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PREFACE

To do a project is especially as an exchange student really challenging. Although we fortunately got a crash course by Viggo Plum and Rie Søgaard Jesen before the semester started, we were clear about that it is maybe more demanding for us than for our Danish fellow students, who learn this kind of working method from scratch. It is even more provoking for all of us to work in another language than our mother tongue German, French and Spanish.

Started up with the attempt to do “something on urban planning”, all of us being interested in human and urban geography, we brainstormed on sub-topics of urban planning and agreed that we wanted to research on housing. Some of us were also interested in technopoles and economic aspects, so we tried to connect these to housing. One of our first ideas coming up was to compare several cities from different countries, probably our hometowns and to find out common features or “innovative elements” that could be applied to other cities and to “the perfect city”. We also wanted to include aspects about Roskilde because we thought it is a good idea to start outside your own door as geographers and analyse the surroundings. We searched for several information on this but then we considered the idea to compare four to five cities to each other too complicated and reduced our project to the comparison of two recently built quarters of one of our home towns and of Roskilde.

When we started to search for books and articles on urban planning and city development, however, we came to the idea to focus on gentrification\(^1\), because we recognised it was in fact a real problem for the society. As it does not only involve geographic matters, but also has economic aspects – houses getting more attractive for upper middle class people because of restoration – and social effects – certain inhabitants being marginalized and pushed out of the district – included, we think that gentrification as a topic for our project work fits very good with our interests and study backgrounds.

We dropped the attempt of a comparison and decided to pick one part of Roskilde, namely Sank Jørgensbjerg. The reasons which pushed us to choose this area better than another one in the city were mainly due to the morphology of the quarter as the special

\(^1\)This term will here only described really shortly. Further details follow in the next part.
housing style which we thought could be good illustrations for our study subject. Of course this was only the outward appearance that let us guess about gentrification in Sankt Jørgensbjerg. So our attempt was to find out more about the social and economical backgrounds.

Once the area chosen we had as our main intention to find out if gentrification takes or at least if it has been taken place there and what urban planners can do to avoid the effects (positive and negative) of gentrification, but after the evaluation, we have decided to focus essentially on the gentrification process in medium-sized cities and especially in Sankt Jørgensbjerg and to find out if gentrification has been taking place there and to what degree.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As promised in the footnote on page one we will now give basic theoretical definitions of gentrification before we go into the problem field more detailed and end up with our cardinal question. Afterwards the project design part will explain the framework of the main part.

1.1 THEORETICAL DEFINITIONS: GENTRIFICATION

The definition of gentrification is a very complex issue. The word is derived from the English term “gentry” which describes the low nobles. In fact the first time this term was used in connection with town development was by Ruth Glass, a British sociologist, in the 1960s. She wrote:

“One by one, many of the working-class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle-classes – upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews and cottages – two rooms up and two down – have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences ... Once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed.”

To this definition, other authors have added some explanations about the process, ...

“[...] in which wealthier people move into, renovate and restore run-down housing in an inner city or other neglected area, housing formerly inhabited by poorer people, the tenure usually shifting from a private rented to owner occupation. It occurs particularly in inner city areas as a result of the wishes of the wealthier people to have easy access to their jobs and the recreational facilities (e.g. theatres) in the central area. Once started in a district, the process spreads rapidly until most of the poorer inhabitants are displaced, so that social character of, and the value of the property in, their neighbourhoods markedly changes.”

or

“[...] by which poor and working-class neighbourhoods in the inner city are refurbished by an influx of private capital and middle-class home buyers and renters… a dramatic yet unpredicted reversal of what most twentieth-century urban theories had been predicting as the fate of the central and inner-city”

---

“Gentrification is quintessentially about urban reinvestment. In addition to residential rehabilitation and redevelopment, it now embraces commercial redevelopment and loft conversions (for residence or office) as part of a wider restructuring of urban geographical space.”

So, with these different points of view that have the key features of physical, social, economic and cultural change in inner-city neighbourhoods in common, we can define gentrification like an overall transformation of a preferable part of the inner city in Western societies, which includes a shift in the physiognomy of the houses, in the economic value of the buildings, in the socio-cultural group of people living there and with this in the whole atmosphere of the quarter, as the supposedly better off new inhabitants also attract and are attracted by shops, cafés, future-oriented enterprises or galleries. More detailed, there is a very visible architectonic al alteration or change in “townscape” because the housing is restored or rebuilt and through this upgraded; there is an economic revaluation, because the housing gets more expensive, as Neil Smith describes,

“We can say that the restructuring of the urban-space economy is a product of the uneven development of capitalism or of the operation of a rent gap*, the result of a developing services economy or a changed life-style preferences, the suburbanization* of capital or the devalorization of capital invested in the urban built environment.”

and there is a social change because the financially weak low-skilled workers, unemployed, elderly people or ethnic minorities who used to inhabit the run-down houses are unable to pay the new rent and they have to move to other places to let the more wealthy YUPPIES (young urban professional people) or the like live in the renewed housing. This way, gentrification brings with it social segregation*, which is considered as its main negative impact and which needs remedy. For the municipalities, gentrification is often an appreciated occurrence, as the wealthier people of course bring in taxes and a better image for the district which in turn attracts investors or tourists. As we are now more clear about which aspects gentrification implies and which not we will narrow from this general problem level down to our cardinal question.

---

6 Neil Smith ; Peter Williams: Gentrification Of The City.
* Every word having an asterisk will be explained in the Glossary in the Appendix.
The Post-Fordism* period has had a lot of consequences on our society for many reasons: It has permitted a reform of former social system but above all because at the same time, it considerably transformed the way cities are organised.

The evolution of cities and their populations is partly reflected in the housing, some people have razed the old houses to built new ones, others have remodelled the buildings equipping them with the new necessities, but moreover in the social mix between middle and upper class in popular neighbourhoods.

Then it is essential, as an example of what happens in our society to refer to gentrification.

From the initial coining by Ruth Glass in 1963, gentrification has become a heavily covered and contested topic which opposes major theories and ideologies in urban geography and thus, in geography in its all.

The occurrence of gentrification is caused by many different preconditions, so it can also have several manifestations that tend in different directions. One cannot find the one reason for the process to start and neither will this be our aim in this research. Gentrification is a process which exists temporarily, i.e. until the whole former population is totally taken over by the incoming population, and is still going on and ever-changing but it is rather to be seen as one effect of an overall structural change in Western societies, in close relation to globalization.

One reason there are many different definitions and explanations of gentrification is because it is shown in a different way in every country. Nevertheless gentrification is one of the main places of the conflict between the liberal humanists, who highlight the choice, the culture, the consumption and the consumption’s demand, and the Marxists who on the contrary insist on the role of the capital, the classes, the production and the supply; in other words it is a conflict between the supporters of culture and individual agency and the capital and profit defendants.

Even though they disagree on what is the main point about gentrification, they all describe this process in big cities and in particular in what we can call “global cities” (London, Paris, and New-York etc.) which have been the first cities subject to this process. Nonetheless in 2002, Smith highlighted that although gentrification was originated from a few cities, it has rapidly descended down the “urban hierarchy” as
As Denmark is a part of Europe and considering all the elements given previously Copenhagen is then a place where gentrification, in theory, should take place. Indeed, the actual example of the renovation and renewal of Vesterbro, the evolution of the quarter which followed this city policy is a well know illustration of gentrification. But what then if we pushed the reflection further: May gentrification take also place in Greater Copenhagen in its all? Is it a phenomenon strictly reserved to big cities or is it possible to perceive it in Roskilde and if we go deeper in the argument then in Sankt Jørgensbjerg – a really small area of a medium sized city?

**CAN WE SAY THAT GENTRIFICATION IS OR HAS BEEN TAKING PLACE IN SANKT JØRGENSBJERG AND TO WHAT DEGREE?**

In this way, the main question implies others such as:
- Are there predispositions to be a gentrified quarter and which are they?
- Does a town rather suffer or benefit from gentrification?
- What are the causes and the consequences for this process – is it inevitable?
- Which are the theories used to define gentrification?
- Can the theories on gentrification mostly based on examples of quarters in Metropolis also be applied on medium-sized cities as Roskilde?
- Which are the limitations of the definitions?
- Is Sankt Jørgensbjerg what we call a “gentrified quarter”? 
Related to our questionnaire these questions will hopefully have an answer:

- Who are the inhabitants? To which strata/milieu do they belong to?
- What does the geographical and housing structure tell us?
- How is the economical background of the inhabitants?
- Do they have a typical lifestyle?

How we will try to find answers to these questions will be explained in the next part: Out overall project design. There will be a special explanation to the Questionnaires Design in the beginning of the fourth part.
1.3 PROJECT DESIGN

As the whole project is based on an investigation on a topic as large as complex, the first thing to do was to decide on the rough steps we wanted to follow. The definition of the subject and later of the cardinal question has been the first element which permitted the creation of an unofficial working table of content and a timetable. These two materials were and are still developed during the projects process and stay our reference points for an efficient organization, changing and getting more precise every day further we are going.

As our projects investigates on gentrification especially in medium-sized cities; it was then essential to give some definition from a geographic dictionary and collect different points of view about it, so as to adapt itemize gentrification in general to a specific area namely Sankt Jørgensbjerg in Roskilde.

We consider Roskilde as medium-sized with 54.375 (2005\(^7\)) to be seen in the Danish context. Further it has a main centre function (referring to Walter Christaller’s theory of central places) for the surrounding communes providing jobs, shopping facilities, public services and recreational places. Although the city has a university it can not be seen as a big city because the university was not founded by the city though by the government in Copenhagen. In order to take the pressure from the city centre and to outsource special ideas and thinking out of the traditional university in Copenhagen. At this point we will not give more reasons proving Roskilde is a medium-sized city – we take it for granted inside our project.

On the next page is a Figure about the overall structure of the project. Explanations for the purpose we have with each single part will be given afterwards.

\(^{7}\)Netborger.dk (DMS), [www.netborger.dk](http://www.netborger.dk), 13.12.2005,13:43
1.3.1 The Project Structure
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CONCLUSION
The discussion of the different approaches is really important because it gives us different points of view on gentrification and we regard it from different angles in order to make clear this complex issue.

Sankt Jørgensbjerg has a particular localization and history although it is a part of Roskilde. The research about the history of the area but also about the city itself has to be included to better understand its evolution from the moment it was established until now. Morphological as well as social conditions will be focussed on. Indeed we think it is useful to have a look at some “city concepts” applied on Roskilde, but also to see the interactions between the town Greater Copenhagen and the Zealand Region.

We prepared a questionnaire (see Appendix) which we printed in hundred exemplars and delivered to the households that had to send it back to us. We included questions dealing with demographic, housing, economic and lifestyle facets. The analyse of the questionaires’ results is mixed with secondary data on Denmark and Roskilde. The intention we had with this field study was to draw a picture telling us more about the inside of the quarter and of course to finally find an answer to our cardinal question.

The conclusion will include a careful discussion of possible answer(s) to our cardinal question. We will further discuss if it is possible to transmit facts on gentrification given by the scientists in their theories mostly based on field studies in gentrified quarters in metropolis, to this really low level Roskilde/Sankt Jørgensbjerg.
1.3.2 Limitations

We are aware of that the topic gentrification is influenced by several different contexts. We decided to focus on social, economical and physical aspects. This is of course not possible without mentioning others like globalisation, political issues and gender aspects. They simply appear as sub-aspects and we try to explain then or give references as good as we can.

Another problem might be the source quality concerning the part about Roskilde and Sankt Jørgensbjerg. We only had Danish literature and tried the best to get information out of it, as some of us already learned some Danish.

The questionnaire was created in the very beginning. We know that we should have included a question about the sex of the person filling it out. After we adjusted our cardinal question (evaluation) and excluded the urban planning the project got another focal point, some questions became redundant and are therefore not included in the analyse of the questionnaire.

We hope right now that you, as the reader of our project, are prepared sufficiently to start with the main part and will be able to follow us up to the answer of the cardinal question.
2. DISCUSSION OF APPROACHES TO GENTRIFICATION

Gentrification is a fundamental urban process, which has different series of improves physically or morphologically and immaterial changes (political, social and cultural) that take place in urban centres which have a significant rising in their status. These immaterial changes have a physical result, but in fact these changes are some of the main causes that can explain the gentrification process.

A lot has been written about gentrification during the past 30 years. Researchers have been arguing over the definition of the term as well as the preconditions under which gentrification takes place. More and more the negative consequences, above all social exclusion, are seen as a major problem in town development and likewise scientists and politicians are also beginning to deal with possible solutions.

In this chapter, we first explain the evolution of gentrification and different stages of the process. Then we want to outline not exactly the causes of, because one can’t tell them directly, but the precondition under which gentrification occurs. Doing this, we will bring into focus the supply side, i.e. the localization of a quarter that undergoes gentrification and the buildings themselves. This will be an attempt to explain the phenomenon from an economical point of view, more precisely in the way Neil Smith\(^8\) and David Ley\(^9\) tried to explain it since the 1980s. After this we will combine the economical with the socio-cultural perspective by lining out the theories of Robert Bearegard\(^10\). Then another focus of attention will be the demand side, which means the gentrifying inhabitants of a quarter. This will be an approach to the process from a socio-cultural perspective, taking into account the theories of Pierre Bourdieu\(^11\), Michael Jager\(^12\) and David Ley from the 1990s. In the end this will result in a more all-embracing and recent explanation of gentrification We are aware of the fact that

there are more ways to try to explain this phenomenon, e.g. by lining out the whole complex of post-modernity or by researching on the specific role of homosexuals or the one of women in this context, but we believe that this would go beyond the scope of our project.

2.1 THE EVOLUTION OF GENTRIFICATION

Even though, gentrification success at a neighbourhood level, the process is in fact joined to global and regional socio-economic forces. The process is to be seen as one effect of an overall structural change in Western societies, in close relation to tertiarization*, globalization*, post-modernity etc.

On a more micro-size level, gentrification goes along with re-urbanization which means that mainly the children of middle-class people, who grew up in monotonous suburbs during the 1970s and 1980s, now move back to the city centre where life is said to be more vital.

In this way, suburbanization and gentrification are two sides of the same phenomenon and create a temporally cyclic movement. According to Jager and Smith\textsuperscript{13} it is possible that quarters which are now totally renewed become neglected areas in a few decades and then undergo gentrification again in maybe a 100 or 200 years.

So the historical development of gentrification is linked with the past socio-economic development. The actual gentrification is quite different to gentrification in other times. It is not the same kind of gentrification now than in the early 1970s, late 1980s, and even early 1990s. Although the first noticed about gentrification date from 1950s, we can divide the gentrification progression in three different stages. This division came from Jason Hackworth and Neil Smith\textsuperscript{14} explanations, and it’s represented in a time-line for better compression.


2.1.1 First-round (wave) of gentrification: sporadic and state-led

Before the recession in the global economy in 1973, gentrification appeared sporadically in a wide territory. The disinvested in inner-city housing in North America and Western Europe and Australia was a change to start the reinvestment. The deterioration in central inner-city was a factor in which the public sector had to intervene for helping, through aggressive politics for the reinvestment in the central neighbourhoods of the cities. Sometimes this help of the public sector acted like a first intervention, which later is followed by the private-market economic forces. These forces reinvested in the central inner-city and in housing, then was when the gentrification started, followed sometimes also by fashion and social behaviour.

2.1.2 Second-round (wave) of gentrification: expansion and resistance

In the later 1970s when the markets started to recover, gentrification emerged with more strength. Some neighbourhoods were changed from working-class neighbourhoods to gentrified neighbourhoods, and some cities that never experienced gentrification started to make politics for attracting the gentrifiers on the way to investment. The second-stage in gentrification during the late 80’s, was defined by the integration of the process of gentrification into a wider variety of financial and cultural developments at the global and national levels. Even if gentrification was perceived as an alternative for investment in central inner-city, the effects were sometimes negative because poor people had to move out from the gentrify neighbourhoods. This situation caused some protests against gentrification in cities like New York.

2.1.3 Third-round (wave) of gentrification: recessional pause and subsequent expansion

The economical recession of the end of 80s-beginning of 90s, caused the inner-city residential land crashed, gentrification stopped, some authors spoke about degentrification, but suddenly in 1993 this has disappeared and reinvestment began again. All the indicators (housing unit sale prices, rent levels, tax arrears, mortgage levels) have reversed. The third-stage is a pure change of economic conditions. In this wave are affected more neighbourhoods than in the past, the economic forces are driving gentrification and it is possible to see how the cultural factors are lost by the corporative economic influence. The opposition to gentrification has disappeared, although the working class has to move out the inner-city neighbours. The role of the state is more relevant that in the second-wave, and usually was and it is still the state, the entity that starts a reinvestment with new infrastructure or initiative.
Now gentrification is a result of the neoliberal politics, which has an influence in the urban areas. Gentrification has evolution, and now it is a global strategy of liberal urban policy in cities of the advanced world. In the past the gentrification process was considered sporadic, an anomaly in the inner cities market, and now it is a global procedure in which most parts of the cities in the developed world are affected, and it is starting to appear in the bigger cities in the developing world (Latin America and Asia). Another reason for this could be the lack of space as cities in these countries are growing over proportional and waste a lot of space. Gentrification can be used as urban regeneration instrument also in order to stop excessive suburbanisation and to bring back life into the city centres. The financial forces are joined to the state or municipality government in this process, the urban regeneration is a business based in the offer of an old and degraded building, housing, areas as a new urban product in relationship with a new kind of social demands in housing. This aspect could link in part the Neil Smith theory and the Ley approach. Thus the new fashion housing demands in the inner cities, where different social groups are involved like white collar workers, gays, business women and men, artist, etc. whom are looking for being distinguished as social group, they try to make their neighbours different to workers and upper-classes quarters. While the gentrifiers look for a different style of life, the state and municipality government takes advantage to regenerate the inner cities and the financial forces to obtain benefit of this process. On the other hand the population living in the newly gentrified quarters before are the affected in this process, because of the rises in the prices of the housing rents or because the houses are turned into owner-occupied residences.
This section of the project is about analysing the gentrification process, from an economical point of view. Hence, in first place comes the global urban analysis, later some different schools (David Ley and Neil Smith) which explain the gentrification procedure, the development with the new tendencies in gentrification and finally compare between the theories.

At the beginning of the 1960s and again in the 1980s, some authors in the Anglo-Saxon world, expounded that in a nearest future with the new innovation in telecommunication and transport, the cities could lose influence and population. This would give enterprises and each single employee more freedom in their way of choosing their place of work where ever they want. Then the urban inhabitants could flee to the countryside looking for a more peaceful life.

But this was only theoretical, because in fact the city was being rediscovered, nowadays the cities are an important piece of the puzzle in the global economy. In the urban rediscovery three branches have especially importance: the prominence of the cities as an economic motor of national development, the rediscovery of urban centrality, and the magnitude of innovation, educational, cultural and “creative” cities.

If we look the strand that argues the importance of the rediscovery of urban centrality, we can see how the metropolises are nowadays an important key of control and organization in the global economy, these cities are important financial central markets that have a high level of services and industrial production, general headquarters of bigger enterprises associated with services industries (telecommunications, business conferences, media, transport, design and cultural industries, etc..) The 21st century economy was reflected by the cities.

The second strand speaks about the significance of the cities as a motor of national economies, some authors argue that the force of a national economy is only the sum of the strength of the different metropolitan regions in a country; it’s a consequence of the resurgence of agglomeration economies. In the cities of the developed countries are concentrate knowledge, innovation, culture and industries of flexible specialization and volatile demand. Factors with a high value in the economy.

The third strand explains how the city centres have stressing the urban culture. In the cities the cultural factors as the media entertainment, sport and education could join positively effects which give importance to the cities (cultural centres, tourist middle, information centre of network, innovational places, etc.). All this factors are linked together in the cities. Every city has its main important economical factors, for example being a node in a global informational network and at the same time participating in the global markets or being a main place where important decisions are made. Maybe a medium-sized city could be a regional market centre at the same time than an industrial and cultural tourist centre.

In the whole cities are a result of the different factors joined together in a complex network.

The academic discussion about the phenomenon of gentrification has started since the first demonstration of the process. At the beginning we had two attitudes defended by the pioneers (Smith and Ley) in the topic whose positions were the opposite. In the past it was important why gentrification took place and now the process is more significant as it is tackled from a more all-embracing point of view, which tries to overcome the reduced visions, based in cause-effect relationships. Older studies deal more with the generic process and now the studies are about the common characters and peculiarities in every area analysed.

The theories formulated by David Ley and Neil Smith, although they were opposite, opened the debate and tried to clarify the question of gentrification. David Ley is professor of geography in the University of Britain Columbia and his main research field in gentrification was about Vancouver (Canada). The theory of David Ley gives an important role to three factors: the economy, the politics and the culture. It’s a theory based on demand, into the post-industrial branch. Then gentrification derived of reciprocal processes which are restructuring demographic, economic and socio-cultural aspects. In this the change of labour force in the actual

---

society has a significant stake, the workers in special functions, new technologies, now the society is mainly working in the services sector. Before a new social class emerged with good economic situation who are also identified with the white collar employees or fourth sector (bank workers, security workers, business man, etc.). This collective has shown an important demand of housing in the inner-cities, because of the advantages for their own living in the city centre. At the same time the demand of small housing was rising, in relationship with the change in the socio-cultural mentality which gives more importance to the individualism and new styles of life, causing that a part of the medium classes is moving to the city centre. David Ley emphasizes too that in the post-industrial society the active role of the government is relevant, in the way of helping to increase the price of ground in the cities centre. Ley21 does not give a main importance to the land and housing market, neither to the supply and production of property and areas, which could be gentrified in the future. For him the offer follows the demand of possible gentrifiers, whose economic potential is a condition for moving the poorest inhabitants in a new gentrification neighbourhood.

The critics to this approach had been basically that he doesn’t give enough importance to the role of the agent of building land (government, promoters, financial corporations) in the gentrification, because the author thinks that their action derivatives of the demand of possible gentrifiers. He considers the behaviour of the ground agents secondary.

21 ibid.
Another big theory in gentrification is the approach of another geographer, Neil Smith\textsuperscript{22}, who is teacher and head of Geography Department at Rutgers University of New Brunswick (New Jersey). He writes under a Marxian perspective and he gives more importance to the offer part than to the demand part in the process of gentrification.

The main point of the Smith thesis is the concept of rent gap\textsuperscript{23}. The rent gap is defined for Smith as the gap between the actual capitalized ground rent (land value) of a plot of land given its present use and the potential ground rent that might be gleaned under a higher and better use\textsuperscript{24}.

In fact, in the economy point of view, it’s the difference in-between of the value of the land-building during the disinvestment and the reinvestment. In others words, it is the potential different between the benefit obtainable by means of a more lucrative use of the land.

Another important element in the explanation of Smith is the idea of frontier. This idea was in relation with the idea of a frontier in the conquest of the West in the United States, he tried to argue that the gentrifying people are like the pioneers in the Old-West: they are leaving their old neighbourhood to come to a new neighbourhood, in this case in the inner-cities neighbourhoods (in the past to the new lands in the West), with new ideas, blood and mentality, whom trying to improve the traditional worker quarter or old quarter in inner cities, transforming in the upper quarter or medium-


upper quarters. According to Smith25 “The frontier is the meeting point between savagery and civilization” It is a strange vocabulary which tried to explain how the new gentrified neighbourhoods are like the new opportunity of the urban American Renaissance (although it is a global process). Smith argues that around of the gentrified neighbourhoods exists an imaginary line where the conditions of life and security were worse, and this is the line used for the market and social agents to delimit the slums with the new gentrified places. Smith put the example of Notting Hill in London where the All Saints Road is conceived the ‘front line’ in the conflict between the local black population and the white gentrifiers. Smith writes that in the same way that the frontier in the old West was moved faster for the banks, railways, the state and other speculators than the pioneers did, the new urban frontier between the gentrified neighbourhoods and worker quarter or slums is moving for the market force like land speculators, municipality, state, banks, enterprises, etc.

Smith argues that in the 19th century the majority of the cities presented a classic different between the value of the land, higher in the city centre and lowest in the periphery. Later during the 20th century in the context of capitalism, the suburbanization, the industry and the population of this age, the situation changed, the old city centre loses value in reference to the CBD and suburbs areas, this difference was bigger during the decades of 1960, 70 and 80, when the suburbanization was important. Smith explains this because the city centre had to maintain the building and the lands uses for recovering the inversion. This disinvesting was the cause of the degradation in the urban centres, which made possible the posterior investment in these areas. When the deterioration of the one building or the area is really important, it passed the point in what the difference in-between the benefit obtained in the exploitation of the ground and the potential benefit with another uses (through investment) would be too big that gentrification was possible. Hence gentrification happened when the difference or rent gap is big enough to insure an economical benefit. In that moment the market forces take advantage and offer restored flats, apartments and houses in the inner-cities. Following this point of view, the process started from the decisions and movements by co-operations or sectors in a neighbourhood, urban agents, and markets influences and not from preference and

decision on an individual scale. In effect according with Smith, the process of disinvestment in some neighbourhood is not something irrational, but it is something that is a result of largely rational decisions by landlords, owners, state and local governments, financial forces etc. And the same with the process of reinvestment. This had serious consequences for the inhabitants of this areas, the process of disinvestment causes social problems (deteriorating housing conditions, increased hazards to residents, ghettoisation, loss housing stock and increased homeless), and the reinvestment sometimes has bad consequences for the poor traditional population of the new gentrified quarters, that have to move away because of the higher housing prices.

---

This picture explains the urban development during the 19th and 20th century, in this we can see in white the situation of gentrified quarters near the CBD in the inner city. The approach of Smith\textsuperscript{27} was into the theory of a cycle of life in the quarters, according to which these experiment stages of growth, decline, and revitalization or potential renovation. The cycle of the quarter’s life is linked to the history of the neighbourhoods and it was developing in economical terms, i.e. the coherence between social groups, with differences in the community’s identity whose material demonstration is the different prices in housing. Although Smith focuses on the economic aspect, especially in the main importance of the supply side, he admits the importance of the demand in the process, where the desire of differentiating makes the gentrifiers try to make a cultural distinction, which according to Smith is supposed to be a re-difference in the social, cultural and economic image of urban areas.

The fundamental critics\textsuperscript{28} to the Smith version of gentrification are centre fundamentally in that his clarification is more a process explanation than a real background explanation, because it is not always true that in the rent gap development gentrifying is the best option. Other critics are based on the importance of individual behaviour, as has been proven in some specific neighbourhoods like e.g. in London.


Robert A. Beauregard, professor for “Urban Planning and Policy Development” at New Jersey State University in the U.S. during the 1990s, sees gentrification as a part of society’s general development for the past decades. He claims that the process itself was invisible, but had visible outward appearances such as the restored houses, new boutiques and well-dressed new residents.

Then Beauregard describes the process as follows: Students, artists, musicians and other members of a subculture are the first ones who move to such a declining central area, because the flats there are cheap and they want to live close to the city centre. So these “creative people” are called pioneers or invaders. As soon as some of the artists have established themselves in the scene and some former students begin to earn more money, they bring in more capital to the quarter and this seizes private investors, who start up fancy restaurants and expensive bars in this popular multicultural district. By this, also the rents rise due to real estate developers which forces the old inhabitants to leave the area. More wealthy hipsters and DINKIES (double income – no kids) settle in the quarter as so-called gentrifiers and introduce a different kind of lifestyle in succession to the pioneers. When the whole area has been revaluated and gentrified, the pioneers might move on to another neglected but good situated quarter to start the process all over.

Beauregard explains that a theory of gentrification has to comprise theories of the shift in production from factory goods to personal services, of a change in reproduction of mankind due to women’s participation in the world of employment, of new consumption patterns subsequent to more free time and money as well as of capital accumulation in a certain quarter.

As he believes that the concept of gentrification was too complex to be explained by one single theory, he proposes three different multidisciplinary approaches to the problem:

The first approach tries to answer the question why the new inhabitants came to the freshly rehabilitated surroundings. It starts from some pioneers that invest at their own risk into the former working-class area located in the inner city, because they
hope to cause a far-reaching change in the quarter which initiates a discourse on town development. The pioneers think that in case of success, the process will soon be backed up by cooperative housing societies, financial institutions and the municipality, which would in the end lead to better outcomes for everyone. By this behaviour, a kind of myth of the inevitability of the gentrification process is created. This approach, however, is more of an ideology than an explanation, Beauregard concedes.

The second approach relates to the question where exactly the gentrifiers settled and who they were. It is said that the stereotype of those people shows that they are mostly young and singles who work in the new economy or service sector and that is why they want to live near the financial centre of a town as commuting gets expensive. As they do not have families yet, they do not need much space and because they have not had the possibility to pile up savings yet, they prefer to live in the small, cheap apartments of the inner city. Beauregard also mentions the beautiful buildings, nice views and green spaces as backgrounds for the gentrifiers’ choice of a particular quarter. He goes on with pointing to the urban lifestyle of these gentrifiers who live mainly in one- or two-people households and therefore often search for a partner or want to make friends in their neighbourhood, which is the reason for cafés and bars to open up in the quarter, giving the residents a place to meet. As they do not have to spend a lot of money on accommodation and children, they are able to use it for luxury, which also explains the fashion and designer shops often found in such a district. Beauregard concedes that these opportunities might also be given in the outskirts of a town, where pioneers and gentrifiers often come from, but he underlines that lot of such facilities and people to meet are concentrated in a small area, if one lives in the inner city. Further on, this approach illustrates the underlying structures of in- and out-moving plus renovating, bringing with it the transition from a derelicted to a fashionable area.

In the third approach the question how the buildings were revaluated is posed. Here, Beauregard takes the economy as a starting point, referring to historic Marxist materialism, which is an explanation close to the attempts of Smith. Assuming that uneven developments in the whole urban area first caused an increase in the market value of suburban houses and a decrease in the one of inner-city homes, Beauregard presents the latter and the surroundings they are located in now as objects of private as well as public investment, as their actual value was higher. Believing that
investment solves economic crises, real estate developers are attracted next, turning the buildings into objects of speculation. At some point, this process becomes self-increasing and the market value of the houses rises and rises. In order to prove his theories, Beauregard then developed some empirical methods. These consist basically of three steps:

- The first is an examination of potential gentrifiers, being done by questionnaires or interviews that supply information on the above mentioned stereotype.
- The second step is the examination of the creation of buildings that undergo restoration, taking into account the property market.
- The final step is the localization of potential out-movers from the gentrified district, showing that the process is coming to its closing phase.

In his conclusion, Beauregard states that gentrification was a rather chaotic concept with complex conditions. Apart from the theories mentioned, one also had to take into consideration the sensitive capitalist structure underlying the process and the more specific historic and accidental factors of the place in question, he says.

2.6 GENTRIFICATION FROM A SOCIO-CULTURAL POINT OF VIEW

Most researchers that deal with gentrification write about the change in classes in gentrified quarters. They claim that a district that was formerly inhabited by working-class people turns into a district for middle-class or upper middle-class inhabitants. Some even argue that gentrification includes the constitution of a new middle-class which is no longer characterized by its economic status, but by its taste and style. Considering the fact that in contemporary Social Studies a pluralistic society is not divided into classes any more, but into several groups of common lifestyles that do not solely depend on social conditions and that in accordance with these lifestyles social milieus are created, we would now like to combine this field of Social Studies with a theory of gentrification.
The word “lifestyle” was apparently first used by Alvin Toffler\textsuperscript{29}, an American social critic, who in the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century predicted an explosion of lifestyles (“subcults”) as diversity in post-industrial societies increased. Pre-modern societies did not require a term approaching subculture or lifestyle, as different ways of living were expressed as entirely different cultures, ethnicities, religions or by an oppressed racial minority group. Lifestyles, by comparison, are accepted or partially accepted differences within the majority culture or group, a fact which seems to be associated with modernity and capitalism.

In sociology, the term lifestyle describes an individual way of life that structures space and time and is determined by a person’s material and cultural opportunities as well as the personal value system and preferences. Emphasizing either the given social conditions or the individual choices, there are two schools of thought concerned with lifestyles: On the one hand there are the theories of Pierre Bourdieu who sees lifestyle as a result of socio-structural conditions that determine a specific behaviour. On the other hand Cultural Studies focus more on personal choice that, according to those theories, leads to a certain conduct of life. In addition, a certain lifestyle shows the self-projection of an individual and in this way expresses the integration into a particular subculture.

Further on, a certain social milieu\textsuperscript{30} is characterized by a group of people having a certain lifestyle in common, in connection with a certain mentality and aim in life. Still, the financial aspect is not excluded from the definition, as different social milieus can be classified according to income and economic status.

\textbf{Pierre Bourdieu}

In Bourdieu’s works on lifestyles, he takes a starting point in the inequalities of post-modern society where struggles for positions and power are no longer only constituted by heritage or economic wealth, but where questions e.g. on education, social capacities and taste get more important. In connection with his research on day-to-day culture, he sets up a system of four potentials that each human is equipped with: economic capital which equals any kind of goods, property and money; cultural capital which consists in education and is partly inheritaged from the parents and also


\textsuperscript{30} The term “social milieu” was coined by French sociologist \textit{Emile Durkheim} in 19\textsuperscript{th} century, meaning the social environment in which an individual is raised and lives.
incorporated by the individual; social capital which describes relationships between individuals that include mutual exchange of support, help, recognition and knowledge; symbolic capital which can only be used if one is provided with the other kinds of potentials and that consists of prestige, reputation, privileges and power given to the bearer by other people. It is possible to transform one sort of potential to another, f.i. one can invest in education in order to earn more money later.

To achieve high positions in nowadays society the symbolic capital appears to be most decisive. This can be explained in a way that symbolic capital is expressed in the clothes, the furnishing, the food, the attitude or the accent – in other words the taste and lifestyle of a person. And as the society gets more and more differentiated into different groups of people with similar lifestyles, one has to conform to one of these groups or try to “set a trend” in order to be looked upon as someone special.

Further on, personal taste can be seen as a distinctive element for a particular social milieu as it results from a person’s cultural background which includes the conduct of everyday life as well as someone’s social environment, financial opportunities and mentality. From taste, one can draw conclusions on the individual, its origin and its recent position in society. It is a means of distinction from other groups and in this way a symptom of significance inside a symbolic order. Moreover, especially taste concerning the fine arts is said to be decisive for the constitution of a social milieu. It made a difference if someone preferred classical art, modern art or kitsch, Bourdieu says.

The first field where an arrangement of society into different social milieus became important was market research. Institutes for market research on people’s behaviour in voting or in consuming got interested in the concept of social milieus and linked empirically gained typologies of social milieus with specific attitudes. Among the elements that build a certain social milieu are typical statements, customer’s potentials, social circumstances, work and profession, free time activities, product interests, media interests regarding prints and TV, typical ways of dwelling, role model qualities, everyday aesthetics and money. This way, the institutes find out about a social milieu’s orientation in consumption and voting and are able to use this information in the identification of target groups. Later, Social Studies adopted these typologies for their own researching on lifestyle and the social structure.
Moreover, the social milieus can be illustrated in graphics and as so-called meta milieus exist which show a supra-national milieu gained from a systematic intercultural comparison on the basis of national milieu models – a bottom-up method – we can now give an overview of the seven meta milieus in Western Europe:

**Seven Meta Millieus in Western Europe**

These meta milieus are described as follows:
- Traditional: security- and status quo-orientation, holding on to traditional values such as discharge of duties, discipline, law and order
- Established: willingness to achieve something, claim to leadership, consciousness of status, marked claim to exclusiveness
- Intellectual: cosmopolitan outlook, post-material values, distinctive cultural and intellectual interests, striving for self-realization and personality development
- Modern Mainstream: desire for pleasant and harmonic life, striving for material and social security

*Figure 4: Seven supra-national social milieus in Western Europe. Source: [www.sinus-sociovision.de](http://www.sinus-sociovision.de) (16/11/2005)*
- Consumer Materialistic: consumption- and materialistic orientation, consumption standards catch up with mainstream but people are often socially disadvantaged and uprooted

- Sensation Orientated: search for fun and action, new experiences and intense events, living here and now, individualism and spontaneousness, provocation and unconventional style

- Modern Performing: young, flexible and socially mobile, intensive life regarding success and fun, high qualifications and willingness to achieve something, fascination for multimedia

Of course, these categories are quite generalizing. Also, the milieus overlap in real life or each person might say that he or she comprises characteristics of several milieus. This again proves that societies are being diversified. Still, this is a closer description of society as just to divide it into three social classes.

**Michael Jager**

In order to combine these theories on lifestyle and social milieus with the phenomenon of gentrification, we will make use of the theory of Australian sociologist Michael Jager, who claims that gentrification was a class-constituting (in our view: milieu-constituting) process that involves aesthetics as a decisive element.

Jager states that urban upkeep was a product of social differentiating and in this way renovation of property reflected changing relations in between social classes. This is nothing new so far. He then argues that the restoration of historically interesting buildings expressed aesthetic taste and style and at the same time built up a distance to the working-class formally living in those houses. This is why the “new middle-class”, who has acquired an artistic insight through education, liked to live in these often Victorian Age dwellings. The shift in priorities from economic conditions to culture and beauty also showed that those people do not need to worry about economic necessities, Jager goes on. The playful dealing with aesthetics and with rules, a cycle of consumption that involves history, culture and a particular urban lifestyle, the willingness to sell its own standards and forms of practice as well as the strive to dissociate itself from the upper-class on the one hand and the working-class on the other hand – those were the characteristics of the newly constituted class.
Jager says that their consumption pattern was not only visible in their restored houses, but also in the “consumption” of fashionable galleries, fancy cafés, boutiques etc. that open in their quarter. This new pattern of consumption which is neither functional nor necessary reflected a new consumption ethic, Jager claims. The important aspect was the amount of “consumption objects” one possessed, which express an affiliation to an architectonic or historic quality. But this lead to aesthetics ending up in kitsch only, as the quantity takes away the exclusiveness from the symbolic objects and with this their value. Or in other words, kitsch objects were being sophisticated to aesthetics, according to Jager. “It is not the aesthetic itself but the social distinction it evokes which is achieved in the display of kitsch.”

By this, but also through the acquired education, the new middle-class tries to climb up within the social hierarchy. A distance to the rather traditionally oriented middle-class and their ways of consuming is expressed and this way, consumption was decisive for the maintenance of (new) social differences. Moreover, Jager concludes that through gentrification “A consumption economy, one might say, finds its reality in appearance.”

DAVIDLEY

During his 25 years lasting work David Ley draw his attention to spatial, economic, social and also political implications of gentrification. This way, he adds even another dimension to the transformation process. Doing this, his focus is on Canadian cities though he stresses that a “study of the local cannot avoid a dialogue with the global.”

Ley points to the coincidence of significant changes in urban space and urban society. More specific, he states that gentrification somewhat started in the same period as the youth movement and counter culture of 1968 and wonders if there were any connections in between. He finds out that the criticism by the students was, with reference to Herbert Marcuse, directed towards the “corporate society whose one-

32 Ibid., p. 89.
dimensional ideology was alleged to produce a one-dimensional personality” and that the manifestation of this one-dimensionality was in fact the monotonous fabric-like suburbs of the 1950s and 1960s, where most of the youths grew up. Now that they sought for freedom and more cosmopolitan opportunities, they called for a liveable and enjoyable (inner-) city. The young people opposed the pro-growth attitude of the local and national governments, who were only thinking in economical terms and wanted to do wholesale modernizations of the cities including massive freeway constructions. So some of these urban reformers formed political parties and entered local governments in the 1970s all over the country. Together with older liberal professionals from the middle-class, one group claimed participatory programmes for citizens, urban growth management, social justice, the preservation of neighbourhood communities, generous parks and urban aesthetics as their goals. Another group that consisted of anti-poverty organizations, labourer’s unions and tenant corporations had even more left-wing goals. Now we cannot observe such a political transition for all cities in which gentrification is taking place, but at least this change in ideology was surely shared in places all over the world.

Further on, Ley describes the visual restructuring of gentrified quarters and relates this to a u-turn in economy and politics from production to consumption. He gives the example of neglected industrial areas that are – due to deindustrialization – being transformed to places of culture, of education, of pleasure or else of service sector activities. Old factory buildings are being “recycled” as concert venues, art colleges, flat or office units. This also is a form of gentrification which one does maybe not think of in the first place. The irony in this venture is that the visual industrial style of the area is maintained, because of its cultural heritage. One could speak of an estheticization of traditional sites and industrial areas in this case. Regarding this aspect, Ley is quite much in accordance with Jager. The so-called consumption strategy which is also used by the municipalities “laid the base for a new round of economic development predicated upon leisure and tourism, an amenity ethic which might attract (or keep) footloose capital” Ley declares. In times of competition between cities for tourists, tax payers, workers, supranational companies etc. the image and the life quality of a place becomes very important. So among a city’s means to seize this capital are the preservation of heritage districts which includes the

34 ibid., p. 5.
gentrification of it as well as e.g. the building of convention centres for sport events or political meetings, the promotion of policies that are environmentally friendly, the allocation of subsidies for ballets or orchestras and the expansion of the public transport system.

But another aspect has to be focussed on. Ley points out that there are in fact two big groups of (potential) gentrifiers which are not exactly the same as Beauregard’s pioneers and successors. Those engaged in politics were the citizens that could benefit themselves from an expanded welfare state, he says. In this way, their aims were not motivated just by charity, but also by their own interests as well-educated employees in the public or non-profit sector, like teachers, social workers, lawyers, architects, doctors, professors or administrative assistants. The other group of gentrifiers included well-educated workers in the private sector, among whom managers, professionals, sales people, engineers, company presidents, real-estate agents, accountants and other white-collar workers, Ley explains. Both these groups could also be related to as workers of the quaternary sector. Those two groups were likely to live in different kinds of houses, he goes on. While the public-sector workers often preferred the older properties, i.e. the dwelling units from Victorian Age, the private-sector workers mostly favoured newly built condominiums, i.e. units with owner-occupied flats. With regard to their age, members of both these groups tended to be under 40 years, Ley states. But there is yet a third group of inner-city inhabitants that might contribute to gentrification. Those are less privileged as the former two and include less skilled workers in the service sector, as shop assistants, taxi drivers, waitresses, bellboys, hairdressers etc. Regarding the fact that these workers often serve the other two groups in areas like leisure and security, they are linked to each other. Those service sector employees also live close to their labour market and take advantages from the city’s opportunities, and this way play their part in the reshaping of the city, although they will not have the financial means to e.g. upgrade the houses as other gentrifiers do.

In terms of the mentioned consumption or leisure strategy and the distinction between the two quaternary sector groups of gentrifiers, Ley talks of the constitution of a new “cultural class”. To his mind, they consist in those well-educated employees in the public or non-profit sector and can be seen as a subgroup of a new middle-class. Their
professions were f.i. in the applied arts or in the media. Again, Ley’s argumentation is close to the one of Jager. But Ley goes further than that when he claims that the common characteristic of those cultural class people was not merely their shared lifestyle of culture consumption, but their “vocation to enhance the quality of life in pursuits that are not simply economistic.”  

36 He expresses that, “Their imagineering of an alternative urbanism to suburbanization has helped shape new inner-city environments, where they are to some degree both producer and consumer.”  

37 We can relate this back e.g. to the former industrial plants that are now transformed to cultural centres, where the new cultural class both works and relaxes or to the restored Art Nouveau dwellings they live in. This way, to have a home in the inner-city means much more to the cultural class than just a functional convenience. For them, it is “an integral part of their identity formation”  

38 Ley explains.

39

In this chapter we have been written about the economical and socio-cultural approaches of gentrification, we related the evolution of the process and the new tendencies in relationship with the new economical and socio-cultural situations in the globalization world. We used the theories of the different main schools in this subject, in the procedure of explain what is gentrification? There before this part is the theoretical framework of the project, that in the following parts of the project help us to understand the hypothetical situation of gentrification in the quarter of Sankt Jørgensbjerg. The following Chapter is about the geographical framework, which allowed us to know more about the geographical, historical, economical reference of the analyzed area.


37 Later on, Ley writes about “New Urbanism” which is mainly a design movement in urban planning, but can also be applied to gentrification. We will though exclude this topic.

38 ibid.

3. THE CASE STUDY

3.1 INTERACTIONS BETWEEN ROSKILDE, GREATER COPENHAGEN AND WEST-ZEALAND

Roskilde is a medium-sized city in the administrative area of Greater Copenhagen. Thus the city of Roskilde has been seriously influenced by the urban planning, policies, changes and successes of Greater Copenhagen as well as by the mobility of workforce and capital. Therefore to understand the urban development processes in Roskilde we have to comprehend the urban processes, planning and development in Greater Copenhagen.

Since 1857, when the town of Copenhagen started to sprawl outside the wall (the defense system), because the population density inside the city had reached its culmination point, the town has developed without stop during the last one and a half centuries. This development has affected also the region area near the city. The growth of the city was in relationship with the growth of the nation state and the industrialization. The population of Copenhagen increased really fast as you can see in the figure.

![Evolution Copenhagen population](image_url)

Figure 5.:Own elaboration. Data from ANDERSEN, HANS THOR; JØRGENSEN, JOHN: City Profile Copenhagen. In: Cities, Vol.12, no. 1, Copenhagen: Elsevier Science Ltd., 1995, pp. 13-22.

---

Copenhagen slowed down its growth during the middle 1970s, when the population was up to 1.75 million. Since then it is the metropolitan region in which the more slowly growth of population is concentrated.

The date for the first urban planning law was 1938. Before this law, there were other kinds of regulations related to the buildings, the infrastructure of roads, waste water, water supply, gas and electricity. But after this, four regional plans have been created.

The first big development plan was The Fingerplan 1947. The plan was established in order to control the way of suburbanization spreading from the capital Copenhagen into the rural areas around it. This plan advised a radial development structure to get an easy access from the rural to the urban areas and to regulate and assure the efficient public transport in-between the new suburbs and the historic town centre. The Fingerplan proposed suburbs, high-quality line-trains and roads out from Copenhagen in five directions to the Western part of Zealand.

Green areas and agricultural lands in the middle between the “fingers” should be maintained, although later this idea was in part destroyed for the new infrastructures and industrial parks. This structure extended the urban development around Copenhagen in 30 or more kilometers.

The finger which corresponded with Roskilde is the index finger pointing to the West. This meant a close connection to Copenhagen concerning building density and the transport system, but it also meant that many people moved to Roskilde but worked in

---

42 Viggo Plum, information given in the class of Contemporary Denmark on Sept 28th 2005.
Copenhagen. This of course brought capital to the provincial town, as the taxes have to be paid to the municipality where one’s residence is. And as there are in fact more commuters coming in to Roskilde from the rural surroundings of Zealand – 15 000 – than are going out to Copenhagen – 11 000 – Roskilde never had the image of a typical satellite city. It has, in contrast, a potential to be a regional centre itself for the West of Zealand, as it has a high level of centrality due to education facilities, institutional services, a commercial centre, tourist attractions and the like – a profile that is also supported by Roskilde’s Master plan 2005.

Another grand development plan applied in Copenhagen was The Structure Plan of 1972.43 This plan was made for the inter-municipality planning board, which started to be the official Greater Copenhagen Council in 1973. The plan designed a centre belt in a length of 20 to 30 kilometers around the city. By the plan the idea was considered to create four nodal sub-centers and also to continue the suburban growth, based on private cars and the amplifying of the growing distance from the city.

A further development plan was The Regional Plan of 198944. It was a reaction to the socio-economic situation in which the urban expansion was blocked, so an intervention was needed. This plan was in some ways a new version of the well-known Fingerplan of 1947. However, the fingers have been prolonged because of the better infrastructure of communication, which meant easier and more rapid access to the city center through motorways and trains. Moreover, this plan tried to develop public and private services in the suburbs, not only in the city center. It aimed at creating new relationships between working places and living places in local areas, in the way of reducing the pressure in the transport infrastructure. The plan further on suggested the “recycling” of land, by trying to use less quantity of land, e.g. by developing former manufacturing grounds to services areas as offices, parks, commercial places etc. The plan was also designed45 to preserve the historic city cores in Copenhagen and the region, like the provincial towns 30 to 45 kilometers away – f.i. Roskilde.

44 Ibid.
Today there is a new perspective for urban planning in which new urban tendencies or processes could appear, like e.g. gentrified areas in middle-sized cities of suburban regions. In a time of global urban trade and the cooperation between regions of different countries on the one hand, like in the situation of the supra-national Øresund region which is a part of Zealand, Denmark, and a part of Scania, Sweden, that shares a number of common interests, flows and infrastructures, the competition and specialization among towns also gets keener on the other hand. As a result of this, it is said in Roskilde's Master plan 2005 that “Roskilde will have to make the right choices and get its priorities sorted out”. In contradiction to the former Danish regional policy, which was based on interregional equalization, it now appears that Roskilde also strikes for its own position not only as a town in Denmark, but also in the cross-border cooperation with Sweden and maybe in all the Baltic Area.

These recent global tendencies lead to the next chapter, in which some urban development concepts for cities will be introduced, leaning on the categorization of David Harvey. After that, we will try to connect two of these concepts with the last development plan of Roskilde Municipality and see in which way it might be possible to apply them to the town of Roskilde.
According to Harvey\(^\text{46}\), there are four types of urban development phases. In the 1970s the fourth stadium, which he calls the Post-Keynesian City, begun and is still going on. The Keynesian economic policy in contrast was designed to maintain among the population the demand for standardized consumption goods and thereby sustain a high level of production and of employment. The massive welfare policy especially of the Scandinavian countries was also an element of the Keynesian City. Due to diversification processes in the advanced societies which include changing consumer values on the one hand and due to the need to revitalize the declining industrial cities on the other hand, however, these kinds of policies are no longer up to date, Harvey says. In addition, it is explained that in the line of globalization, regionalization and the international division of labour cities and regions have to compete more and more against each other in order to maintain their economic, politic and symbolic status of power in an emerging international urban hierarchy. This competition is related to management functions, research and educational institutions, housing and consumption facilities.

Since the 1980s there are four different categories of cities according to Harvey’s typology, which are described as the Global and Dual City; the World City; the Informational City and the Entrepreneurial City. Roskilde is supposed to be an Entrepreneurial City\(^\text{47}\), which means that from an urban planning perspective the public sector, i.e. the local government, controls the city’s development “in a more businesslike manner, in which institutions of local governance operate like the private sector or are replaced by private-sector-based systems.”\(^\text{48}\) In particular, this could be partnerships between public and private stakeholders, shareholder companies that are owned by public institutions on different levels or “QuaNGOs” (quasi non-governmental organizations). In Roskilde there is an example of public/private cooperation in the science park CAT and an example of public/public collaboration “between the National Environmental Research Institute in Roskilde and the

\(^{46}\) Harvey, David: From Managerialism To Entrepreneurialism. The Transformation Of Urban Governance In Late Capitalism. In: Geografiska Annaler B (Human Geography), 71/1, 1989, pp. 3-18.

\(^{47}\) We learned this from Viggo Plum and Peter Skriver in European Regional Studies on Sept 29th 2005.

European Environmental Agency” should be established according to the Master plan 2005, published by the City of Roskilde in 1994. Urban planning in general tended to be less state-led and less all-embracing for the past decades, but rather project-based and participatory-oriented, which can also be seen in Roskilde.

In the introduction to the Masterplan 2005 the procedure of planning is outlined as follows: “The process begins with the publication of a report from the City council. [It] is a paper inviting citizens, associations, organisations etc. to participate in the debate.” Then several fora, whose members are composed in a way “that main players in each field are represented” are established and those “are expected to create debates all over the town” discussing different themes for 10 weeks.

“On the background of the public debate a draft plan is drawn up, in which the strategic objectives of the City’s development are established.”

The draft Masterplan “is then released for a further public debate over a period of 8 weeks.” Only after this long procedure, ensuring the agreement of the population, the city can start redevelopment.
But still, in Denmark this “governance” policy, which is supposed to work bottom-up, does not always seem to be in contradiction with a top-down policy for the elites. One certain city concept that is apparently popular at the moment and that might be an example for this is the Creative City. It is a dwelling place for the new “creative class” and supplies the goods and environment those people demand, such as museums, architectonic works, luxury hotels, shopping malls, conference and learning centres, waterfront promenades or restored inner-city housing. In this way, the concept is in close connection to gentrification.

It is not necessarily economic elites, but might be the successors of the counter-culture and welfare state employees from the 1960s and 1970s, that are addressed as creative class.\footnote{cf. Part 2.4) Discussion Of Approaches To Gentrification From A Socio-Cultural Point Of View.}

If this concept can be applied to Roskilde, however, is doubtful. Since Roskilde has a university and some other schools for higher education, one could expect the right target group for a creative class. Still, most of these people seem to live in Copenhagen and apart from that, to live an “urban lifestyle” in Roskilde appears to be difficult as the essential facilities are mostly not given. But like in the time of the big Masterplans in the 1950s, a pro-growth strategy is again on the agenda of the governments, though the aim nowadays is not industrial growth but the expansion of the service sector. And subsequently, in the declared paradigms of the current Masterplan 2005, it can be read that in order to strengthen Roskilde’s role “as a centre of research and education”, students should be integrated more into the city’s life. This should be reached by e.g. developing “an international Latin quarter environment in the centre of Roskilde with plenty of atmosphere in an informal urban life style matching the requirements of young people.” Moreover, “international scientific go-together centred on common interfaces between science and art” should be arranged. It is obvious, that E&R are supposed to function as an engine for growth, in economy but also in population. This can be seen in the suggestions of the municipality, which include “cooperation between research institutes [...] and industry” or the task “to adopt the concept of an ‘environmental town’ based on principles of high-technology and urban ecology: an integrated urban quarter consisting of houses, research and educational institutions and business enterprises.”

This ecological village or community called Munksøgård has meanwhile been built near RUC in Trekroner. The houses are built from environment-friendly materials and
the village has its own electricity, water and waste cycles to make it sustainable. However, it does not have research institutes or business enterprises. Other objectives possibly pointing in the direction of a Creative City comprise the renewal of the harbour area as a place of leisure and education as well as the opening of the shopping centre Ro’s Torv or the renovation of the historic town centre with “new peaceful rooms for outdoor living” and “artistic and informative expressions of the city’s history”. But these goals sound, to our mind, a little too idealistic and exaggerating speaking of the provincial town Roskilde.

As it is also expressed that the profile of “Roskilde as a residential town” should be improved by “ensuring residential areas of high quality, and by providing more flexibility and diversity in the housing market, as well as cultural activities, good services, and satisfactory traffic conditions”, one can derive that students and former students who have their own family now should be attracted to settle down in the town. The target groups are obviously not only commuters working in Copenhagen or pensioners, but explicitly young couples (with children), as f.i. schools, day care facilities and bicycle paths are emphasized. The realization of this plan can at present be seen in the erection of 2,500 new dwellings in Trekroner, Svogerslev, Vindige etc. The population was thus expected to rise from 50,800 in 1994 to 55,200 in 2005.

With these developments, Roskilde Municipality seems among others to aim at more independence from Copenhagen, for which it has been playing the role of a suburb or satellite city ever since.

In order to understand not only the recent political and planning-related aspects that play a role in the urban development of Roskilde, we will now have a closer look at the historic events and periods that contributed to shaping the image of Roskilde today. As it was already said in part 2) it is also important to consider the specific history of a place to be able to examine whether gentrification occurs there.
3.3 History of Roskilde from the Foundation until the Second World War

Roskilde was established around 990 in the blossoming time of town foundations in Europe. With its location at the bay and several springs delivering fresh water – that’s supposedly where the name “Roskilde” comes from: “King Ro’s Spring” – the town soon became one of the biggest and most important centres in the Northern Europe of the Middle Ages. Before the Reformation that took place between 1534 and 1536, Roskilde had played an important role in the spiritual and cultural life in Denmark, because it had the Cathedral, which was the bishop’s residence, and it was also the King’s residence. According to Roskilde bys historie, Roskilde, which in those times had been the spiritual centre of Denmark, developed to the status of a provincial town during the Renaissance. In 1536 the decision was taken by the King’s Lord Lieutenant of changing the diocese to Copenhagen. This introduction of Protestantism had serious consequences for the town as the rich Catholic elite and the Royals – and with them the capital – left Roskilde. In only a couple of years, the town’s population declined from about 10 000 to 1 500.

The mid-seventeenth century then is known as the time of misfortune. Some wars like Tortensson War, the war with the Swedes, the Plague, and the different fires affected seriously the population growth and the city of Roskilde (see Figure 9).

Because of the new property tax that was made in 1682 for that all property was evaluated, we know the situation of the urbanized areas of Roskilde. Only the central streets – Algade, Skomagergade, Bredgade and Bondtinget – and the main square, which together was the medieval town, were built-up areas (see Appendix: Reesen’s 50 Karlsson, Per; Tønnesen, Eva; Vogelius, Jorgen: Roskilde bys historie. 1850-1970. Band 2. In: Historisk Samsfund for Roskilde Amt. Roskilde: Museums Forlag (ed.), 1998.

Figure 9: Population figure of Roskilde the last 1000 years (Source: www.roskildehistorie.dk, 01.12.2005, 09:23)
Kort og forklaring). The rest of the periphery was farmer areas or fields dotted with mills. From the map you can also see that Sankt Jørgensbjerg is a very small part with the church in the middle and a few houses around it. It had more the character of a village outside Roskilde than that of a city district. But we suppose that the development of the city of Roskilde had also an influence on the events in Sankt Jørgensbjerg. Therefore we will now have a closer look on Roskilde in the years leading towards the industrialization age.

Until 1750 the time of crisis continued. Since this moment the situation started to improve, as Roskilde got better communications with the new street from Kalundborg to Korsør which passed along the city. Because of this geographical advantage position (see Figure 10), whereupon the travellers, who were coming from other parts of Denmark on route to Copenhagen, had to pass and stop in Roskilde to pay duties, the cities economy benefited.

From Figure 11 (next page) we will learn about the professions the inhabitants of Roskilde had in 1753. It strikes that 18 % of the household’s heads are widows but in those days the Danes were fighting against the Swedes what made the bad times even worse because the labour force of the men was weakened also in Roskilde due to that war. The second largest group is the civil servants maybe because in bad times governments tend to employ more servants in order to cope with the chaotic situation of war. Another supposition could be that they were employed by the state as soldiers and therefore civil servants. 9,1 % of the whole labour force are shared by the craftsmen and the day-labourers whose profession depends on their daily employers. As we tried to split up the working force into four sectors, meanwhile we created a new group called “0”, in which the dependent persons (mainly alms, widows) were

Figure 10: Public and royal lanes on Zealand 1638 (Source: www.roskldehistorie.dk, 01.12.2005, 9:50)
included, it was not easy to find out to which economical sector (I. = Agricultural sector, II. = Crafts and Industry, III. = Services) the day-labourers and the others should belong to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husstandsoverhoveder / head of the household</th>
<th>1753</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Associated sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryggere &amp; brændere/ Brewers and Distillers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallhåndværkere/ Metalworker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steh-, træ-, glas og lerhåndværk / Stonecutter, Carpenter, Glazier, Clayworker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skind- og læderhåndværk, Tanners</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekstilhåndværk, Tailor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almisse, Alms</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagere, Baker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagtere, Butcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daglejere, day-labourers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0, I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daglejere, day-labourers = 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daglejere, day-labourers = I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daglejere, day-labourers = II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedsmænd, public servant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enker, Widows</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordbrugere, Tillers/ peasents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Købmand, Merchants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Møllere, Miller</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vognmænd, Carter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andet, Others</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0, I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I alt, total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11: Labour in Roskilde (Source: www.roskildehistorie.dk, 01.12.2005, 10:40, own addings)**

We decided to distribute the 9,1 % “others” among the sectors 0, I and II with each 3 % and 0,8 % counting to the III. sector (see table below). The daily labourers could wholly count to the service sector, as they provide services to other employers. However these were mainly low-skilled and bad paid they would adulterate the result.
As it is not guaranteed that they work every day they also count to the sector 0. So we decided to distribute them among the sectors as seen in the table above.

Out of the table and our own calculations we created Figure 12. The analysis however has to be done carefully as it is only from a sample of 317 households in Roskilde that didn’t include Sankt Jørgensbjerg those days. It is obvious that the city was in crisis those days as 31% were non-working population (widows, alms, partly day-labourers, small children) and supposedly living in poverty and bad conditions. It is typical that the I. sector is not that big in a city as the farms are situated on the countryside. Therefore it is typical that the II. economical sector is the largest since a lot of craftsmen provided the population with their manufactured products. The service sector is already quiet big for that time. Mainly public servants belong to this sector but also millers, carters and merchants. Concerning Sankt Jørgensbjerg one can guess that this table would have another distribution, as it was the hill on that mainly poor people lived (see part about Sankt Jørgensbjerg).

![Figure 12: Distribution of labour force in Roskilde 1753](image)

Above that, Roskilde continued being an educational centre, it sustained the Cathedral School. Agriculture had an important role in the surroundings and also for Roskilde (providing services and labour force to the farmers), the industry at this moment started slowly with a smaller paper mill situated at Maglekilde, and in 1763 a large sugar refinery was opened, although shut down in 1779. Roskilde had the advantage of its many springs so that the hydro-power could be used for traditional mills milling corn and also beginning industry. In the 19th century Roskilde indeed had some industry coming up: weaving mills and cloth production (Maglekilde Mill),
later there a factory, paper and cardboard production (Sankt Klara Mill) in the first half of the century, in 1847 the railway between Roskilde and Copenhagen was inaugurated and after a short break of development, because of the Slevig War 1848 and a cholera epidemic in 1853, from that especially Sankt Jørgensbjerg was affected, brought new impulses to the city of Roskilde. More factories started to produce spinning products, mineral water and cellulose. Breweries and distilleries grew and the trade boomed. With the new tracks between Roskilde and Korsør and later the connection to Køge in the South (1870) and Kalundborg in the West (1874) Roskilde became the traffic and with it a trade nodal point for Zealand. Hotels and guest houses (Danish: Kro) opened, the Hospital was founded as well as Roskilde Trade school and Technical School. In 1872 Roskilde had 19 industries with 199 workers, and in 1919 it had 30 industries with 689 workers. At the beginning of the industrialization the socio-economic differentiation started to advance. The trade unions developed, one example was The Danish Labour Union for Roskilde and Sankt Jørgensbjerg, popular until 1891. In 1900 there were 16 trade unions with 492 members in Roskilde. In between 1875 and 1905 26 strikes happened.

In the end of the century Roskilde Bakery (Danish: Brødfabrik), Roskilde Factory (Danish: Maskinfabrik), a tannery and Roskilde Dairy were founded. This economic growth lead to a higher demand for electricity so that a power plant was erected next to the gas works, whose main building is today still situated in the harbour area. Until the World War I Roskilde got better educational facilities as the Roskilde upper secondary school, the butchery school (1907) which is today still situated in Lejre, south of Roskilde households school. 1911 first attempts by the municipality of Roskilde to incorporate Sankt Jørgensbjerg failed.

The city and its industry benefited from the War as they provided Germany with agricultural products especially tinned food. After a second failed try and with the intervention of the Ministry of Inner Affairs Sankt Jørgensbjerg finally became a part of Roskilde in 1938.

After the German occupation during the Second World War the Social Democrats did politics in favour of the middle classes. Construction was the new motor of the economy in whole Roskilde a lot of new quarters were erected but the core of Sankt Jørgensbjerg seemed to be a sleeping part except some peripheral new constructions. This part was dealing with Roskilde’s history until the Second World War with the purpose to give information about Roskilde’s development. It was difficult to find out
about the relationship between Roskilde and Sankt Jørgensbjerg due to limited sources. In the whole we can consider Sankt Jørgensbjerg as a labourer pool for jobs that didn’t need any special knowledge as for example help in the households of the inhabitants of Roskilde, working on the farms and later in the factories.

The next part deals with Sankt Jørgensbjerg especially and will together with this text be the basis for the questionnaires part in which we will link selected data from the decades after the Second World War on Denmark and Roskilde with the results from our questionnaire.
This part deals with the older and newer history of the quarter Sankt Jørgensbjerg. The aim is not to tell the whole history but to give the reader an overview to be able to compare what has been going on there before and is going on there today. Of course were there influences from local and national historical events that will not be considered here. Most of the information about Sankt Jørgensbjerg rages from 1850 until 1970. This period will be focussed on so that the researched information about the area that we get from the questionnaire will continue to draw a picture of this part of the city.

The name Sankt Jørgensbjerg can be ascribed to Saint George known from the famous tale in which he became a martyr because he killed the dragon\textsuperscript{51}. It is situated on a hill, which means “bjerg” in Danish, in the North-Western part of the city of Roskilde close to Roskilde Fjord (see Figure 13 and detailed map from KMS in the Appendix). Inside itself it can be divided into three parts (see Figure 14, next page):

The tale begins with a dragon making its nest at the spring which provides a city-state with water. Consequently, the citizens had to temporarily remove the dragon from its nest in order to collect water. To do so, they offered the dragon a daily human sacrifice. The victim of the day was chosen by drawing lots. Eventually the “winner” of this lottery happened to be the local princess. The local monarch is occasionally depicted begging for her life with no result. She is offered to the dragon but at this point a travelling George arrives. He faces the dragon, slays it and saves the princess. The grateful citizens then abandon their ancestral Paganism and convert to Christianity. (Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint_George#Traditional_origin, 06.12.2005, 15:53)
The Western and biggest part (W in the Figure) where the hospital called St. Hans (first mentioned 1150) was situated, and which in older days was the place for mentally ill people. Therefore the name Sankt Jørgensbjerg is often considered as a metaphor for the fight against the “disease” done in the St. Hans hospital because in those days the knowledge about psychological diseases was not really advanced so that there were a lot of crude attempts to treat the alleged mad people. Today it is a modern hospital still dealing with psychiatry.

The Eastern part with mainly the former Sankt Agnes monastery, that later was also called the new hill “Det nye bjerg” (DNB) and to be demarcated from the third part by the old hill “Det gamle Bjerg” (DGB) by Sankt Hans Gade (see also Figure 14). The latter is the area where the analysis in form of a questionnaire is based on and therefore will be focussed concerning its history. People those days as well as nowadays call it “Bjerget” which simply means the hill. Also the name “fattig-bjerg” which means poverty hill was often used because the population there was rather poor. To find out more about the quarter, housing and street names will be analysed in the following sections followed by a summary from the literature of the local historians Arthur and Lotte Fang giving an idea of the social conditions and life on the hill.

Figure 14: Map of Skt. Jørgensbjerg: 1:25.000 (Source: http://www.kms.dk, own editings)
3.4.1 Housing on the hill

Due to bad fire safety and as we also know from www.roskildehistorie.dk most of the houses burned down several times, so that there are hardly any original houses from the time before 1800 nowadays. Hence it is hard to specify an exact period as the area developed and grew gradually. The houses are constructed quiet simple and typical for the Zealand Region peasant houses. They were low timber-framed houses trimmed with a mix of clay willow-branches and straw. The walls were whitewashed with the typical lime and the roofs were made of straw as well. For the very first houses windows were really seldom and small due to really expensive glass not affordable for the poor inhabitants. The floor was also clay and all houses had an open chimney.

Figure 15: Typical house in Brøndgade in Skt. Jørgensbjerg 1800 (Source: www.roskildehistorie.dk, 04.12.2005, 11:14)
The old hill developed around the church, which is the oldest stone church in Denmark from 1028. First it was dedicated to St. Clemens, the Saint of the seamen and later it changed to St. Jørgen. So the parish was developing rather independently from the city of Roskilde in the beginning (see Figure 16, 17).
3.4.2 Street names and their meanings

The main streets around the church are named Kirkegade (Church Street), Brøndgade (Font Street) and Asylgade (Asylum Street) (see Figure 18).

In older days the street Brøndgade had two names: The upper part was called Kattekrog, which means “cat corner” because there was an old lady living with many cats. The lower part was named Præstestræde and that means “Prieststreet”. The Asylgade first got the name when the asylum was established in the 1880ies and before was called Sladdergade which means “gossip street”.

The Smedegade got its name from the profession of the people living there, because Smede means blacksmith (see picture in the Appendix). Other streets were named after their location, like Strandvej (Beachway) or Toftevej (Paddockway).

The Wendtgade is named after the gardener named Wendt, who had a great importance for the development of the hill in the 19th century. He brought a recreational area to Sankt Jørgensbjerg that was not only used by its inhabitants but also really popular for the inhabitants of Roskilde who liked to go there for their Sunday walk.

From the street names it can be concluded that the hill’s character was stamped by the church, the font, countryside elements and people on the hill. According to Arthur Fang the Font Street was kind of the main street in the beginning.
3.4.3 Social life on the hill in the 18th and 19th century

People on the hill were really poor and lived in bad conditions. Parasitic diseases advanced through dung of the cattle and excrements on the streets were normal. They lived from hand to mouth and every day they had to fight for food. But the harder it was the better was the social solidarity among the population. As the quarter was really close to the hospital and people in those days thought that mental illness is infectious, not the richest people settled down here. They were mainly peasants, fishers and craftsmen for whom the strong winter, when they were without work, was really hard. So many fell for alcohol and became addicted, so that the women had to care for their families and also children had to contribute to the families’ welfare. They did washing and cleaning jobs and worked on the fields of the bigger farmers. After industrialization many people from the hill found work in the factories in Roskilde. They worked for example in a paper factory or bottled mineral water from the springs around. The boys worked in the tobacco factory and the girls as housemaids or maidservant on the farms.

Until 1893 the infamous poorhouse (Fattiggaard), that gave the hill its special name (Fattig-Bjerg), was situated on the hill. The asylum was established in 1883 and after 1922 was used as assembly house for the church until 1982 when it was sold and reconstructed into three modern privately owned flats. This reconstruction fell already under the local development plan rules from 1972 (see also Lokalplan 32 in the Appendix). In this plan the protective instructions are documented so that “[...] the characteristic and valuable parts of the older housing are not disfigured by modifications, extensions or new buildings”\textsuperscript{52}.

\textsuperscript{52} translated from Roskilde Byråd, 11.11.1981: Extension for the Lokalplan 32
3.4.4 Recent developments

In the Roskilde atlas of “values worth preserving” in towns and buildings dated from 1990, a project initiated by the municipality in cooperation with several architects and the ministry of environment and urban planning, buildings and surroundings of a special architectonic or cultural quality are registered and illustrated on maps (see Figure 19 and 20). The idea behind this atlas is the increasing interest in historic town development and building culture that struck Europe throughout the 1980s.

This, the authors explain, was in close connection to a new demand for economic investments into historic buildings after which those are revaluated (gentrification!). The intention of the atlas therefore is the visualization of valuable buildings and an instruction for further urban planning and (re-)development. The texts, pictures and maps are thought to serve politicians and urban planners as well as business people and citizen. Right after the publication of the atlas, its findings resulted in a revision of Roskilde’s current local development plan. About Sankt Jørgensbjerg, which is related to as a worth to be kept area outside of the town centre, it is said that the dwellings are already being preserved very well, as the picturesque former village is seen as an attractive living area.

Most of the mansions in Kirkebakken, Asylgade, Kirkegade, Brøndgade and Smedegade are rated “highly worth protecting”, a few buildings like the church are even under historical preservation protection, like for example the church.

The authors state, however, that there were two surroundings which have been neglected from a preservation perspective. Those were a part of St. Hans Gade and the harbour, which they suggest to redevelop for different kinds of uses. The reconstruction of the waterfront with the yacht harbour and a promenade really close to the quarter is an investment by the municipality into the area in order to upgrade its attractiveness (Lokalplan Nr. 296). The conversion of the closed gas station into a gallery could be another attempt to enrich cultural life in the area.
In an article from 1985 the local historian Lotte Fang is interviewed concerning the changes on the hill. The title is “Bjerget er blevet moderne” which means the hill has become modern or fashionable. The article proves that in the 1980s the upgrading or gentrification process had already begun in Sankt Jørgensbjerg. She argues that in the beginning some people were not really aware of the quarters’ history. They just focussed on their own imaginativeness concerning how houses should look like. But later they paid attention to the history of the quarter and tried to renovate and construct the houses and especially their facades like they have been before. (see Figure 21a and 21b).

Figure 21a & 21b Kirkebakken in Sankt Jørgensbjerg in 1889 and today (Source: Fang, Lotte; own picture)
In our last part about the latest tendencies in Sankt Jørgensbjerg we tried to find out about the housing prices there, in order to investigate the local property market and real estate agency’s interventions to be able to examine whether gentrification was taking place. So we studied the announces of estate agencies like Nybolig, Dan Bolig and home between Oct 7th and Dec 2nd 2005 in the weekly Boligavisen, which is an insert to the free local newspaper Roskilde Avis.

We found out that there are approximately two offers of 19th century cottage houses in Sankt Jørgensbjerg per issue, though it is mostly the same houses as the week before. Of course we can’t say anything about rising prices, as it would be necessary to study the announces for several years then. We got the impression, however, that those dwellings in Sankt Jørgensbjerg are on average more expensive than other dwellings in Roskilde which have a comparable size, age and condition. For example, there was a house in the CBD in Store Gråbrødrestræde from 1896 that had a living space of 69m² and cost 2,075,000 DKK (about 276,667 €), while the houses in Sankt Jørgensbjerg from 1870 with a living space of 70m² cost around 3,000,000 DKK (around 400,000 €). Also country houses in the same style as the ones in Sankt Jørgensbjerg, which were located in other districts of Roskilde Amt with a rural atmosphere, were about half that price. Still, one should not draw too quick conclusions from this as it was just a very short analysis that we did.
But one thing we can get out of the announces is that most of the houses were restored and modernized from the in- and outside by professional craftsmen during the past 20 years, especially within the last five years.

Although the traditional outer appearance of the former fisher houses was kept, partly due to cultural heritage reasons and restrictions by the municipality (see Appendix: Lokalplan No. 32), the inside is often equipped with the most modern and best kitchen, bathroom, underfloor heating, a fireplace, new windows, walls, parquet floors and pipelines – so the dwellings are almost completely re-built inside. This seems a bit paradox, but it fits in with the concept of gentrification. If this was the only characteristic found in Sankt Jørgensbjerg on behalf of gentrification, however, one might rather call it urban renewal, we think.

What is also interesting is the way the dwellings are advertised in Boligavisen. In every announce the charming old appearance of the houses is emphasized as well as the beautiful view over the fjord and the church and the nice surroundings in the quarter on the whole. The proximity to the city centre seems less important, it even appears less decisive as the proximity to the new harbour and the public park. This could be an indication for the quarter being rather a place for “recreative living” or retired people even, not for a living space close to the workplace.
To sum up this chapter it can be assumed from the different historic facts that mainly people belonging to the lowest and later also up to lower-middle class had been living on the hill until the late 1960s. But concerning the transition of inhabitants to other classes or social milieus during the last decades, we will now research on the outcome of our questionnaire we delivered to the residents on the hill.
4 THE QUESTIONNAIRE

As it is already explained in the introduction the idea to create a questionnaire came to our mind from the very beginning. It also became necessary as secondary data about the quarter on that low level is not available. That's why we decided to work with primary gathered data in order to get closer to a solution for our question:

IS SANKT JØRGENSBJERG A GENTRIFIED QUARTER?

4.1 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

We have described previously the criteria for a gentrified place, the predispositions and the reasons to attract gentrifiers in a city/area and made a profile type of “the” gentrifier. This profile should later be compared to the results we get from this questionnaire in order to be able to answer our cardinal question. So with the new material we gave to a small part of inhabitants of the quarter, only hundred exemplars printed and sixty nine answers, we will present our results as a quantitative analyse as well as a qualitative analyse. Indeed we will try to compare when it is relevant the data we got from it to similar data about Roskilde and/or Denmark so as to see to what extend gentrification considering all the elements given in the previous parts of the project may be observed in this area.

We are aware of the fact that with a cohort of 69 we cannot make a representative evaluation, but only draw vague conclusions.

The matter was to generate a short Danish questionnaire which can be divided in three main parts to have a better comprehension:

- socio-demographic and economical aspects
- geographic and housing aspects
- attachment to the quarter and leisure
Of course the titles given here are highly general, and we have decided to put the nineteen questions (see them in the appendix) after one another without separation in between, because we were thinking that all of them are related to the other ones. But as we think it is important to understand the procedure we followed and the expectations we had from it, we will describe and explain each question: their formulation, the kind of question (open/ closed), the choice of answers we proposed, what we were meaning and of course why we focussed on one point better than on another one.

We are conscious of the fact that our questionnaire is far from being perfect, but it has been realised before we got deep knowledge about gentrification and all the aspects it implied and while we had a different ambition and cardinal question. This is maybe the first auto critic we had to admit and it may explain a lot of faults we made. We also have to mention that almost all the questions are closed questions with given answers that had to be crossed and so we of course expected specific answers by posing specific questions, which pushes the outcome of it all in a certain direction. For some reasons which the causes are unknown to us, certain inhabitants didn’t answer to all the questions. We have then decided to consider only the answers we got.

The first question is presented as a table people had to fill in to inform us on how many people are living in the house and their respective ages. We can also deduce from it if they are in couple, with/ without children etc. From the answer we might see if people are in the age group of “typical” gentrifiers.

The second question is aiming at teach us the study level of the inhabitants. Indeed the level of education can explain different other data such as yearly disposable family income (question no.5), real estate or the belonging to specific occupational groups. It also tells about the social status those people have.

The third and fourth questions give us details about the labour profile of the inhabitants. These are also considered decisive when researching on gentrification. We forgot in question no.3 the answer “retired” and as well “jobless” which is we
think a mistake. It is nevertheless easy to deduce people retired because of their age and the years of living in the area (question no.6).

We already had a short explanation of the fifth question; it is to know the social strata we have matter with. Are they in majority rich or poor? What is the yearly average income?

Concerning the question no.7 it is divided into two parts: the first one is only about the surroundings and the second about other reasons which we have called “personal”. The purpose of this question was to know if the inhabitants have moved to Sankt Jørgensbjerg for particular reasons. We had as main idea to get the confirmation they moved in for the same reasons as gentrifiers had in other cities, like proximity to city centre or historic buildings. The choice of answer stays to our point of view objective even though largely influenced by our a priori. We asked them not to check more than two boxes to analyse it more easily.

The questions no.8 until no.11 are solid indicators about the proportion of owner/renter (no.8), which is very important to know if a district is being gentrified. Especially as we did not have the opportunity to find out about the ground rent or house prices during more than one year in another way, it was good to ask for this economic aspect.

But this “part” of the questionnaire is also aiming at giving us information about renovation which is one main aspect among all the ones gentrification has. For the question no.11, as the date of renovation is asked and the way they used to do it, we opted for a value scale from 0 to 3. Each number corresponds to a part of work (100%, 2/3, 50 %, 1/3) and different possibilities are proposed (professional craftsmen, themselves, friends).

The following questions are part of the last division which concerns the inhabitants’ attachment to Sankt-Jørgensbjerg and their leisure.

The question no.12 is well significant; it is to know from where they were before they moved in. we can know their geographic origins (Jutland, Zealand, Greater Copenhagen etc.) and also deduce from the answers if they are “mobile” people or not and to what degree. So we can conclude if those people are in a “back-to-the-city” movement or carrying out suburbanization etc.
The next three questions are a way to know how people feel inside the quarter. Is it for them a pleasant or an unpleasant place to live and stay there for their whole lives? Do they have problems in the quarter (no.15), and which ones?

Questions no.16 and no.17 indicate us the inhabitants’ status of living. The summerhouse possession and the frequency of holidays are pertinent indicators about the social strata we are confronted with.

Then the last two questions are socio-cultural ways to define which kind of people these residents are. As gentrification does not only relate to morphologic and economic aspects, this was important to do. What they are doing during their free time (no.18) – if they are rather interested in culture and arts or in sports and what exactly their hobbies are relates to the social milieu the inhabitants are in. We might even see if the theory of the “new cultural class” can be adapted to the people in Sankt Jørgensbjerg. The newspapers they read (no.19) may tend to be highly representative on their political opinions and thus also relevant for examining the inhabitants’ social milieu.

In the next part, we will have a look thanks to several graphics to the results we get from the questions described on the top. Nevertheless, as it has been said in the introduction of this part, we have changed our cardinal question after the questionnaire was made and then have decided for this analyse not to represent some questions due to a contested interest for our subject.
69 households answered our questionnaire and are the base of this part of our project. Those households represent 169 persons and from them we will try by a quality analyse to draw a general portrait on the quarter’s inhabitants including their demographic structure as well as their social and economical characteristics.

### 4.2.1 Socio-ecomomic and demographic aspects

![Graphic 1](image1.png)

**Graphic 1**

![Graphic 2 and 3](image2.png)

**Graphic 2 and 3**
The graphs 1 and 2 show the household structure on the hill. The medial size of the households is 2,4 members. It strikes that mostly two persons live alone in more than 50% of the households. Graphic 2 underlines that the 2-people-households are a lot of couples without children which is a cliché of a gentrifier’s household: dinkies. Nevertheless at the same time which may seem paradoxically, households with children which represent 38% is another characteristic for a typical gentrifier while it is said in the literature that middle class families also contribute a lot to gentrification though the image of the yuppie is still dominant. The profile of the typical gentrifier is and has been changing since the last years.

Singles play a minor role as they only have a stake of 20 % in the whole statistic and 72% of them (14% of the whole population) are living without any children.

From this graph which is in connection with the results from the ones before and data about Roskilde and Denmark, one can easily see that most of the inhabitants are between 40 and 64 years old, especially in Sankt Jørgensbjerg where they represent 55% against a little more than 30% for Roskilde and Denmark. Approximately 25% of the population is under 24 years old: teens are more represented than people around the age of twenty as they probably moved out of there parents’ house.
The dependency rate of non-active population (children under 16 and senior citizens over 65) on the active population in the labour market is 0.365 meanwhile the rate for.

The over-representation of the 40-64 years old as well as the weak representation of 25-39 (12%) and people aged more than 65 years old (5%) in Sankt Jørgensbjerg compared to the city and the national scale for which the percentages are respectively around 20 and 15 may be a relevant example of a past gentrification. The quarter may have been the object of a substantial wave of ‘immigration’ from people at that time younger with the wish to live in a peaceful area close to the city. This phenomenon may then by different process explained in the previous parts of the project have pushed the old inhabitants out of the quarter due for example to the increasing of houses’ prices.

More than 90% of the inhabitants questioned have a study level equal or superior than academic education. This percentage doesn’t exceed 23% for the country. Indeed in Sankt Jørgensbjerg people have a high level of education compared to Denmark: 39% admitted having a university degree/level and 52% an academic education level
although in Denmark those percentages represent only 5 for the university and 18 for
the academic education.
The country is generally less instructed since the majority of its inhabitants (77%)
didn’t continue after the upper secondary school which represents paradoxically the
highest percentage in the education in Denmark (48%) and the lowest in Sankt
Jørgensbjerg.
We may deduce from this graph since the education level in the quarter is higher than
the national average that the people may be potential gentrifiers. Indeed as it has been
said previously education is part of the criteria evocated when it is a question of
gentrification especially for the highest levels which generally implies a certain
quality of life due to high salaries.

This figure is aiming at showing us the distribution of the employee in each activity
sector. The percentage of public and personal services in Sankt Jørgensbjerg (82%) is
over represented compared first to the other sectors in the quarter but also compared
to Greater Copenhagen which has only 40% of the people working in this sector.
Nevertheless the other sectors are less represented there like for example finance and business activities, wholesale and retail trade, manufacturing etc. which is not the case in Greater Copenhagen. This can be explained first by the role Copenhagen plays in Greater Copenhagen, it is indeed the political and financial place since it is the capital, and secondly by the size of Sankt Jørgensbjerg and the economical role of Roskilde getting more and more important to the regional scale.

Moreover, the employment in the service sector is often related to jobs with high-responsibility which fits with the study level of the inhabitants as it was said above.

After the services in our research area the second sector is classified as ‘other’ because the activity is not stated and represents 9%. Unfortunately it is not exploitable for our analyse.

Here we have compared the results from our questionnaire with the latest data we got on the yearly income in Denmark that is to say in 2002.

One notes in the graph that the most frequent yearly income in Denmark in that year, situated between 100,000 and 250,000 DKK, represents 41% which is on the contrary
in Sankt Jørgensbjerg one of the less important since it only represents 13.6%. Globally Sankt Jørgensbjerg’s population has a higher income than in Denmark. Indeed more than 86% of the households have a yearly income superior to 250,000 DKK while in Denmark it is only 56%. Thus, the poorer groups are hardly represented in the area (13.6%) against 44% for the whole country. The criteria of income may be high relevant concerning the population living in the quarter. Even if here it is only a matter of yearly income one can imagine nonetheless the population is quite comfortably off due to their study level and also their profession as it was said before.

4.2.2 Geographic and housing aspects

72% of the inhabitants have been living in the quarter for more than 6 years inside which 28% can be considered as old residents as they have been living in Sankt Jørgensbjerg for more than 21 years. Only 6% have been living there for less than one year.

One can have doubts about an actual gentrification in the quarter since the population does not change significantly but one can imagine has been taking place in the quarter rather few years ago considering the number of living years of the inhabitants. Indeed
it should not be excluded that between 1983 and 1995 the area may have been the object of a high afflux of new incomers which are now old residents.

Although Sankt Jørgensbjerg is an old village which suffered many years ago from poverty and a strong housing degradation it is now as you can see on the graphs a quarter mainly chosen as a place to live because of his attractive surrounding due to the proximity of the fjord, the harbour and the housing specificity. On the graphic 9a more than 30% of the people questioned consider that the beauty of the surroundings as well as the housing are the first reasons which motivated them to move to Sankt Jørgensbjerg. The “better” recreation offered there is also one of the causes invoked since this has been chosen by 16% of the population. The new activities all around the area give the possibility for the inhabitants to recreate themselves (sailing, museum etc.) more easily as well as an access to a better social place which includes first the local infrastructures and the inhabitants’ social milieu.

The nearness from the Roskilde city centre is a good reason too for the people to live in this quarter since it is near from their working place (19%), economical activities, shops, which are part of a medium-size city and by the way near the nature and a more rural area inside the city.
As the main personal reason to move in, 40% answered that they choose this quarter because family or friends already lived there and 7% because it was a house from an inheritance. Those answers are particularly interesting in the way it shows us that there is as it was mentioned in the third part of our report a real identity and attachment to the quarter which is reinforced by the desire to distinguish from Roskilde community.

The proportion of owners against tenants is quite relevant as a tendency in the quarter: 64 persons (nearly 93%) own their home against 5 who rent.

The graphs (graphics 8 and 10a) we made and which are commented on the top can be compared in the sense it shows us the owned detached houses constructed before 1900 in Roskilde like it is the case for most of the houses in Sankt Jørgensbjerg (see next graphic below). As one can see on the graph the owned houses have sensibly decreased passing from more than 290 to less than 275 during a period of 15 years between 1980’s and middle 1990’s. This phenomenon may find its explanation in the worldwide recession which happened at that moment and maybe forced people to sell their houses. At the end of the 1990’s the number of owned houses has been stabilized between 280 and 285 which may explain the 93% of owners in a small part of a city.
Considering the average age of the dwellers in the quarter which is between 40 and 64 years old (refer to graphic 3) and that most of the people (72%) live in Sankt Jørgensbjerg since more than 6 years, and 28% since more than 21 years, the period during which they moved in may approximately be situated in 1983 which would historically have been a period of increasing gentrification.

As one can see in the graphic 11 the majority of houses in the quarter have been constructed not later than the 19th century, with a peak in the 18th (33 houses) and in the 19th (24 houses). We can conclude that this area of Roskilde concentrates a majority of old houses.

Concerning the graphic 12, one can notice that most of the houses have been renovated less than 15 years ago with a high increasing after 2000. Indeed 31 houses have been renovated in this period. It is moreover important to highlight that real estate agencies’ intervention is quite present in the quarter has it has been showed in the third part of the report with the property announces in Roskilde Avisen.

The visual aspect as well as the specificity of the houses in this area of Roskilde are one of the most important characteristics first as a reason for people to move in as it already has been said but also as an identity related to this quarter which confirms that you are in Sankt Jørgensbjerg and not elsewhere in the city. Moreover the wish for dissociation to the city of Roskilde is a central aspect in the history of the quarter and in the inhabitants’ common values and attachment to the place.
City policies although quite restrictive since they are aiming at keeping this typical aspect encourage owners to renovate their homes so as to avoid a too important degradation like it was the case during the 20th century or a visual change because of new modern buildings.

The renovation as well as the renewal of a quarter is part of the main reasons when it is a question of gentrification. The visual aspect of the houses and the new commodities which follow from the renovation are major criteria in the choice of new place of residence for potential gentrifiers.

Graphic 13

Due to the difficulty to analyse properly the results we had from this question, we have decided to divide it up in different degrees of intervention for the way of renovation in only three categories inside which the answers are equally distributed. Then one can note in the figure that the recourse of professional craftsmen has been adopted by 34 houses. Only 15 houses have been renovated by the owners themselves which may be interpreted as those people are part of the first ‘invasion’ of gentrifiers e.g. doing the work without any professional help, and 14 renovated before the dwellers moved in due for some of them to the real state agencies. As it was said previously when it was question of the yearly income, the inhabitants are quite wealthy and the way of renovation chosen confirms it.
4.2.3 Attachment to the quarter and leisure

This graphic shows that the majority of the inhabitants before living in Sankt Jørgensbjerg lived relatively near to it: 25 persons lived in Greater Copenhagen and 28 in Roskilde city.

First as it has already been mentioned, 7% of the people have their house from inheritance which might mean among others things that on the one hand they always lived in the quarter or, on the other hand that they moved at the adult age and moved back there later maybe due to a real attachment to the quarter.

But in the most cases, this migration from the East to the West which can be the result of suburbanisation and/or gentrification may be explained by many reasons. Indeed, the beauty of the surroundings in the quarter which is as we remind, the first reason inhabitants had chosen to move in, as well as the rural and natural aspect inside Roskilde, near from the city centre and from all the infrastructure one medium-sized city may have, but also the attractive houses which offer the future inhabitants a typical style of housing which is specific to Sankt Jørgensbjerg because of its history and way of living and finally in this non-exhaustive list, for its localization in Greater Copenhagen and the Øresund region considering all the conveniences it implies.
There is a high proportion of people who think the quarter is pleasant (67) inside which 63 persons imagine living there for ever. Only 4 people have answered they planned/wish to move somewhere else.

Such craze for living in the quarter has already been evocated on several occasions earlier and may be analysed as a strong identity in the quarter as well as a peaceful area which offers a good quality of life and where it is comfortable to live especially as an old resident. The old people’s home situated in the quarter confirms these words.
In this graph we have mixed two elements related one to the other since it is a question of holidays and the owning of a second home. As one can see, the percentage of a second home is quite weak (25%) nonetheless the inhabitants are taking holidays frequently. Indeed 71% of them answered leaving for holidays (not less than five days) more than twice a year in which 22% for three times a year. The small part of the people which owned a second home is highly represented in the last category of holidays: 83% of the people having holidays more than four times a year owned a second home.

The fact of leaving for holidays is a component of people’s life style since it includes a financial capital and a flexible schedule which are characteristic of gentrifiers. Nevertheless as one had seen, the financial aspect is not relevant concerning the owning of a second home but this may be explained by the excessive cost of a home in Sankt Jørgensbjerg as it is said in the third part of the report and by the fact that nearly 93% of the people are highly attached to the quarter and imagine to live there for ever (graphic 15).

Most of the people marked reading books (60) or going to the theatre and/or the opera (52). Several other cultural activities like concerts, painting and playing instruments were ticked off as well as the visit to the museums –none of the residents named e.g. watching television, playing computer games or going to the pub, what would not fit in the stereotype of a cultural gentrifier.
30 people stated they sail, which is known as a kind of upper-class hobby that costs a lot of money. Of course in Sankt Jørgensbjerg it is quite easy to do water sports as the quarter is situated right above the fjord. However, among the other activities that the occupants do are swimming, playing tennis, golfing, biking, walking etc. All those sports are usually being done alone or with only one or two people, no team sports like football or basketball were named which may be more ascribed to typical working-class people with a lower educational standard.
For the last graph we will try to deduce from the reading of the newspapers the political opinion of the Sankt Jørgensbjerg’s inhabitants. Regarding this, 50% of the citizens affirm reading Politiken which is considered as a newspaper rather on the social democrat wing while in the country in 2003 the same newspaper represented only 13%. In Denmark the newspaper the most read which can be compared to one in our researched area is the Jyllands-Posten which is highly oriented on the right wing with 16.2% against 4.7% in Sankt Jørgensbjerg as well as the Berlingske Tidende which is in the second position in the classification for Sankt Jørgensbjerg (15.3%). The importance of ‘other’ especially for Denmark may be explained by the existence of several local newspapers as it is the case for Roskilde Avis which is not represented in the graph due to an unworkable comparison. Nevertheless Roskilde Avis gathered 12% of the readings in all the newspapers read in the quarter.

For cultural gentrifiers as we supposed Sankt Jørgensbjerg’s inhabitants may be it is said quite often in the theories that they tend to be left-oriented which continues to fit with our point of view.
4.3 SYNTHESIS OF THE ANALYSE

To attempt to draw a general painting of the population in Sankt Jørgensbjerg is not an easy thing to do, however that is what we have tried by the way of this short questionnaire mainly oriented to prove the fundament of our project and then confirm our first idea on the area:

**SANKT JØRGENSENBÆRG IS A GENTRIFIED QUARTER.**

- The demographic structure is mostly composed of couples without children aged between 40 and 64 years old.
- The study level in the quarter is higher than it is in Denmark.
- The majority of the inhabitants are employee in the service sector.
- Their average yearly income is considerably superior to the Danish one.
- The quarter has few new residents: 72% are living there for more than 6 years.
- The first reasons mentioned to move in are:
  - Beauty of surroundings
  - Attractive housing
  - Family or friends live there before them
- The number of owners is very important: 93% against 7% for the tenants.
- The period in Roskilde where the detached houses constructed before 1900 have been in the highest point correspond to the period where a lot of the people moved in Sankt Jørgensbjerg.
- The majority of the houses are old and newly renovated
- Dwellers have chosen as the first to renovate their home a professional way.
- Their geographic origins is often from Roskilde and the Greater Copenhagen
- Inhabitants like to live in the quarter and more than 90% don’t want to move.
- Their free time is mainly cultural even though individual sports are mentioned.
- Their political opinion is more oriented on the left wing if we consider the newspapers they read.

With this short portrait of the incomers’ answers we will now try to make a deeper analyse considering the knowledge we have and then to answer our cardinal question.
5 CONCLUSION

After you have been following our argumentation through the main part we now try to draw the conclusion. We aim at answering our cardinal question from different angles by connecting the main points of the questionnaire with the theories and the historical background.

We are aware of the fact that the theories on gentrification are mainly large-scaled and that it is complex to apply such concepts on medium-sized cities and such a small area like Sankt Jørgensbjerg. Since those theories are based on field studies in metropolises as London, Paris, New York City, known as global cities, they have different characteristics as Roskilde: size of population, global network, different economical market, impacts from deindustrialization, more differentiated income groups, more social minorities, etc. Nevertheless trying to apply those theories is what we have tried to do, by linking these two scales.

The connection may be done in different ways but we have chosen to discuss these arguments we developed all along the project by first collecting those that are against gentrification in Sankt Jørgensbjerg and then the arguments that are in favour of it.

If we take the pure definition of gentrification and do not consider the circumstances in the context in which Sankt Jørgensbjerg is embedded, we might conclude from a physic point of view that gentrification is not happening there as it is only a residential area and does not have the typical flair of a gentrified quarter with cafes, galleries and so on (cf. part I).

In contrast Sankt Jørgensbjerg has the character of a quiet village with a particular morphology, for example the church in its centre, the streets arranged around it, and the street names (cf. part III). Further on, the detached houses don’t correspond to the typical houses in gentrified areas which are mostly multifamily residences.

Further on, although we do know that in the past Sankt Jørgensbjerg was a poor quarter providing a labour pool for Roskilde, we could not find out whether it was a stereotype working-class quarter during the 1950s and 1960s.
Regarding the social community of the village with this distinctive identity related to the history of the quarter, this is in contradiction with the usual anonymity in gentrified quarters. Different than in big cities, where people largely tend to live in one person households without knowing other neighbours despite all the infrastructures in the area aiming at easier socialization, one of the main reasons given by Sankt Jørgensbjerg’s inhabitants for moving there is the family and friends that have already been living in the district.

In addition, as the average age in Sankt Jørgensbjerg is between 40 and 64 years old and with the cliché of Yuppie gentrifiers being mainly between 20 and 40 years old, this also speaks against a hypothetic process of gentrification going on there now.

Moreover, if we connect the results from the questionnaire (cf. part IV) with the theories on social milieus, it can be derived that those people in the quarter belong to the old established milieu or in different terms to the upper class and therefore do not fit with the stereotype of gentrifiers.

Looking at the question from an economical point of view, the theory of Neil Smith is not really applicable on the quarter for many reasons: the rent gap which has been explained largely previously cannot be identified in the area because of the economical force of housing offers that seems to us less important than the demand for houses there, the Danish economy which is less neo-liberal than in other countries, and also because of the specific Danish housing market that we should have studied deeper. Even though we know from the Contemporary Denmark course that the housing prices in the country are generally rising and that about 70% of people own their houses and we can see (cf. part III) that real estate agents do earn money through speculation in the quarter, we don’t have enough knowledge to explain the process more thoroughly.

Considering all these elements it appears to us that if there is a gentrification process occurring whenever it happened (few years ago or now) it is more related to social circumstances than to economical ones in this precise case.

Partly the same aspects as we picked above against a hypothetical gentrification process in our research area may be taken on the opposite side to prove that gentrification has been taking place there.
Talking about gentrification always implies a definite period in the time. Then, when we were talking about the average residents’ age in the quarter which is quite old compared to the typical gentrifier, we could derive that gentrification took place twenty years ago which is in accordance with the moment when people moved in there (cf. part IV). The demographic structure of the households which consists mostly of couples without children also fits with the theories about the concept. And we know that even families, who search for a nice central place to settle down, play a role that gets more and more important in gentrified areas.

In addition, most of those people that answered our questionnaire have an exceptional high study level, work almost exclusively for public and private services, have high incomes, spend a lot of their free time doing cultural activities and have probably a political orientation rather to the left. All of this could be a proof that Sankt Jørgensbjerg’s inhabitants are part of the so-called cultural gentrifiers after David Ley (cf. part II). If we connect all the characteristics we got from the questionnaire with theories on social milieus we can suppose that these people belong to the intellectual milieu which consists of individuals with cosmopolitan outlook and distinct cultural interests, often those people that had been participating in the students’ uprising of 1968.

Regarding the quarter from a morphologic perspective, the recently restored or even rebuilt dwellings, this often done by professional craftsmen, further account for the idea of gentrification taking place in Sankt Jørgensbjerg. The inhabitants’ most quoted answer to the reasons why they moved to the quarter was accordingly the attractive housing and the beauty of the surroundings. This could count on the one hand as a demand side argument and on the other hand as a supply side argument, as we cannot tell for sure if the housing market initiated the upgrading process or the residents.

One reason that could have acted as a prerequisite for a supposed gentrification process in Sankt Jørgensbjerg is the latest renewal of the harbour as a recreational place. As we know from the questionnaire many people in Sankt Jørgensbjerg sail and also mentioned the proximity to the fjord as one reason to come there. This is in accordance with Neil Smith’s theories which state that it is often the municipality that invests in a new infrastructure to make an area more attractive and e.g. seize tourists, which is the case here (cf. part III).
Moreover, it could be due to building restrictions of the municipality that an urban atmosphere with shops, cafés and so on in the quarter is not developing. We know (cf. part III) that the traditional character of Sankt Jørgensbjerg should be maintained, so it is in most cases not allowed to use dwellings for business activities.

Summing up all these arguments that account either for or against gentrification in the quarter, we now finally come back to our cardinal question. In our opinion Sankt Jørgensbjerg could be a gentrified area to some extend, but in a really special way. We think that the process didn’t occur in this typical mode, because Sankt Jørgensbjerg never was a stereotype working-class area, but for a long time a village outshone by the medium-sized city Roskilde. Due to this fact the circumstances were of course different than in an urban area, but nevertheless some criteria for gentrification correspond to Sankt Jørgensbjerg: The neighbourhood offers a beautiful place with historic charm in which the inhabitants today can have a high standard of living. All in all the kind of gentrification here could be described as a rather rural than urban type, a gradual shift from a poor, run-down village to an attractive, peaceful place to live mainly for medium-upper class families.
APPENDIX

GLOSSARY

CLASSIFICATION: This term involves splitting a population into mutually exclusive categories on predetermined criteria, either deductively (using a previously determined set of classes) or inductively (finding the best set of classes for the particular date set). With inductive classifications, the guideline is usually that each member of a class should be more like all of the other members of that class than it is like the members of any other: the classes are thus internally homogeneous and externally heterogeneous. (1)

FORDISM: A late, and successful, stage of capitalism characterized by large-scale production semi-skilled labour, easy credit and mass consumption. This concept is based upon the production methods of the Ford Motor Company, particularly its use of assembly lines for automobile production. (2)

GENRE DE VIE: Literally translated as a ‘mode of life’, or in Anglophone cultural geography as ‘lifeway’, the term refers to the connected forms of livelihood functionally characteristic of human group; for example, transhumants, fishing communities or peasant agriculturists. (1)

GLOBAL CITY: One of the world’s leading cities-major node in the complex economic networks being produced by economic globalization. The influence of global cities (e.g. London, New York, Tokyo) is linked to their provision of financial and producer services. Global cities have impressive central areas that symbolize their immense power, status and wealth but which create huge degree of spatial disparity and inequality in their national scale. (3)

GLOBALIZATION: As a concept this emerged around 1960 when the Canadian media scholar Marshall McLuhan coined the term global village to capture the impact of new communications technologies on social and cultural life. Time space compression, it is argued has so transformed the structure and scale of human relationships that social, cultural, political, and economic processes now operate at a
global scale with a consequent reduction in the significance of other geographical scales (national, local, etc.). (1)

**INFORMATIONAL CITY:** A term coined by Manuel Castells to describe the modern city as the outcome of three linked processes- the restructuring of capitalism firms towards more flexible network forms of organization; the growing centrality of the production and management of information in modern societies; and the growth of information technologies – which are reshaping urban time and space. (1)

**INDUSTRIALIZATION:**

1) Process of growth of large-scale machine production and the factory system.

2) Process of setting-up such organizations, especially in the introduction of manufacturing industry in countries or regions where people are engaged mainly in agricultural activities (primary industry). It is usually accompanied by the establishment of service industry (tertiary industry) and by social change, e.g. in patterns of consumption, and in migration of people from rural areas to the growing urban settlements. (4)

**Milieu:** geographical environment upon which a group depends for its livelihood. (1)

**Post industrialist society:** A concept widely used, and now often lacking the specificity of its original formulation by Daniel Bell. As its current and general level, post industrial society describes an occupational transformation, noted first in the United States, toward a white-collar, service-oriented workforce in advanced nations, with specialized information (and information technology) playing a key role in the shaping of economy and society. (1)

**Post industrial city:** A city with an employment profile focused on advanced services – that is, jobs in professions, management, administration, and skilled technical sectors. Its profile is materialized in a downtown skyline of office towers, arts and leisure sites, and political institutions. (1)
POST MODERNITY: In contrast to postmodernism, post modernity is usually regarded as the historic period when the social and economic processes associated with postmodern turn have taken place. (1)

REGIONALIZATION: Special case of the more general of classification. The individuals comprising the population to be classified are areas and the resulting classes (regions) must form contiguous spatial units. Because of this additional criterion, regions defined for a population of areas may not be as internally homogeneous as a classification of the same areas without the contiguity constraint. (1)

RENT GAP: The rent gap describes the discrepancy between actual rent attracted by a piece of land (‘capitalized ground rent’) and the rent that could be gleaned under a higher and better use (‘potential ground rent’). (1)

SOCIAL CLASS: A problematic, disputed concept, widely used in the social sciences, applied to a group of people of similar rank or status in a community, the basis for the grouping being variable, e.g. determined by education, power, income, wealth, prestige, occupation etc. The term social class is often used loosely in the UK, to distinguish upper, middle and working class without any precise definition of the criteria used. (1)

SUBURBANIZATION: Is the outward growth of urban development to engulf surroundings villages and rural areas which initially growths linear along the communication lines. (1)

WORLD CITY: A term coined by Patrick Geddes (1915) for ‘certain great cities in which a quite disproportionate part of the world’s most important business is conducted’ (Hall, 1984). Hall identified eight such cities, centres of both economic and political power (though he later referred to them as ‘giant metropolises’). (3)
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Reesens own explanations from 1677

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Location</th>
<th>Meaning/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Røde Port</td>
<td>Domkirken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heste-Market</td>
<td>Bispegardens Kilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algaden</td>
<td>Løngang (Absalonsbuen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skomagergaden</td>
<td>Convent-Huset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Støden</td>
<td>Regentzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Højbroestrådet</td>
<td>Latinse Skole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringstedgade</td>
<td>Vicarii Huset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugge-Pylsestræde</td>
<td>Hospitalet kaldet Due Brødre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breedege eller Kongens Gade</td>
<td>St. Lauritz Taarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natmands-Stræde</td>
<td>Raadhuset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lammegade</td>
<td>Hafe hvor tilforn har staet St. Olufs Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampestræde</td>
<td>Hr. Søren Olufsens Boder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille Allehelgens Stræde</td>
<td>St. Gertruds Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Allehelgens Stræde</td>
<td>Herluf Trolles Boder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sorte Brødre Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snefre Stie</td>
<td>St. Agnes Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vor Frue Stræde</td>
<td>Graae Brødres Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrgedage eller Ørsegade</td>
<td>St. Mariae Klostres og Kirke Sted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graabrodres Kirkestræde</td>
<td>Alle Helgens Kirkes Sted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grønnegade</td>
<td>St. Bodils Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiermagnernis Stræde</td>
<td>Due Brødre og dens Kirkes Rudera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canniche Stræde</td>
<td>Hellig Korses Kilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenhaves Stræde</td>
<td>Høye Brynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulfs Gade eller St. Olufs Stræde</td>
<td>St. Bodils Brynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bispegardens Stræde</td>
<td>Magle Kilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funes Broe eller Fundes Broe</td>
<td>Bundetings Brynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundetinger</td>
<td>Allehelgens Brynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkebroe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smørfadet, Buryri patina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map and Table 1: Reesens Kort from 1677 including explanations (Source: www.roskildehistorie.dk, 02.12.2005, 10:42)
Behrmanns Map from 1832
Behrmanns own explanations to the map from 1832

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets and Lanes</th>
<th>Monasteries</th>
<th>Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Røde Port</td>
<td>Vor Frue Kloster</td>
<td>Domkirken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahlgaden</td>
<td>Graabrødre Kloster</td>
<td>Vor Frue Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skomagergaden</td>
<td>Sankt Clara</td>
<td>Sankt Dionysius Kirke*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Støden</td>
<td>Sortebrødre Kloster</td>
<td>Allehelgens Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellig Korsstræde</td>
<td>Sankt Agnes Kloster</td>
<td>Sankt Nikolaj Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hestemarket</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Bothulfi Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Torvestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Laurentius Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille Torvøgade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Hans Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gråbraørestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Mikkel Kirke*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsegaden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Peders og Pauls Kirke*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkesøestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Olai Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Læderstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Ibs Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneversti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sankt Mortens Kirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vor Fruestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gade uden navn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Allehelgensstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille Allehelgensstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byens endeløse stræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringstedgaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puggepølsestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blegdamsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredgaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaistræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natmandsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lammegaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille Grønnegade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vor Frue Klosterstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundekjær</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Grønnegade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorte Brødrestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannikestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimorstæde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Agnesstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pedersstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenhoffstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanderborggaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ols eller Olufsgaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Strandstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille St. Olsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkebroestæde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bispegardsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkestræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provstestrædet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gertrudsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hansstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regentsstræde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolegaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondetinget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* er placeret forkert
Map and Table II: Reesens Kort from 1677 including explanations (Source: www.roskildehistorie.dk, 02.12.2005, 10:42)