-Hoograven. As a result, these low-income households run the risk of being forced to leave the area (since their dwelling is being demolished) and, owing to the lack of choice on the local housing market, they may well end up in a similar situation, but in a different neighbourhood. And those whose dwellings are not being demolished may lack the opportunity to move at all.

As a result, it seems that in the main it is the people with reasonable financial resources who profit from these kinds of physical intervention (demolition and new-building projects), while those without such resources (often non-Dutch native residents) experience disadvantages. Although the aim of the policy is exactly the opposite, there is a danger that the spatial polarisation in the city will increase. Because demolition plans lead to fewer housing opportunities for low-income households, these may be expected to concentrate in those areas where cheap housing is still available.

In short, it seems difficult to answer the central questions about who profits and who experiences clear disadvantages from policies that aim to improve the situation in several
selected living areas. However, two main conclusions can be drawn. First, it seems that residents with a Dutch background are better informed about what is happening on their estate than non-Dutch residents. Although it seems difficult to reach this last group, it cannot be said that the ethnic minorities experience disadvantages from this fact. Despite differences in the level of their importance, several policy initiatives seem to benefit everybody: physical interventions such as refurbishing the existing housing stock and measures that increase (feelings of) safety, for example.

At the same time, however, there is a chance that some residents will not be able to profit from these favourable effects at all. When newly-built dwellings are too expensive for some of the present residents, they may have to leave the neighbourhood. In this respect it can be said that low-income households (often with a non-Dutch background), profit less from several interventions than those with more financial resources.
Appendix

RESTATE survey

First some basic information to be provided by the interviewer/local coordinator

City of interview: ………………………………… (to be coded later)
Neighbourhood: ………………………………… (to be coded later)
Date of interview: …………………………………
Name of interviewer: …………………………………
Number of survey: …………………………………

Introduction

Interviewer: register the kind of dwelling in which the respondent lives
1 apartment/flat
2 single-family house
3 other: ………
9 unknown

Interviewer: register the number of floors of the building
…… floors
99 unknown

Interviewer: register the floor of the dwelling under consideration (including ground floor)
1 ground floor (i.e. accessible without stairs)
2 first floor
3 second floor
4 third–fifth floor
5 sixth–tenth floor
6 eleventh floor or higher
9 unknown

Good morning/afternoon/night. My name is …… I am working at the University of …
We are carrying out a large international comparative research project in cities in 10 European
countries. The European Commission subsidises this project. The focus is on housing and
neighbourhoods and this area has been included in the study. Therefore we would like to ask you a series
of questions and hope you will be prepared to answer these. All information will remain anonymous and
confidential. I would like to start with some questions about your current housing situation.
1 When did you first move to this address?
   1 before 1960
   2 1961-1970
   3 1971-1980
   4 1981-1990
   5 1991-1995
   6 1996-2000
   7 2001-2004
   9 unknown

2 What was the tenure of the place you lived at before this address?
   1 rented from local council
   2 rented from housing association/registered social landlord
   3 rented from a private landlord
   4 owned with mortgage
   5 owned outright
   9 unknown

3 With whom did you live at your previous address?
   1 alone
   2 partner and/or children
   3 family (parents and siblings)
   4 friends
   9 no answer/unknown

4 Do you rent or own your present dwelling?
   1 social rent (from municipality, housing corporation, housing company, etc.)
   2 rent from private person
   3 rent from private company
   4 own with mortgage
   5 outright owner
   6 other:..........................
   9 unknown

5 What is the approximate size of your dwelling in square metres?
   1 below 30 m²
   2 between 31 and 40 m²
   3 between 41 and 50 m²
   4 between 51 and 60 m²
   5 between 61 and 80 m²
   6 between 81 and 100 m²
   7 over 100 m²
   9 unknown/no answer
6 How many bedrooms does your dwelling have?
   1 one bedroom
   2 two bedrooms
   3 three bedrooms
   4 four bedrooms
   5 five or more bedrooms
   9 unknown/no answer

7 What share of your income is needed to cover your total housing costs (rent or mortgage, electricity, water, etc.)?
   1 less than 10 per cent
   2 11-30 per cent
   3 31-50 per cent
   4 more than 50 per cent
   9 unknown

8 When was your present dwelling built?
   1 between 1945 and 1960
   2 between 1961 and 1970
   3 between 1971 and 1980
   4 between 1981 and 1990
   5 between 1991 and 2000
   6 between 2001 and 2004
   9 unknown

9 What was the most important reason for moving to this neighbourhood?
   (one answer only: only the most important reason)
   1 low rent/housing costs
   2 nearness to relatives and friends
   3 nearness to work
   4 good connections (e.g. public transport)
   5 good schools
   6 presence of other services
   7 there were no other dwellings available
   8 other ...........................
   99 unknown

10 Where was your previous dwelling located?
   1 in the same neighbourhood
   2 somewhere else in the city
   3 elsewhere in the country
   4 elsewhere, abroad
   9 unknown
Now I would like to ask you some questions about the satisfaction with your present dwelling and the neighbourhood.

11 How satisfied are you with your home? Please indicate on a scale between 1 (very low) and 10 (very high).
   ...
   99 unknown

12 Has your satisfaction with your home increased or decreased in the last 5 years?
   1 lower
   2 same
   3 higher
   8 not applicable (settled less than five years ago)
   9 unknown

13 Has your dwelling been renovated/refurbished in the last five years?
   1 no (go to question 15)
   2 yes
   9 unknown

14 What has been improved? (circle all answers that apply)
   1 renovation of the kitchen
   2 renovation of the bathroom
   3 change of layout
   4 renovation of the roof
   5 renovation of the floor
   6 renovation of the entrances
   7 renovation of the outside walls
   8 complete renewal (after demolition)
   9 other: ......................................
   99 no answer/unknown

15 How satisfied are you with your neighbourhood? Please indicate on a scale between 1 (very low) and 10 (very high).
   ...
   99 unknown

16 Has your satisfaction with the neighbourhood increased or decreased in the last five years?
   1 lower
   2 same
   3 higher
   8 not applicable (settled less than five years ago)
   9 unknown
17 Which aspect of the neighbourhood do you like most?
1 green spaces
2 accessibility to public services
3 playgrounds for children
4 youth facilities
5 proximity to work
6 proximity to schools
7 quality of local schools
8 people who live there
9 other: ……………………………………………..
99 unknown

18 Which aspect of the neighbourhood do you like least?
1 green spaces
2 accessibility to public services
3 playgrounds for children
4 youth facilities
5 proximity to work
6 proximity to schools
7 quality of local schools
8 people who live there
9 other: ……………………………………………..
99 unknown

19 How do you rate the contacts you have between yourself and other residents in your neighbourhood?
1 good
2 moderate
3 bad
9 unknown

20 Do many of your close friends or relatives live in the neighbourhood?
1 yes, both relatives and friends
2 yes, but only friends
3 yes, but only relatives
4 no
9 unknown

21 Do you feel weakly or strongly attached to the neighbourhood?
1 weak
2 neutral
3 strong
9 unknown
22 Do you regard the estate you are living in to be socially mixed (households with very different incomes) or socially homogenous (mostly households with approximately similar incomes)?
1 socially mixed
2 moderately mixed
3 socially homogenous
9 unknown

23 In some areas people mix together and try to help each other, while in other areas people mostly go their own way. Is this an area where people mostly help each other or where people mostly go their own way?
1 help each other
2 go their own way
3 mixture
9 unknown

24 In your opinion, is a high level of social mix in the estate good or bad for the interaction between residents?
1 good
2 neutral
3 bad
9 unknown

25 What is the reputation of the estate in the rest of the city?
1 good
2 moderate
3 bad
9 unknown

26 Do you agree with this reputation?
1 yes
2 no
9 unknown

27 Do you **personally** experience serious problems in the neighbourhood with respect to:
1 = yes
2 = no
8 = not applicable (has lived here not longer than a year)
9 = unknown

- dirt on the streets 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- drug abuse 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- burglary in dwellings 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- burglary in cars 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- graffiti/vandalism 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- feelings of unsafety 1 yes 2 no 8 9
28 Which of the mentioned aspects have been improved by any policy or action?
- upkeep of public places 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- condition of roads 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- playgrounds for children 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- maintenance of buildings 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- lack of employment 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of schools 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of commercial services 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of public services 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- different values/norms/lifestyles 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- racism/racist harassment 1 yes 2 no 8 9

In the next block I would like to ask a few questions regarding the policies of the local
government or other institutions with regard to the neighbourhood you are living in.

29 Do you know about any policies or actions aiming at improvement of living in your
neighbourhood?
1 yes
2 no (go to question 32)
9 unknown

30 If yes, what are, in your opinion, the most important positive effects of these policies in
recent years?
                       
                       
                       
9 unknown
31 Who were the principal actors in these policies or actions?
1 national government
2 local government
3 housing companies/housing corporations
4 local population
5 other: ..................
9 no answer, unknown

I would like to ask you a few questions about your activities in and use of the neighbourhood.

32 Do you or one of the members of the household actively participate in an association that
aims to improve the neighbourhood?
1 yes
2 no (go to question 34)
10 unknown

33 What kind of participation is that?
............... unknown

34 Do you participate in a sports club, cultural association or another organised social activity
in the neighbourhood?
1 yes
2 no
9 unknown

35 Can you reach the following facilities within 10 minutes from your home?
- a grocery shop 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- your bank 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- a post office 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- a general practitioner (doctor) 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- public park 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- bus stop 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- primary school 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- a dentist 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown
- your place of work 1 yes 2 no 9 unknown

36 How many hours per day – on average – do you spend outside your neighbourhood on
normal weekdays?
1 10 hours or more
2 5-9 hours
3 3-4 hours
4 1-3 hours
5 less than 1 hour
9 unknown
I have a few questions regarding the future.

37 Does your household have plans to move house within 2 years?
   1 yes
   2 no (go to question 40)
   9 unknown (go to question 40)

38 What is the main reason for considering moving?
   1 present home is too small
   2 present home is too expensive
   3 want to buy a dwelling
   4 want to be closer to relatives/friends
   5 want to live in a more quiet environment
   6 want to live in a more safe environment
   7 want to live closer to work
   8 other: ..........................
   99 unknown

39 Where would you like to move to?
   1 in the same neighbourhood
   2 close to the present neighbourhood (less than 5 km from present home)
   3 somewhere else in the city
   4 elsewhere
   9 unknown

40 Do you think the future of your present neighbourhood will be better or worse than today?
   1 better (go to question 42)
   2 neutral (go to question 41)
   3 worse (go to question 41)
   9 unknown (go to question 43)

41 If you envisage no change or change for the worse for the neighbourhood, how can that be turned into a brighter future? What should have highest priority?
   ..........................
   ..........................
   ..........................
   99 unknown (go to question 43)

42 What is the main reason why you think the neighbourhood's future will be brighter?
   ..........................
Finally I would like to ask you some short questions about the household.

43 *Interviewer:* register gender of respondent
   1 male
   2 female

44 May I ask you in which year you were born?
   ....

45 How is the composition of your household?
   1 living alone (go to question 48)
   2 living with a partner, no children (go to question 48)
   3 living with a partner and .... children (how many children?)
   4 single-parent household, with .... children (how many children?)
   5 living alone with .... others (no partner, no children) (to question 48)
   6 living with partner and .... others (to question 48)
   7 living with partner and .... others and .... children
   8 other: ........................
   9 no answer

46 What is the age of the oldest child still living at home?
   88 .... age
   not applicable

47 What is the age of the youngest child living at home?
   88 .... age
   not applicable

48 How many years did you follow school education since you were 6 years of age?
   1 none
   2 1-6 years
   3 6-10 years
   4 11-12 years
   5 13-14 years
   6 15 years or more
   9 unknown

49 Do you have a paid job?
   1 yes, for .... hours per week
   2 no
   9 no answer
50 Does your partner have a paid job?
   1 yes, for …. hours per week
   2 no
   8 not applicable
   9 no answer

51 How many people in your household are income earners?
………..

52 Would you classify the monthly household income as high, medium high, average, medium low, or low, compared to national levels?
   1 high (top 10%)
   2 medium high (between top 10%-30%)
   3 average (between top 30% and bottom 30%)
   4 medium low (between bottom 30% and lowest 10%)
   5 low (poorest 10%)
   9 unknown

53 What is the main source of your household income?
   1 work
   2 unemployment or social benefit
   3 pension
   4 other:……………………….
   9 no answer

54 In terms of ethnicity, how would you call yourself (for example: native UK, Moroccan, Dutch Moroccan, American, Hungarian, French, Algerian, etc.)?
………………

55 And your partner?
……………..

56 Is there anything you would like to add related to this interview?
………………
### Tables

#### Appendix to Chapter 4: Positive and negative aspects of Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord

**Table 4.1A – Characteristics of respondents who spend on average less than 3 hours or more than 5 hours outside the estate (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 3 hours</td>
<td>&gt; 5 hours</td>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>&lt; 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid job yes/no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
Table 4.2A – Characteristics of respondents who are dissatisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied with their dwelling (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of living in dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling improved yes/no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
Table 4.3.1 – Characteristics of respondents who are dissatisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied with the estate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of living in dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours spent outside estate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3 hours</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 hours</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
### Appendix to Chapter 5: Effects of policies

Table 5.1A – Characteristics of respondents who know or do not know about policies or actions that aim at improving the situation in their estate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of living in dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid job yes/no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
Appendix to Chapter 6: The future of the estates

Table 6.1A – Characteristics of respondents who are positive or negative about the future of their estate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th></th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Total abs. (100%)</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of living in dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid job yes/no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* The category ‘neutral’ has not been inserted in the table (82 and 60 respondents answered ‘neutral’ in Nieuw-Hoograven and Kanaleneiland-Noord respectively).
Table 6.2A – Characteristics of respondents who do/do not want to move within two years (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuw-Hoograven</th>
<th>Kanaleneiland-Noord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan, Tunisian, Algerian</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner and children</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of living in dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid job yes/no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
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List of people interviewed

These key persons are mentioned in the text. We have learnt a great deal from them. For data protection reasons we have listed their functions and not their names.

- Assistant neighbourhood coordinator for Utrecht South
- District administrator of housing association
- Social workers in Kanaleneiland-Noord
- Employees of neighbourhood center Utrecht Southwest
- Representative of local government
- Managing director of property development company