

Welcoming Difference or Wily Dispersal? Emerging Problems of Urban Regeneration in the Multiply Deprived Area of Bijlmermeer (Amsterdam)

Karen Leeming and Tasleem Shakur

*Edge Hill College of Higher Education, Lancashire, UK **

Abstract

Within the European Union there are a number of different approaches taken when tackling the regeneration of areas with multiple deprivation. This paper examines some of the effects that the urban restructuring approach used in the Netherlands has had on some of the residents of a large housing estate on the outskirts of Amsterdam known as Bijlmermeer or the Bijlmer. Within this area of multiple social and economic disadvantages, black and ethnic groups form the majority of the population. This paper is based on observations obtained from semi-structured interviews and discussions with local residents, project officials and relevant academics, and a number of Human Geography field trips to the area. Some of the early findings suggest that the transformation of this area from a failed Utopian vision into a thriving and successful multi-cultural built-environment is based on dispersing some of the most socially and economically excluded residents from the area via demolition, renovation and rebuild programmes. This in turn supports the work of other researchers in suggesting that the theory of urban restructuring has been adopted as a policy not to promote social cohesion but as a policy to prevent ethnic resistance.



Introduction

Many contemporary European urban policy initiatives recognise that their needs to be a consolidated, area based approach when tackling the regeneration of regions with multiple deprivation. However, within the individual countries of the European Union the differing social and economic histories, the structure of local and national governments and the composition of the urban fabric mean that interpretations of how this approach is achieved can be diametrically opposite. Within the UK the avowed focus of the regeneration of areas with multiple deprivation is the preservation of communities and engagement of these existing residents within the planning and implementation of urban renewal initiatives (Ginsberg, 1999; Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; 2001). Conversely, within the Netherlands, there is a belief that the approach adopted by countries such as the UK maintains a high proportion of low-income households within areas of multiple deprivation that in turn leads to physical and social monotony and low social cohesion. To counteract this, the focus of Dutch housing policy since 1997 has been urban restructuring (Priemus, 1998). This policy diversifies the housing stock within areas of multiple deprivation in order to encourage social mix and to decrease the numbers of low-income housing. The reasoning behind the policy is that new inhabitants who are wealthier than existing residents will act as a social and economic catalyst and will demolish the homogeneity generated by an economy overwhelmingly based on low income (van Beckhoven & van Kempen, 2003). This paper examines how urban restructuring has impacted upon a large area of multiple deprivation on the outskirts of Amsterdam and some of the effects it has had on existing residents¹.

* K Leeming: Research Fellow, Centre for Local Policy Studies. T Shakur: Director of ICDES, Edgehill College, Lancashire, UK. Emails: leemingk@edgehill.ac.uk & shakurt@edgehill.ac.uk

Bijlmermeer: The background context

The focus of this study is an area called Bijlmermeer (or the Bijlmer), which is situated, in the submunicipality of Zuidoost several kilometres to the south east of the city of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. Bijlmermeer is a large-scale housing project that was built on polder land during the 1960s to ameliorate the severe post-war housing shortage within Amsterdam. It has undergone several changes in administrative control over the years and is now under the control of the City of Amsterdam, and has formed part of the Southeast municipal district since 1987.

Bijlmermeer was intended to be a modernistic, model satellite town to Amsterdam and was designed to house 50,000 people (Catling, 1998) utilising the 'Functional City' concept of the Swiss architect Le Corbusier (Stadsdeel Zuidoost, 1994). Le Corbusier advocated clear demarcations between living, working, recreation and traffic areas, and the resulting design for Bijlmermeer was as a car-free zone with tall buildings in park-like surroundings (*figures 1 & 2*). Cars were diverted via raised roads, and parking was in peripheral and rooftop car parks with access to them via internal corridors and external footbridges (Kwekkeboom, 2003).

Figure 1:
The original plan for the Bijlmermeer,
Municipal Urban Planning, 1968



Figure 2:
Bijlmermeer under construction 1971



Source: Bruijne, D., van Hoogstraten, D., Kwekkeboom, W. & Liutjen, A., 2004: 10.

Bijlmermeer was largely based upon high-rise (10 floor), deck-apartment blocks built in a honeycomb pattern interspersed with green spaces, cycle and pedestrian paths, and shopping centres between the blocks. Unfortunately the original plan was altered due to budget restrictions and many of the refinements of the plan that were geared towards providing a pleasant environment and 'quality of life' were abandoned or compromised. For example, larger but fewer lifts were installed, long access galleries or walkways were added, and the covered street part of the design was raised one floor with the ground floor becoming a storage facility (Kwekkeboom, 2003; Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 1987).

The housing was originally intended for the predominantly white, Amsterdam middle-classes, and a small number – who are still in residence today – did move in. However, by the time that the development was finished, the housing preferences of the majority of the

Amsterdam middle-classes had veered from expensive gallery apartments such as those in Bijlmermeer, to lower-priced, low-rise developments in the suburbs in new towns such as Almere, Lelystad and Purmerend (Luijten, 1997; Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 1987; Webbink, 2000).

Spiral of Decline

Within a relatively short space of time it became evident that the development had major problems. For example, the large amount of parkland surrounding the blocks meant that it was both difficult and expensive to maintain, and so it became run-down and a dumping ground for garbage, litter and the discarded equipment of the drug trade and was generally avoided as a leisure site by residents.

Additionally, the apartment blocks proved difficult to manage. This was partly due to their sheer size. During the building of the development it had been decided to increase the numbers of apartment units in order to increase the potential income from rents. These were incorporated by such means as adding extra floors to the buildings (Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 1987). The finished complex had 18,000 housing units, 13,000 of which were in high-rise blocks, with an official population figure just short of 50,000 (Dukes, 2002). However, due to the numbers of 'unofficial' residents, others have estimated the population to be in excess of 100,000 (Markovic, 2000).

Other reasons for the apartment blocks being difficult to manage were the changes that were made to the original design. For example, there were too few elevators to service the buildings properly, and the existing elevators were extremely large – holding around 100 people. This meant that if elevators were vandalised or put out of action then it affected large numbers of residents. Also, the aisles and walkways, such as those leading to the car parks, were dark and often sited in obscure places and they became sites for drug selling and drug taking and of crimes such as mugging, with the open parkland allowing for a speedy escape (Webbink, 2000). Additionally, the high rents of the area meant that many of the apartments remained (officially) empty and this contributed to the budgetary problems of the Management Company leading to a reduction in maintenance and security that exacerbated the existing problems.

Consequently, rather than becoming a modernistic, model satellite town to Amsterdam, Bijlmermeer became a place where those with multiple social and economic disadvantages and few options were encouraged to locate.

Ethnic Context

Initially, the area became home to the many immigrants who moved to Amsterdam in the run up to Surinamese independence in 1975. In July 2001 one of the Bijlmermeer project managers estimated that Surinamese residents formed 25%-30% of the population. However, a recent study by RESTATE (Aalbers, van Beckhoven, van Kempen, Musterd and Ostendorf, 2003) puts the figure for the Southeast as a whole slightly higher at 31%, with 40% in Bijlmer-Centre and 33% in Bijlmer-East.

Later additions to the Bijlmermeer population include immigrants from other Dutch colonies such as the Netherlands (or Dutch) Antilles, North Africa, and more recently Asia and Eastern Europe. The area now has such a multiplicity of nationalities that it is difficult to

obtain reliable statistics. For example, one project manager refers to a survey of residents held in the late 1990s when making decisions regarding ethnic populations. This survey indicates that there are just over 80 different nationalities in the area, however, the manager of a community project geared towards promoting and improving the image of Bijlmermeer believes the figure is nearer to 150. A third, unofficial survey, indicated that the figure is over 160, albeit with only one or two representatives from some nationalities. The residents and the officials who took part in the study for this paper suggested that the huge discrepancies between the official and unofficial figures are due to a combination of four factors.

The first is to do with legitimacy: If residents are living in Bijlmermeer illegally, such as by multiple occupancy or squatting, then they are less likely to respond to official surveys as this may bring them to the attention of the housing authorities and lead to eviction. There is some supporting evidence for this factor. On the 4th October 1991 an Israeli El Al cargo plane crashed into two of the apartment blocks killing the crew, an unidentified passenger and at least 43 people on the ground. Investigators found that due to the high numbers of illegal immigrants living in the development, and their unwillingness to co-operate with the authorities, it was impossible to ascertain the exact numbers of residents killed (Smith, 2000). The crash may also have been a contributory factor in some residents wanting to leave Bijlmermeer.

A second factor concerns the ability to speak Dutch: Many of the immigrants – especially the more recent – are unable to speak Dutch and may have difficulties in responding to surveys accurately. The third factor is the high rates of illiteracy amongst residents, which means that they tend to ignore written or postal questionnaires, and the fourth factor is a distrust of any officials who ask questions. So residents may be able to speak Dutch and are living in the Bijlmermeer legitimately, but refuse to participate in detailed surveys because either they cannot or because they are afraid of what the information may be used for.

Bijlmermeer not only houses an extremely diverse population with differing cultures, languages, experiences and needs, it is also the site of severe social and economic problems. For example, until recently, the crime and labour market inactivity rates within the area were amongst the highest in the Netherlands (Catling, 1998; Markovic, 2000), and although these rates are falling, they are still considerably higher than the average in Amsterdam (Aalbers *et al*, 2003). Additionally, there is a high concentration of drug problems that is in part fuelled by the movement of the drug scene away from the red light district of Amsterdam into parts of Bijlmermeer (*ibid*).

The severity of these problems and the ways in which they manifest themselves has meant that for most white residents – although not all – moving out of the area has been a high priority. However, the same is not true for the many Surinamese and Guyanese residents – provided that they live in a block with a low crime rate – who believe that the area has a lot to offer provided that the problems are tackled (Catling, 1998). Those white residents who do not want to leave are, in the main, original residents of the development. This group are sometimes known as the ‘Bijlmer Believers’, and they have tried to focus the attention of the authorities on the advantages of the original design plan of Le Corbusier, whilst forcing them to tackle the problems blighting the area (Webbink, 2000).

Renewal of the Bijlmer

In 1992, it was decided that the problems of Bijlmermeer needed to be addressed and the Nieuw Amsterdam Housing Association, Southeast City district (the district council for Zuidoost) and the City of Amsterdam set up a Steering Committee for Renewal of Bijlmermeer and the Projectbureau ‘Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer’ (Bijlmermeer Renewal). The renewal strategy was based upon three elements: spatial renewal; management renewal; and social renewal (Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 1987).

The spatial renewal involves somewhere between 50-60% of the original high-rise area (as the plans are responsive to ongoing feedback from the redevelopment, the Projectbureau cannot give a definite figure at this time). The project – which is expected to be completed at some time between 2007 to 2010 – encompasses the demolition of some of the housing blocks, the redevelopment of others into smaller units, the development of new housing (see fig 3), and the division of tenants into one third social rental, one third premium rental and one third owner occupier (Webbink, 2000).

Figure 3: New Layout plan of K-South block based on the Urban Renewal Plan of Bijlmermeer 1996



Source: Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer 2002: 115.

The management renewal element is geared towards the actual management of the residential and living environment and intends to concentrate on improving the quality of life within the area by involving the residents in the decision-making processes.

One part of the social renewal element is to tackle the high levels of labour market inactivity in the district. It proposes to do this by ensuring there are co-ordinated links with the nearby business district of Holendrecht/Amstel III – which is one of the largest in the city – and the

adjoining leisure and entertainment complex containing the Amsterdam ArenA, a multiplex cinema, and the Mojo Concert Hall. This part of the social renewal element has the avowed intention of employing local people in construction work and training a further 2,000 residents for watch duty work (Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 1987).

Fortuitously for Bijlmermeer, as it was formulating this renewal strategy the European Commission launched a new initiative to target areas of extreme deprivation. The URBAN initiative was introduced in 1994 and advocates an integrated approach to regeneration. It is also area-based, and has a strong emphasis on local participation in project design and implementation.

The ‘Black and White’ Conflict

The renewal strategy already in place in Bijlmermeer meant that it matched all of the criteria and the URBAN Bijlmermeer Programme was launched in September 1995. However, from the beginning of the programme there were major problems concerning local participation in the decision making process. The majority of the representatives in the organisational set-up of URBAN-Bijlmermeer were white, and the vast majority of residents of Bijlmermeer are from non-white ethnic minority groups (Dukes, 2002). This led to black politicians together with representatives of other agencies and groups forming the *Zwart Beraad* or ‘Black Consideration’ group (Leistra, 1996). Increasing confrontation between *Zwart Beraad* and white district councillors led to the suspension of the URBAN-Bijlmermeer programme from May 1996 to January 1997 and the headlining of the problems in local newspapers as the “Black and White conflict”(Dukes, 2002).

Resolution of the conflict included the replacement of the Steering Committee by the Uitgebreid Bestuurlijk Overleg (UBO) with 4 seats for ethnic minority groups and a seat for religious institutions, and the inclusion of two seats for ethnic minority groups on the Supervisory Committee URBAN-Bijlmermeer (Dukes, 2002). Project criteria were also changed to include the stipulations that:

- The project should be multicultural and would therefore help to reinforce the multi-ethnic community.
- The project should be developed/created by residents’ groups, from the bottom-up.

Additionally, a two million guilders “Fonds voor Onderop” or “bottom-up Fund” was established by the UBO for community projects. Also, under recommendations from *Zwart Beraad* and the UBO ethnic minority organisation, a Multiculturalisation and Participation Bureau was initiated in 1997 to stimulate and support grass roots projects in the area, as well as monitoring the quality and progress of programs from a multicultural viewpoint (Dukes, 2002; Kwekkeboom, 2003).

The URBAN-Southeast Investment Programme ran from 1995-1999 and the area received a new tranche of funding when it was given Objective Two status by the European Union (Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, 2003). This is a major subsidy programme geared towards ensuring economic and social parity within the EU.

Community Involvement in the Renewal Process

Involving the community within the regeneration process has proven difficult for several reasons. First is because of the multiplicity of nationalities, languages and cultures, and attempts to circumvent the problems that arise from this has included both formal and informal approaches. Formal approaches have included having interpreters present at information points and during public enquiries, publishing literature in several languages and making presentations to individual ethnic groups. Informal approaches include contacting people via stalls at markets and festivals, and at sport and games facilities (Webbink, 2000). Second, the high turnover of residents and the social and economic problems of the region has led to limited involvement by the residents in promoting social cohesion and place-attachment (Aalbers *et al*, 2003). Third, and perhaps more interestingly, is the belief by a number of residents that it is pointless to get involved because the decision-making authorities do not have their interests in mind. Instead they believe that the authorities are more interested in ensuring that they move out of the Bijlmer because they do not fit into the planners image for the future of the area.

Welcoming Difference or Wily Dispersal?

On first appearances, the policy of urban restructuring actively welcomes the differences between social, cultural, national and economic groups. It assumes that these differences will produce dynamism within a community that will act as a regenerative catalyst for areas with multiple deprivation. However, there is an increasing body of research that contests this approach and argues that the residents of these areas would increase their social and economic standing if policies were geared to renewing and supporting the *existing* communities in the area and not fragmenting them, dispersing them and introducing a wider social mix (Atkinson, R. & Kintrea, K. 1998; Bolt, G., Burgers, J. & van Kempen, R. 1998; Reijndorp, 1996, 1997) and that urban restructuring does not necessarily promote social cohesion and contact within neighbourhoods (van Beckhoven & van Kempen, 2003). Some residents of the Bijlmer go further, they believe that the policies are there to actively and widely disperse the poor, especially those who are black and from minority ethnic groups so that they are no longer a potential ‘threat’.

“We live on the streets and they don’t like it, because we’re poor they think we’ll riot” (non-white resident).

“We frighten them, I think it’s because we like loud – clothes, music, talk” (non-white resident).

“We’re not wanted. We live outside, our culture is outside and this outside culture is off-putting to the middle classes. The Council allowed the place to deteriorate so much so that they have an excuse to move people out and redesign the place. At same time they’re making people work for benefits so that the place is kept clean. These are things to attract the middle classes. No street culture, low buildings, and clean” (non-white resident).

“We’re not target for all this money. The target groups are elites, not people residing in area (non-white resident).

“It’s all elements to attract the middle classes. Limited street culture. Low-rise buildings, and kept clean cheaply by people on benefit” (non-white resident).

“They leave it, they leave it, and they leave it. And then they have to do something, they have to take the people away because they say there are too many people outside” (non-white resident).

The low numbers of socially rented accommodation available after refurbishment of high-rise blocks fuels this belief as does the strict allocation process for the accommodation that is available. To have a chance of being re-housed within Bijlmermeer a resident must be an urban renewal candidate. To become an urban renewal candidate they must have been renting a home within the Bijlmer high-rise buildings for two years – essentially they must be ‘legal’ tenants in order to have any rights to re-housing. However, even if they are urban renewal candidates this does not mean that they will be re-housed in a similar sized home or even within Bijlmermeer. The reduction of the numbers of social housing available within Bijlmermeer has ensured that the numbers wishing to remain will by far exceed the numbers of social housing available. Urban renewal candidates are only given *priority* when the supply of suitable² rented housing is searched, and if there is not housing available in Bijlmermeer then they are offered suitable accommodation elsewhere in Amsterdam.

Those tenants who have been renting a home within Bijlmermeer for less than two years – and there is a tacit acknowledgement that this will include the 10-15% of residents who are living in Bijlmermeer illegally – are categorised as semi-urban renewal candidates and as such are not eligible for automatic re-housing. This group, which includes some of the most socially and economically excluded as well as most vulnerable groups, are given removal expenses of 4,500 Euro and help in searching the housing lists of Amsterdam and its environs for suitable accommodation. At present, there is evidence that a large number of those Bijlmer residents who are *sans-papiers*³, and those who have legal residency in the Netherlands but who are living illegally in Bijlmermeer are continually moving from high-rise buildings undergoing renovation into unrenovated high-rise blocks (Aalbers *et al*, 2003) rather than move from the area. This is possibly because they have access to jobs, albeit low-paid and insecure, through the many informal networks of the alternative economy.

Several residents also alleged that one of the reasons a number of people wanted to move away from Bijlmermeer was because of the El Al cargo plane crash in 1991. When the plane crashed its cargo was said to be flowers and perfume, this was later changed to non-toxic chemicals. Finally, the Israeli government admitted that the plane was carrying 190 litres of Dimethyl Methylphosphonate (DMPP) one of the primary components in the manufacture of the deadly nerve gas Sarin, as well as approximately 24 pieces of depleted uranium ranging in weight from 6 to 30 kilogrammes that were acting as a counterbalance weight (Reydt, 1999; Sancton, 2001; Uijt de Haag, Smetsers, Witlox, Krüs & Eisenga, 2001). A large number of people (estimates veer from 300 to over 800) who were near to the crash site, either because they were rescue workers or because they were residents, have experienced a number of health problems in the interim. Whilst the majority of these complaints may be related to Post-traumatic Stress Disorder, there are also a number that have suffered physical complaints such as auto-immune diseases, genetic faults and rare diseases and cancers (Reydt, 1999; Sancton, 2001; Smith, 2000). According to Sancton (2001, p4) many Bijlmermeer residents believe “that authorities have been slow to respond because the victims are mostly poor immigrants⁴”. The sum total of the handling of the aftermath to the crash has been that a number of residents now believe that it was a significant dispersal factor for several reasons. First, the area housed a large number of unregistered tenants or ‘illegals’ who have limited rights when expressing housing preferences under the regeneration

programme's criterion, second, there was the perceived possibility of contracting a disabling or fatal disease, and third, that the authorities were reacting to the events very slowly.

In other parts of Bijlmermeer, even those residents with a middle income (gross earnings of approximately 20,420 to 38,571 Euro per annum) who are interested in buying rather than renting a property within the area are finding that they are being priced out of the market. In the early 1990s the price of a house in the Bijlmer was much lower than surrounding regions, over the past ten years they have risen sharply across the board. For example, apartments in the renovated buildings are put up for sale as soon as the former tenants have vacated them and they are mainly in the price range 90,756 to 136,134 Euro. This has encouraged the Amsterdam City Council to help these buyers by extending the Amsterdamse Middensegment Hypotheek (AMH) or Amsterdam middle-sector mortgage to the Bijlmer. The AMH is a repayment free and practically interest free loan up to the value of approximately 45,378 Euro and gives prospective buyers the chance to buy at a reasonable price (Bijlmerbouw, 2001 p4).

But for some, especially small businesses, this is too little, too late. Prior to renovation, a number of the retail premises in Bijlmer were empty and were targets of vandalism and in some cases arson attacks. Local shopkeepers were encouraged to move into the premises by low rents and taxes in order to both deter the vandals and to provide sorely needed services such as ethnic food stores. When the regeneration spread to the shopping parades, some of the tenants felt that the much higher taxes and rents of the new premises were a strategy to force them out so that firms offering more generic brand names that were attractive to the middle classes could move in. For some of these tenants, their fears have been realised and they have had to move out of the Bijlmer.

“They've done this to get security on the cheap”

Many of the unemployed within Bijlmermeer have problems with literacy and numeracy, many are semi-skilled or unskilled, have little job experience and have problems with self-esteem. The introduction of initiatives such as ‘Dubbel Plus’, which offers government subsidised jobs that pay between 30-50% more than standard social benefit to those who have been unemployed over a year, are registered with the Employment Office and are over 23 years of age, are geared towards providing some of the missing skills and experience (Aalbers *et al*, 2003). However, as many of the jobs provided are within the district police, the district cleaning department and the housing corporations, and because a number of residents who are enrolled in the scheme believe that they had no choice but to accept low paid jobs because otherwise they thought that they would lose their social benefit, this has fuelled a belief that they are being used as cheap labour as security guards, cleaners and caretakers to make Bijlmermeer more attractive to outsiders.

“Many of the people here don't get work. Then at the same time they make people work but they don't get any extra money, they get the same as when on social, you see...if you get 1500 guilders a month you get food and others, if you get 1750 you get nothing, you have to pay for the food you see” (non-white resident).

“You have to take job, no social if you don't” (non-white resident).

“They want it nice and safe, you see, but it costs too, too much, so they make us do it” (non-white resident).

“They’ve done this [subsidised jobs initiative] to get security on the cheap” (non-white resident).

It would appear that the types of job opportunities offered by the renewal process have also contributed to this belief as well. For example, one idea was to employ as many of the unemployed Bijlmer residents as possible on construction projects. However, even though training facilities were put in place, and there were thousands of applicants, the Job Centre did not manage to find enough recruits. The problems were similar with the development of the Amsterdam Arena and Arena Boulevard. Those from the Bijlmer who are employed tend to be in low paid and low skilled jobs such as cleaning (Reindorp, 1997).

Conclusion

Urban landscapes are the result of the power relationships between those who design them, those that govern and service them, and those who live there. Regenerating urban landscapes can be a measure by which the former two groups seize back control of neighbourhoods from the latter group and re-impose their cultural norms and values.

There is no doubt that the multicultural neighbourhood envisaged by the urban renewal managers of Bijlmermeer is one that welcomes different cultures and nationalities – it has to given the size of the ethnic population there. However, the indications coming from some of the residents are that it is a multicultural vision that is geared to producing a sanitised version of the neighbourhood that already exists by dispersing those elements of the existing community that do not promote this vision. The social engineering that is taking place in Bijlmermeer is promoting a social mix that it is believed will produce a more harmonious, tolerant and positive community, but, this form of society is also one that can be viewed as a strategy to prevent ethnic resistance (van der Horst, 2003) or even a strategy that ‘is dangerously close to the old saying ‘urban renewal = Negro removal’’ (Priemus, 1998, p308). Especially given that within the Netherlands, the idea of active dispersal and de-concentration of ethnic minorities goes back to the 1970s and is still a policy feature of some political parties today (van Beckhoven & van Kempen, 2003). Urban restructuring does not promote social cohesion, instead it is more about the restructuring of the physical environment in the hope that it will:

“...contribute to [the] social and economic vitality of the city as a whole” (van Beckhoven & van Kempen, 2003, p871). The implications for the high-rise parts of Bijlmermeer are that urban restructuring is both welcoming difference *and* utilising (maybe not so) wily dispersal techniques that ensure that ex-residents cannot move back into social housing in Bijlmermeer once they have moved away because they do not contribute to this ‘social and economic vitality’. Or, as one resident phrased it:

“...once you’ve gone, it’s bye, bye”.

Notes

¹ Based on a number of informal, semi-structured interviews, human geography field trips and a few research visits (funded by both individual students and EdgeHill College) that were held over a period of three years (2001-2004) with residents of Bijlmer-Central and Bijlmer-East.

² Suitable in this case meaning one that is judged appropriate for the residents’ income, household size and existing terms of residency.

³ Without legal residence status in the Netherlands

⁴ Within the Netherlands the terms ‘minority’ and ‘immigrant’ are usually interchangeable (Mollenkopf, 2002).

References

- Aalbers, M., van Beckhoven, E., van Kempen, R., Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2003) *Large Housing Estates in the Netherlands. Overview of developments and problems in Amsterdam and Utrecht*, RESTATE report 2e, Urban and Regional Research Centre, University of Utrecht.
- Atkinson, R. & Kintrea, K. (1998) *Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood Impacts of Owner Occupation*, Edinburgh, Scottish Homes.
- Bolt, G., Burgers, J. & van Kempen, R. (1998) “On the Social Significance of Spatial Location; Spatial Segregation and Social Inclusion”, *Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 83-92.
- Bruijne, D., van Hoogstraten, D., Kwekkeboom, W. & Luijten, A., (2003) *Zuidoost Amsterdam Southeast*, Amsterdam, THOTH Publishers.
- Catling, C. (ed.) (1998), *Amsterdam*, APA Publications
- Ginsberg, N. (1999) “Putting the social into urban regeneration policy”, *Local Economy*, May, 55-71.
- Kwekkeboom, W. (2003) “Rebuilding the Bijlmermeer 1992-2002”, In: Bruijne, D., van Hoogstraten, D., Kwekkeboom, W. & Luijten, A., *Zuidoost Amsterdam Southeast*, Amsterdam, THOTH Publishers, 75-113.
- Leistra, G. (1996) “Bijsturen in de Bijlmer”, *Elsevier*, November 11th, p38.
- Luijten, A. (1997) “A barrel of contradictions: The dynamic history of the Bijlmermeer”, *Archis*, 3, 15-13.
- Mollenkopf, J. (2002) *Assimilating Immigrants in Amsterdam: A Perspective from New York*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam Study Centre for the Metropolitan Environment.
- Priemus, H. (1998) “Redifferentiation of the Urban Housing Stock in the Netherlands: A Strategy to Prevent Spatial Segregation?” *Housing Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 301-310.
- Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer (2002) *Finale Plan van Aanpak, I Definitieve Versie*
- Reijndorp, A. (1996) “Bevordert herpositionering de leefbaarheid?” *Nieuw Tijdschrift voor de Volkhuysvesting*, 2, No. 6, 6-9.
- Reijndorp, A. (1997) “Between city and state: Social renewal in the Bijlmermeer”, *Archis*, 3, 56-63.
- Smith, G. (2000) “Uranium Skies: What Was Aboard Flight 1862?” *Earth Island Journal*, Winter, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1-7.
- Social Exclusion Unit, (1998) *Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal*, Cm 4045, London, The Stationery Office.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan*, January, London, Cabinet Office.
- Stadsdeel Zuidoost, (1994) *From Bindelmere to Southeast City District*, Amsterdam, Stadsdeel Zuidoost Communications Department.
- van Beckhoven, E. & van Kempen, R. (2003) “Social Effects of Urban Restructuring: A Case Study in Amsterdam and Utrecht, the Netherlands”, *Housing Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 6, November, 853-875.
- van der Horst, H. (2003) “Multicultural Theming in the Netherlands: Pacifying, Essentializing and Revanchist Effects”, In: Ingram, S. & Reisenleitner, M. (eds.) *Placing History: Themed Environments, Urban Consumption and the Public Entertainment*, Wien, Turia and Kant, 1-24.

Other Sources

Bijlmerbouw: Informatiekrant Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, Winter, 2001, English summary, p4.

Bruijne. D, Van Hoogstraten. D, Kwekkeboom. W. & Luijten. A.(2004). Zuidoost, Southeast Amsterdam. The Netherlands : Thoth

Dukes, T. (2002) *The European Community Initiative URBAN: Help or Hinder for Local Participation? The case of URBAN Bijlmermeer (Amsterdam, the Netherlands)*, <http://www.by-og-byg.dk/eura/workshops/papers/workshop5/dukes.htm>

Markovic,I.(2000)*Going Dutch*.

http://www.europamag.com/Numero_hors_200/Immigration/Ntherlands/Immig_neth.htm

Reydt, P. (1999) “Dutch government rocked by parliamentary report into 1992 El Air crash”, 27 April, <http://www.wsws.org/articles/1999/apr1999/hol-a27.shtml>

Sancton, T. (2001) “Burning Questions!, Friday, March 16, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/printout/0,8816,22329,00.html>

Uijt de Haag, P.A.M., Smetsers, R.C.G.M., Witlox, H., Krüs, H.W. & Eisenga, A.H.M. (2001) “Risk analysis of depleted uranium following an aircraft crash”, 16 March, *Cyclone Fluid Dynamics*, <http://www.cyclone.nl/bijlmer/bijlmer.htm>

Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer (2003) *The development of Amsterdam Southeast*, Amsterdam, Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer/Arena Boulevard.

Webbink, J. (2000) *Renewal in Tomorrow's Town*, Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer, September, (Unpublished project overview).