



Achieving urban regeneration without gentrification? Community enterprises and community assets in the UK

Alice Earley

To cite this article: Alice Earley (2023): Achieving urban regeneration without gentrification? Community enterprises and community assets in the UK, Journal of Urban Affairs, DOI: [10.1080/07352166.2023.2229459](https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2229459)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2229459>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 21 Aug 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)




View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Achieving urban regeneration without gentrification? Community enterprises and community assets in the UK

Alice Earley 

University of Glasgow

ABSTRACT



There is a long-standing debate regarding how far, if at all, urban regeneration can benefit existing residents, while the extent of gentrification is limited. Community management/ownership of assets, such as community centers or green spaces, by community enterprises (CEs) is one mechanism by which this could be achieved, by ensuring these remain in collective management/ownership. However, while research has explored the role of CEs and their assets within regeneration, further research is required regarding their role in gentrification. This article contributes to this gap, based on two in-depth case studies of CEs managing community centers in Bristol, England and Glasgow, Scotland. The methods included semi-structured interviews, a focus group and analysis of organizational and policy documents and neighborhood statistics. The findings indicate that, despite great efforts, CEs are currently unable to achieve their potential contribution to regeneration without gentrification, in the absence of greater public sector support. Nevertheless, I argue that urban scholars, policymakers and practitioners need to take greater consideration of the potential of community asset management/ownership as a mechanism for achieving more socially just regeneration, while the extent of gentrification is limited, and the support required to enable this.

KEYWORDS

Urban regeneration; gentrification; community enterprise; community asset; community control; community development

Introduction

Despite a plethora of research on gentrification, urban regeneration and the relationship between the two processes (for example, Leccis, 2019; Porter & Shaw, 2009; Slater, 2006), there has been limited recent research considering the role of community enterprises (CEs)—and specifically their community assets, either managed or owned—within processes of urban regeneration and gentrification, in socioeconomically unequal urban neighborhoods (see Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010 for exceptions). Socioeconomically unequal neighborhoods have not traditionally been the focus of research on social/community enterprise and regeneration in the UK, which has tended to focus on deprived neighborhoods, perhaps due to the targeting of these within public policy (for example, Amin et al., 2002; Huggins & Williams, 2009; Johnstone & Lionais, 2004; see Varady et al., 2015a, 2015b on the U.S. context). The neighborhoods of focus here are thus those broadly conceived as “a neighborhood” by residents but which are home to stark differences in socioeconomic indicators at smaller geographies. These areas may be at greater risk of gentrification or may even have started to gentrify, being less “risky” for investors if there are large “rent gaps”¹ that can be capitalized upon (see Smith, 1979).

CONTACT Alice Earley  alice.earley@glasgow.ac.uk  UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, University of Glasgow, Third Floor, Olympia Building, Glasgow G40 2QH, UK.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

This article contributes to these gaps, with the aim being to explore the role of CEs, and particularly the community assets that they own/manage, within processes of regeneration and gentrification over time in socioeconomically unequal neighborhoods. It is based on in-depth, largely qualitative case study research² with two CEs managing community centers—one in Bristol, England, and one in Glasgow, Scotland (see Earley, 2020). I develop a conceptual framework based on Marche's (2015) analysis of the varying roles of community gardens in gentrification,³ applying this to CEs that manage community centers. I do this to consider how, in these cases, these organizations, via their community assets, may contribute to resisting, limiting/mitigating, reflecting or even exacerbating gentrification (and consider how this interacts with the potential for community-led regeneration). I thus respond to recent debates in this journal regarding alternative forms of community economic development (see Fields, 2015), including Community Land Trusts (CLTs; for example, Choi et al., 2018; DeFilippis et al., 2018) and Community Development Corporations (CDCs; for example, Heil, 2018).

While there is an extensive literature seeking to define gentrification (see Lees et al., 2008, for an overview), there is not space here to outline this. Rather, Hackworth's (2002) definition of gentrification as "the production of urban space for progressively more affluent users" (p. 815) is useful here. In contrast, regeneration has been characterized by Roberts (2000) as a:

comprehensive and integrated vision and action which leads to the resolution of urban problems, and which seeks to bring about a lasting improvement in the economic, physical, social and environmental condition of an area that has been subject to change. (p. 17)

Despite these different definitions, Shaw and Porter (2009) note that critical urban scholars have often argued that regeneration is a "euphemism" for gentrification, particularly within urban policy (p. 2). Shaw and Porter (2009) instead argue for a more nuanced understanding of regeneration and gentrification, viewing them "as occupying different spaces on a continuum of social and economic geographic change, where maximum disinvestment, or 'filtering,' is at one extreme, and 'super gentrification' (Lees, 2003) . . . is at the other" (pp. 2–3). In this conceptualization, the two do not have to be "synonymous" (Shaw, 2008b, p. 1719), with Shaw and Porter (2009) arguing that "regeneration becomes gentrification when displacement or exclusion occurs" (p. 3). This is the view adopted here. More recently, Lees and Ferreri (2016) have argued that the "radical urban critique" which characterizes some gentrification research "is no longer enough," with a need to better understand how "a 'true' urban regeneration" could be developed by grassroots organizations seeking "neighborhood investment without displacement" (pp. 22–23; see also Shaw & Porter, 2009). The issue of displacement is thus crucial to these definitions and my understanding of the terms. I thus understand "'true' urban regeneration" to reflect Scotland's Regeneration Network's (2016, p. 2) definition of *community-led regeneration*, being:

rooted in the particular identity, culture, assets and connections of people and places; based on the meaningful involvement of the community of focus in both planning and delivery; a collaborative, long-term process . . . ; [and] a mechanism for appropriately linking local circumstances and assets to wider policies and resources.

In terms of other definitions, CEs have been described by Pearce (2003) as social enterprises that have a specific geographical remit (p. 29). A common type of CE in the UK is the Community Development Trust (CDT).⁴ These have been defined by the Development Trusts Association Scotland (DTAS, 2021) as "community-owned and led organization[s], working to combine community-led action with an enterprising approach to address and tackle local needs and issues." These organizations often manage or own community assets and aim "to create social, economic and environmental renewal in a defined geographical area, creating wealth in that area and keeping it there" (DTAS, 2021). This is a similar model to the CDC in the United States but, as Bailey (2012) notes, CDTs tend to be smaller in scale than CDCs. Community assets can be wide-ranging, including, for example, housing, green spaces, business incubators, and cafes (DTAS, 2012). *Community assets* have been defined by Archer et al. (2019) as:

land, buildings or other large physical structures for which long-term ownership rights are in place . . . and where this is held by a community or voluntary organization which operates for the benefit of local people . . . [and is] controlled by local residents. (p. 3)

The article is structured as follows. I first synthesize the international Anglophone literature regarding the regeneration and gentrification debate, integrating information on UK-specific policy developments to contextualize the empirical research where necessary. This section ends by setting out the conceptual framework of the resistance-mitigation/limitation-reflection-exacerbation spectrum, building on Marche's (2015) work, which is utilized in the following analysis. Subsequently, I outline the methodology before introducing the case studies. I then present the findings and analysis, before the discussion and conclusion. In doing so, I aim to contribute to three distinct gaps in knowledge, specifically: (1) the actual and potential role of asset-managing/owning CEs within regeneration and gentrification in socioeconomically unequal neighborhoods; (2) the specific role of the community assets managed/owned in regeneration and gentrification; and (3) wider conceptual debates regarding the interrelations between, and nuances of, regeneration and gentrification (see Shaw & Porter, 2009). I thus use community assets as a lens for exploring the complex interrelations between regeneration, gentrification and community enterprise (see also Ernst & Doucet, 2014).

I argue that urban scholars, policymakers and practitioners concerned with gentrification need to take greater consideration of the potential role of community asset management/ownership as a mechanism for enabling more socially just forms of community-led regeneration to be developed to benefit existing residents, while the negative impacts typically associated with gentrification are limited, as well as the additional support that is required to enable this (see also Colomb, 2009; Shaw, 2009). Negative impacts can include direct or indirect residential displacement, commercial/industrial displacement, "changes to local services," and "community resentment and conflict" (see Atkinson, 2002, p. 7, for a full review of costs and benefits). While there are many constraints and limitations to the potential of community-led regeneration in the capitalist context (DeFilippis et al., 2010), it is vital to better understand these possible alternatives to gentrification, and the support required to enable these, if we are to continue the search for understandings of how "true" urban regeneration" can take place (Lees & Ferreri, 2016, p. 22).

The regeneration and gentrification debate

Crucial to contextualizing this research is Shaw and Porter's (2009) call for further research regarding the nuances between, and complexities of, regeneration and gentrification. In particular, they emphasize the need to better understand how regeneration can take place while gentrification and its negative impacts are limited, to inform policy, practice, and academic debate (Shaw & Porter, 2009; see also Atkinson, 2008; Berg et al., 2009). Shaw's (2005) identification of four factors that can help to limit gentrification is thus useful here: a "housing stock not particularly conducive to gentrification," "security in housing tenure," "the 'embeddedness' of local communities" and "political activism," and progressive public policy (pp. 176–182; see also Levine, 2004; Rigolon & Németh, 2019). There are also other factors affecting the extent of gentrification, such as transport networks and physical boundaries, as well as the city's positioning, nationally and internationally (Lees et al., 2008; Shaw, 2009; Van Criekinging & Decroly, 2003). However, two of Shaw's (2005) factors are most relevant for this analysis: the role of public policy and the nature of the local community, including community activism. These are further detailed below.

Regarding the role of public policy, Atkinson (2008) argues that to achieve mixed communities while limiting the negative effects of gentrification, as noted previously (see Atkinson, 2002), there is a need to combine macroeconomic interventions, for example, to reduce structural inequalities, with local activities, such as "community engagement and consultation in regeneration and planning" (p. 2633). Yet, Shaw (2008a) argues that while public policy can be used to "stop [or modify] gentrification," this seldom occurs (p. 2637). This may be because gentrification serves the interests

of the state and others with power, for example, in relation to economic development (Shaw, 2008a). There is thus a need to develop and implement mechanisms to stop “regeneration becom[ing] gentrification” and the associated impacts of “displacement or exclusion” (Shaw & Porter, 2009, p. 3). This would arguably need to incorporate broader policy reforms, for example, in relation to welfare, housing and employment to reduce inequalities (see Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016).

However, this potential has arguably been increasingly limited since the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of 2007–2008 and, in the UK context, the introduction of austerity and so-called “welfare reform” since 2010 (see O’Brien & Matthews, 2016). In the UK, regeneration has been deprioritized as a policy area, with reduced funding, meaning that increased risks and responsibilities have been placed on communities to deliver regeneration through “enterprising” and asset-based approaches (Rolfe, 2018), increasingly reflecting U.S. policy trends (see Bailey, 2012). These policy shifts have arguably increased inequalities between communities that possess the social, economic and cultural capital (see Bourdieu, 1986) to develop and deliver regeneration themselves and those that do not (Hastings & Matthews, 2015; Rolfe, 2018).

In Scotland, regeneration is devolved to the Scottish Government and scholars have noted increasing policy divergence since the Scottish National Party (SNP) came to power in 2007 (see Roy et al., 2015). Yet, despite the current Scottish government’s clear commitment to addressing poverty and inequality, it is arguably constrained by UK central government policy, described above (Hastings et al., 2015; Rolfe, 2016, 2018). This is important context for this article, given the locations of the case study CEs.

In both contexts, it is therefore vital to recognize the impact of wider factors, particularly austerity and the transfer of responsibility for the provision of services, such as affordable housing and welfare, from the state to the third sector (see Bailey, 2017; Hastings et al., 2015; Milbourne & Cushman, 2015). This “responsibilization,” combined with reductions in funding and a subsequent increased “need” for “enterprise,” will likely further limit the capacities of community groups to deliver community-led regeneration, resist or offer alternatives to gentrification, fill growing gaps in service provision and remain financially sustainable (Bailey, 2012, 2017; Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016). While the extent of state withdrawal and the “responsibilization” of community groups is not as extreme in the UK as it is in the U.S. (Bailey, 2012), this is a key issue to consider when examining the role of these organizations in gentrifying communities and their potential to contribute to alternative community-led regeneration trajectories (see DeFilippis et al., 2010).

Local communities can also play a role in limiting gentrification (Shaw, 2005). There is a long history of community activism in urban regeneration and gentrification, for example, with communities being involved in, or opposing, interventions (Shaw & Porter, 2009). Despite this history, Lees and Ferreri (2016) note that few studies have focused on local resistance and alternatives to gentrification in the UK (see also Lees et al., 2010). Lees and Ferreri (2016) thus argue for the need for increased attention to “realistic alternatives” which could contribute to meeting the definition of community-led regeneration set out earlier, for example, by ensuring “the meaningful involvement of the community” and community control of assets (see SURF, 2016, p. 2). Options can include “community land trusts” and “neighborhood planning” (p. 23; see Lees, 2014b for further explanation of how these models and others can offer alternatives).

Another potential example of a “realistic alternative” (Lees & Ferreri, 2016, p. 23) is the role of CEs more broadly, and CDTs in particular. However, research regarding the role of these organizations in gentrification is limited in the UK, with a need for up-to-date research that examines the role of CEs in the context of austerity. Nevertheless, a small number of exceptions are worth noting. For example, Colomb (2009) explores the role of the Shoreditch Trust in a socioeconomically unequal neighborhood in east London. While recognizing the difficulty of assessing how far the trust truly “represents a successful form of community control over the area’s development,” Colomb (2009) argues that it has nonetheless “represented a positive form of local mobilisation against the negative impacts of rapid gentrification on social and community spaces,” aiming to achieve holistic regeneration aims and

ensure that community assets remain in collective, rather than private, ownership (pp. 165–166). In contrast, some authors, like Lees (2014a), who uses the example of the Creation Trust in Southwark, London, critique the role of CDTs as complicit in market-driven processes of urban regeneration. Despite these exceptions, existing research examining the role of asset managing/owning CEs in neighborhood change in the UK has tended to focus on regeneration rather than gentrification (for Bailey, 2012, 2017), with a need for further research here.

In the U.S. context, there is a limited body of scholarship examining the potential of similar organizational types, such as CDCs and CLTs, in limiting gentrification, including via community control of assets (for example, Choi et al., 2018; DeFilippis, 2004; DeFilippis et al., 2010; see below). However, while Thibault (2007) asserts that CDCs “create the conditions, such as rising real estate values, that lead to gentrification” (p. 848), Varady et al. (2015a) cite that there are insufficient examples of “CDCs attempting to create stable mixed-income communities in areas experiencing gentrification” (p. 14). Moreover, Varady et al. (2015a) argue that:

[w]hile it is impractical for CDCs to ‘stop’ gentrification, they may address the problem of displacement by enhancing the stock of socially managed housing and by implementing programs promoting social interaction across class lines (DeFilippis et al., 2010; Hymowitz, 2013). (p. 14)

There is therefore a need for up-to-date research in this area in the UK to explore this potential. The next section considers the specific role of community assets in regeneration and gentrification, respectively.

Community assets, regeneration and gentrification

Scholars (for example, Aiken et al., 2011; Wyler, 2009) have traced how community asset management/ownership largely became an explicit regeneration policy emphasis in the UK under the New Labor government (1997–2010), despite grassroots community organizations owning or managing assets in the UK and further afield for many years (see, for example, DeFilippis et al., 2010). Research exploring the role of community management/ownership in regeneration has grown accordingly (for example, Amin et al., 2002; Murtagh, 2019; Vickers et al., 2017). Scholars have identified several benefits of community management/ownership, such as “increased confidence, skills and aspirations locally; improved access to services and activities . . . ; [and] jobs, training and business opportunities” (Aiken et al., 2011, p. 7). Moreover, the Development Trusts Association Scotland (DTAS, 2012) suggests that assets could hypothetically contribute, in a small way, to redistributive regeneration agendas, creating spillover benefits for neighboring, more deprived areas, and potentially reducing relative deprivation and inequality, if assets are used to deliver “key services” for those in need (pp. 16–17). More recently, Latham and Layton (2019) have emphasized the importance of “social infrastructure,” i.e., community assets, for both “their practical utility but also because they are spaces where people can socialize and connect with others” (p. 9). Conversely, Aiken et al. (2011) cite that community assets can reduce neighborhood stigmatization and make areas “more attractive to outsiders” (p. 54), thus potentially increasing the risk of gentrification.

On the other hand, scholars have highlighted how community assets can play a role in enabling communities to limit gentrification or mitigate its negative impacts if assets remain in collective, rather than private, management/ownership (for example, Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis, 1999, 2004; Tuckett, 1988). While truly affordable housing is widely regarded as the key mechanism for limiting gentrification and displacement (Bailey & Robertson, 1997), it is important to consider other limiting factors in areas with a small social housing stock (Walks & August, 2008). Ernst and Doucet (2014) have thus argued that there is a need for further research exploring the role of other types of community asset. They explored the role of working-class pubs in a gentrifying neighborhood in Edinburgh, Scotland, finding that if these continue to operate, despite gentrification, “experiences and interactions [may] remain positive” (Ernst & Doucet, 2014, pp. 202–203). However, they suggest that “if these spaces . . . disappear or become completely gentrified,” there may be “much more negative experiences” (Ernst &

Doucet, 2014). Furthermore, Colomb's (2009) aforementioned work regarding the Shoreditch Trust explored how non-housing community assets, including a healthy living center, restaurant, shop and office complex (Shoreditch Trust, n.d.) were used for "property development and social enterprise activities," helping to maintain "key social infrastructure for lower-income groups" (Colomb, 2009, p. 166).

Despite this potential, the role of community assets in gentrifying neighborhoods can be ambiguous; assets can reflect gentrification and gentrifiers' wishes and tastes (DeFilippis et al., 2010; Fainstein, 2010). For example, regarding community gardens, Marche's (2015) research in San Francisco found varied roles, with one garden "rather unambiguously enhanc[ing] gentrification," another being "halfway between facilitating and merely accompanying it," and the other "resist[ing] it, but mainly in a symbolic, immaterial—although by no means insignificant—way" (p. 9). These issues have also been examined in the broader literature exploring the relationship between green amenities and environmental gentrification (see, for example, Alkon & Cadji, 2018; Anguelovski & Connolly, 2021; Maantay & Maroko, 2018; Martinez, 2010).

The relationship between regeneration, gentrification and community assets therefore depends on the type of asset, the nature of its use and the background and values of the individuals involved in both its governing board and as employees—their demographics, socioeconomic status and positioning in relation to gentrification (Benson, 2014; Collins, 2020; DeFilippis et al., 2010; Moore & McKee, 2014). Existing research has found that volunteers involved in community-based efforts are often those with the time and social, economic, and cultural capital to facilitate participation (Bailey, 2012; DeFilippis et al., 2010). For example, in the U.S., Holifield and Williams (2014) found that park groups were "more likely to remain active at larger parks more common within affluent, predominantly white neighborhoods" (p. 70). Further, scholars such as Fainstein (2010) have cautioned how, even when initiatives are established by working-class residents or even altruistic middle-class residents committed to social justice, this ethos can be difficult to sustain as a neighborhood gentrifies, with CEs' boards and potentially employees increasingly reflecting the changing population (Fainstein, 2010). Community-minded middle-class residents can thus experience tensions and contradictions when seeking to contribute to their community's development, for example, when wanting to help but not always understanding the needs of working-class residents (see Jackson & Benson, 2014; Savage, 2010; Schlichtman & Patch, 2017). However, this is not always the case. Based on a case study in Brooklyn, Hamilton and Curran (2013) explored how long-term residents and incoming gentrifiers can collaborate "to achieve political pressure for change and to promote more just sustainabilities" (p. 1557).

Furthermore, it is crucial to recognize the more general limitations CEs can face when seeking to contribute to community-led regeneration and/or to mitigate the negative impacts of gentrification, via their assets, with structural inequalities in power (DeFilippis, 1999), no matter how enterprising they are (see also Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010). These constraints are arguably even greater in a context of state retrenchment and austerity, such as the UK (O'Brien & Matthews, 2016), but also other Anglophone countries, including the U.S. (for example, Bailey, 2012; Varady et al., 2015b) and European countries, such as the Netherlands (for example, Kleinhans, 2017; Kleinhans & van Ham, 2016), despite different contexts in terms of the state's role. These challenges can lead to a risk of "mission drift" as organizations seek to ensure financial sustainability, potentially distracting from social/community aims (see Somerville & McElwee, 2011; Thibault, 2007; Thompson & Williams, 2014).

There is therefore a need for further research exploring the role of CEs, and their community assets, in urban regeneration and gentrification, considering these tensions and limitations, as well as the opportunities. In this article, I contribute to this research agenda, using community assets, specifically community centers, as a lens to better understand the complex interrelations between regeneration, gentrification and community enterprise, using the conceptual framework described below (see also Ernst & Doucet, 2014; Shaw & Porter, 2009). I extend Marche's (2015) analysis of the role of community gardens in gentrification in San Francisco to the UK context, by considering the ways in which the case study CEs and their community assets may interact with regeneration

and gentrification on a spectrum of resistance-mitigation/limitation-reflection-exacerbation. This allows us to better understand these potential interactions and possible alternatives to gentrification.

The potential role of community enterprises and their community assets in regeneration and gentrification: A spectrum, extending Marche's (2015) work

- **Resisting gentrification and potentially developing grassroots community-led regeneration approaches:** In this scenario, CEs might mobilize to resist development plans and/or develop alternative community-led regeneration strategies that ensure that existing residents are the primary beneficiaries, for example, by developing community housing schemes or neighborhood plans (see Lees & Ferreri, 2016). They could also lobby the local authority and other stakeholders to resist gentrification and displacement (Lees & Ferreri, 2016). Here, community assets could be used to organize resistance and maintain community activities and services, thus potentially reducing the risk of indirect displacement (see DeFilippis et al., 2010).
- **Mitigating/limiting gentrification and enabling community-led regeneration:** Community enterprises and their assets could play several roles in this respect. For example, they could continue to serve as spaces for the delivery of affordable, accessible and inclusive services, maintaining “social infrastructure” (Colomb, 2009; Latham & Layton, 2019; Varady et al., 2015a). This approach could also contribute to community-led regeneration, potentially reducing inequalities in service provision (DTAS, 2012). Where services and/or activities generate surpluses, these could be reinvested into community regeneration (DTAS, 2012). Community assets could also be used to offer local employment/training opportunities, thus increasing residents’ economic capital, potentially reducing the risk of displacement (Choi et al., 2018; Colomb, 2009). Community assets could act as social spaces that bring different parts of a community together, thus contributing to community cohesion (Choi et al., 2018; Latham & Layton, 2019; Varady et al., 2015a). Further, community assets could be spaces for community development and capacity building activities (Colomb, 2009). These activities could help to improve residents’ social and cultural capital, potentially facilitating their engagement in debates about how community-led regeneration could be achieved and/or how gentrification can be contested (Bernstein & Isaac, 2021; Colomb, 2009; Hamilton & Curran, 2013; Lees & Ferreri, 2016).
- **Reflecting gentrification and limiting the potential for community-led regeneration:** In this scenario, CEs and their assets are likely to largely reflect neighborhood and population changes, with their governance, aims and operations mirroring the needs and wishes of an incoming gentrifying population (see Fainstein, 2010). There may be tokenistic references to community-led regeneration, but CEs may face challenges meeting the needs of “traditional” residents, either due to a lack of effort or altruistic intentions which do not necessarily align with the needs of working-class residents (Fainstein, 2010; Lees, 2014a), unless great efforts are made to counter this risk. This approach could also legitimize gentrification to an extent by increasing the perception that “regeneration” efforts have community buy-in (see Lees, 2014a).
- **Exacerbating gentrification and contradicting community-led regeneration:** In this scenario, CEs may use their assets to actively contribute to gentrification, for example, by developing high-cost services and activities that meet the needs of incoming gentrifiers and are economically prohibitive for “traditional” residents (see Fainstein, 2010). They may adopt a tokenistic, top-down approach to community-led governance, participation and engagement, further disempowering and excluding traditional residents (Paton, 2014). CEs may even challenge alternative community-led regeneration plans proposed by these residents and/or promote gentrifying agendas led by the public and/or private sectors (see Lees, 2014a; Thibault, 2007).

There are thus several ways in which the community assets managed/owned by CEs and the organizations themselves might interact with gentrification and community-led regeneration. These are explored in the following analysis.

Material and methods

This article is based on research with one CE based in Bristol, England, and one in Glasgow, Scotland (see Earley, 2020). Data was collected between 2017 and 2018. I selected the cities because they are both home to neighborhoods where there is debate about gentrification; they experience socioeconomic inequalities within and between neighborhoods (DCLG, 2019; Scottish Government, 2020); they have a history of community activism and a strong “social economy” (see Amin et al., 2002); and they enabled comparison of the role of different policy contexts in England and Scotland. The case study neighborhoods and organizations were also selected to reflect these concerns. After a scoping stage involving desk research and initial meetings, I selected Community Central Hall (CCH),⁵ based in the Maryhill/Woodside area of north-west Glasgow, and BS3 Community Development (BS3 Community),⁶ based in the BS3 postcode area of south Bristol, with the two largest neighborhoods being Southville and Bedminster.

This study was informed by a constructivist and interpretivist framework, with emphasis on “how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced [and] produced” (Mason, 2002, p. 3). Within this, I adopted a “relativist ontology,” with the view that a singular “reality” does not exist (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013, p. 26). Rather, there exist a “series of alternative social constructions” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p. 16). In terms of my positionality, my interest in this research topic stems from my education and previous employment in this field, with a commitment to the potential of more socially just forms of urban regeneration, thus affecting my approach to the topic and every stage of the research process (Holmes, 2020; Snape & Spencer, 2003). I thus agree with Snape and Spencer (2003) that it is “impossible to conduct objective, value-free research,” with a need, instead, to “declare and be transparent about . . . [our] assumptions” (p. 17). Given these philosophical considerations, my positionality and the aims of the research, while analysis of some descriptive statistics was useful to better understand neighborhood change over time, I deemed a largely qualitative approach most appropriate (see Earley, 2020, for further details).

The college’s Research Ethics Committee approved the study, with principles including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality and pseudonymization and anonymization of participants being applied. At CCH, 34 individuals participated (sixteen employees, three board members, four volunteers, five service users and six local stakeholders). The majority of these were individual interviews, with four service users participating in a focus group. At BS3 Community, 39 individuals participated (eight employees, five board members, three volunteers, nine service users and fourteen local stakeholders). The majority participated in individual interviews (two responded via e-mail, instead), with two joint interviews conducted at the request of participants. The focus of the interviews and focus group was on the perceptions and experiences of participants in relation to regeneration and gentrification, and the role of CEs and community assets within these. Nevertheless, I also analyzed neighborhood statistics and organizational and policy documents, using these additional data sources for triangulation, thus strengthening the reliability of the findings (Bryman, 2012; Polkinghorne, 2007).

I analyzed descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel and qualitative data was transcribed, coded by hand and then inputted into NVivo for additional rigor, along with data from organizational documents (Crang, 2005). For most of the case study interviews, I used thematic analysis (see Braun & Clarke, 2006). For those participants who could offer a longitudinal perspective, I used narrative analysis to better understand “how [they] made sense of what happened and to what effect” (Bryman, 2012, p. 582). I analyzed each case study separately; the same major themes were used for each to ensure consistency in relation to the research aims, although additional sub-themes were created for

each organization where applicable. The next section introduces the case study organizations and neighborhoods.

Case study introductions

BS3 Community, originally the Southville Community Development Association (SCDA), is based in south Bristol, serving the BS3 postcode area (broadly Southville, Bedminster and Windmill Hill wards). The organization was established in 1991 to manage part of a former school building owned by the local authority, which was redeveloped and named the Southville Centre (TSC), on a 999-year lease from the local authority. The remainder of the site was transferred to a housing association (Barker, 2014). BS3 Community Development's (2018) aim is "to serve the community, develop its social capital, improve the local environment and help ensure that the area is a great place to live and work to improve the health, wellbeing and happiness of our community" (p. 4).

These formerly industrial wards experienced decline in the 1980s. However, participants described how the area has not typically been eligible for state regeneration funding due to its middling position on the Indices of Deprivation, with investment tending to be private sector-led, and gentrification beginning in the 1990s (Boyden, 2013). They explained how Southville gentrified first, being widely perceived as the more "desirable" part of BS3. Bedminster started gentrifying later, as Southville became increasingly unaffordable for many. BS3 is thus home to socioeconomic inequalities, as evidenced in Index of Deprivation data (DCLG, 2019).

Community Central Hall (CCH) is both the name of an organization and a community center based in the Woodside area of Glasgow, serving the Greater Maryhill area. CCH was formerly a Methodist church that also provided services and activities for the local community. The church closed in 1976 as the congregation declined, with a community campaign launched to save the building; the local authority subsequently bought the site, with management transferred to the community group in 1977 (Robertson et al., 1986). CCH's (2021) aim is: "to be at the heart of the community by delivering diverse services to enrich people's lives."

Woodside is located between Maryhill and Glasgow city center, being close to the typically affluent west end and the University of Glasgow. The area has received extensive regeneration investment since the 1960s, with much change, particularly regarding housing (Hutton, 2005). However, relative deprivation remains, with great disparities in socioeconomic indicators, such as income and education levels, within Woodside and with neighboring areas, as demonstrated in the Scottish Government's (2020) Index of Multiple Deprivation. Despite some signs of gentrification, participants cited that ongoing social issues, such as unemployment, in-work poverty and low educational attainment were also atypical of wholly gentrified areas, and may even limit gentrification, by making the area less attractive to certain types of incomer. Thus, while parts of the area may have experienced some gentrification and others are certainly at risk of gentrification, this is not uniform (Gray, 2015).

Both organizations are registered as charities and operate as community enterprises, being governed by a voluntary board (see Bailey, 2012). They offer a variety of paid-for and free services, including early education and childcare, older people's services, youth services and room hire, using surpluses from paid-for services to cross-subsidize those that are free or low-cost (see Bailey, 2012). Both do outreach community development work. BS3 Community also hosts a café.

Results: The role of the CEs, and their community assets, in urban regeneration and gentrification

This section analyzes the role of each organization and asset in community-led regeneration and gentrification locally, using the conceptual framework described previously. It is first necessary, however, to analyze the extent of gentrification in each neighborhood, using both qualitative data and neighborhood statistics.

The extent of gentrification

In BS3 (South Bristol), there was a view that the neighborhood had generally gentrified since the 1980s, but that the extent of change was not uniform across the area. For example, data on house prices at the ward level show increases in house prices since 1995 (when data is available from), albeit with variations between wards (ONS, 2022a, 2022b). Likewise, participants had varying views regarding how far different parts of the area had gentrified and what their view of gentrification was. Several participants described how they felt that parts of the area had “tipped over” the edge, with negative impacts associated with gentrification, for example, unaffordability, increasing inequality and exclusivity now outweighing positive impacts, such as increased social capital, community pride and a more “vibrant” retail/leisure offer (see Atkinson, 2002; Shaw & Porter, 2009). There were concerns that more advanced gentrification was negatively impacting the nature of the community. For example, Jessie (Local Stakeholder) described how more recent incomers are “much more affluent, private sector workers” who are less “engaged in the community.”

Housing tenure statistics from the 1981 to 2011 Censuses show that there has been a decrease in socially rented housing (and a generally lower proportion of socially rented housing than Bristol as a whole) and an increase in privately rented accommodation (ONS, 1981, 1991, 2001, 2011). This again can signify affordability issues and a subsequent risk of displacement (see Atkinson, 2002). Participants also noted direct and indirect displacement locally (see Marcuse, 1986), recognizing that while some “traditional” residents may own their homes and thus be able to remain in the area, neighborhood change can nevertheless be very “disempowering” (Jessie, Local Stakeholder). However, Harriett (Local Stakeholder) felt that population change was largely due to older working-class residents passing away, rather than being displaced. While participants did not suggest that BS3 Community, via TSC, had resisted gentrification, they had varied views regarding how far it had mitigated/limited, reflected, or even exacerbated gentrification (see Marche, 2015), as is discussed in the following analysis.

In contrast, participants had mixed views regarding the nature and extent of gentrification in Woodside and the Greater Maryhill area where CCH is based. While participants suggested that there had been significant change locally since the late 1970s, they generally felt that the “traditional” character of Maryhill’s community still largely remained, albeit somewhat fragmented, with relatively minimal gentrification. Further, Daniel (Organizational Representative) felt that the neighborhood “feels a world apart” from the generally more affluent and gentrified “west end” where the University of Glasgow is based, for example, lacking forms of middle-class consumption, such as coffee shops.

However, others felt that while there has been some gentrification, “it’s not encroached to the extent that it’s totally forced out an existing community” (Rosanna, Local Stakeholder). Furthermore, Isla (Local Stakeholder) gave quite a contradictory perspective:

I don’t think the regeneration that we are doing here is leading to gentrification. And, if it is, it’s not gentrification that’s leading to people being pushed out . . . the communities look better, feel better. That might . . . lead to more private interest in the area but . . . that’s only a good thing because it will sort of stimulate . . . mixed-tenure development.

Nonetheless, participants described changes that are commonly associated with gentrification, including housing demolition and dispersal of residents. Several participants noted that these changes had increased isolation for some as friends and family have moved away, reducing their support networks and sense of community. For example, Jason (Organizational Representative) commented that “a lot of the families that I grew up with no longer live here . . . it doesn’t feel like a community anymore.” While there were varying views, these narratives arguably provide a counter to those who expressed a view that gentrification has either not occurred in Maryhill or that it is a “positive” thing in an area “requiring investment,” for example, in the creative industries.

Moreover, both qualitative and quantitative data indicate increases in house prices, a sign of gentrification, with Firhill intermediate zone⁷ (where CCH is located) experiencing a greater percentage increase in median house prices from 1993 to 2013 than the Glasgow average

(Scottish Statistics, n.d.). Participants noted that house price increases had not been uniform across the wider area, with greater increases in the more affluent parts of the area, potentially exacerbating existing inequalities. Notwithstanding, Woodside is home to some of Shaw's (2005) factors that can limit gentrification, such as social housing and community assets, including CCH. Two of the neighboring wards, where many service users come from, have higher proportions of social housing when compared to Glasgow City (General Register Office for Scotland, 2001; National Records of Scotland, 2011).

The next section explores the roles of the organizations and their assets within regeneration and gentrification. Please note that there was little evidence of either organization, via their asset, resisting gentrification, although depending on one's view, they have either developed or enabled community-led regeneration and development in different ways; these are now discussed. Under each subheading, the Bristol case is analyzed first, followed by Glasgow.

Mitigating/limiting gentrification and enabling community-led regeneration

In Bristol, several participants described how the Southville Centre (TSC) and BS3 Community Development as an organization more broadly had played an intrinsic role in reviving a sense of community in the early days, in a neighborhood which had suffered from deindustrialization. They explained how, at this time, the organization sought to encourage social integration between older and incoming residents via the asset, "recognizing that . . . even as an area becomes more affluent, there are people who are still very vulnerable" (Dennis, Organizational Representative). This approach thus helped to limit some of the negative impacts of gentrification and enable a community-led approach to regeneration and development.

The community asset, TSC, was generally described positively as a community hub that, over the years, had provided a meeting space for social interactions; activities and services, such as for children and older people, to be delivered; and community development work to be facilitated. For example, Erin (Local Stakeholder) described it as "a motor for change," stating that "Southville would be a shadow of itself without this space." Likewise, Morgan (Local Stakeholder) described TSC as "a vibrant active sort of place, well-used by all sorts of different activities and meetings and groups." In addition, participants explained how TSC has, at times, facilitated mixing and interaction between different parts of the community. For example, William (Organizational Representative) explained how, in the early 2000s, childcare services may have acted as "a leveler," being used by both working- and middle-class parents. However, previous studies have highlighted how social mixing does not necessarily lead to greater understanding (for example, Butler & Robson, 2001) and, in the case of Collins (2020) work regarding multiculturalism and gentrification, "does not necessarily lead to sociocultural connections" (p. 256). There was thus a sense that the space had helped enable community-led regeneration, but also some concerns that it had reflected gentrification to a degree, as discussed later.

Regarding the organization's role in community-led regeneration and community development, while there was some concern that the organization's outward-facing work had declined over the years, as discussed later, participants described how BS3 Community has proactively aimed to do more community development since the early 2010s, creating a permanent community development manager role, funded partly by increasing surpluses from early education and childcare services. This has a focus on engaging less affluent, working-class community members, who arguably experience more adverse impacts from gentrification, such as displacement, unaffordability and social exclusion (see Atkinson, 2002). Participants spoke very highly about this work. While these activities are relatively small-scale, and although they are seemingly not a deliberate anti-gentrification strategy per se, they do aim to ameliorate some of gentrification's impacts by expanding social and community services to meet a wider variety of needs. Participants also suggested that they can also have a great benefit at the individual level. For example, Arthur, a beneficiary of older people's services and long-term resident, exclaimed: "I just enjoy it all!"

In Glasgow, participants described the grassroots origins of CCH as an organization and asset, being led by a large community committee keen to develop community-led regeneration at a time when there was neighborhood change taking place, led by top-down forces. Several participants emphasized the asset's longstanding role in the community, being used for a wide range of services and activities, such as those for children, young people and older people, over several generations. It was described as being "like a patchwork quilt" (Daniel, Organizational Representative) and "a support mechanism for people" (Alec, Organizational Representative). They described the inclusivity of the space in comparison to some local authority or privately run spaces. For example, Bruce (Organizational Representative) commented that the building is "always open," with someone who "will listen." Furthermore, given the range of services and activities offered, participants described positive impacts at the individual/community level. For example, Jacob, a beneficiary of older people's services, explained how the service had helped to reduce his loneliness: "I've met people . . . I felt I was just stuck in the house after my sister passed away." Further, Bruce, a beneficiary of young people's services, expressed that "I wouldn't like to picture my life without being involved here."

Moreover, in terms of CCH's contribution to (community-led) regeneration, respondents explained how the organization made particular efforts to align with, and contribute to, national and local "policy priorities" in relation to "social exclusion/justice, regeneration, community involvement and health" in the New Labor years (Community Central Hall [CCH], 2003, p. 1). While there was concern that this commitment had reduced over time, partly as a result of austerity, at the time of data collection, participants described CCH's efforts to increase its role in regeneration locally, having recently secured Scottish Government funding for two Community Regeneration and Community Development posts, which had this as an explicit aim. These roles involved developing a community cinema, partnerships with regeneration activities locally, providing training, volunteering and employment opportunities and contributing to wider social and economic regeneration activities (CCH, 2019, pp. 4–7). This thus arguably enabled community-led regeneration and helped to mitigate some of the challenges of gentrification encroaching from neighboring areas.

Thus, several participants, although by no means all, expressed a view that while things had changed over time, with external factors creating challenges discussed in more detail later), the original ethos still remained: "their commitment to the community has not changed . . . the priorities have changed, but . . . that's due to funding and just times changing . . . it's nothing that they have done" (Jason, Organizational Representative). Furthermore, Abigail (Local Stakeholder) commented, "CCH still remains the traditional vanguard to support the local community," suggesting that the organization and asset may have helped to limit some of the negative effects of gentrification, such as a loss of community and social isolation (see Atkinson, 2002; Rigolon & Németh, 2019; Shaw, 2005).

Overall, while some recognized that the use of the halls had changed somewhat, they nevertheless emphasized that it continues to be a vital space for social interactions and the delivery of varied and affordable community services. Furthermore, participants generally felt that the original ethos to provide for, and represent, the existing community largely still remains. The findings indicate that CCH has remained committed to the community-led regeneration of Woodside and greater Maryhill over time, responding to and reflecting neighborhood changes and wider factors and mitigating some of the challenges, rather than acting as a mechanism for resisting or exacerbating gentrification (see Marche, 2015). Participants therefore suggested that the contribution to regeneration has been largely social, focusing on the delivery of services and activities and the development of social capital, as well as providing local employment and volunteering opportunities. This approach can have a great impact for some at the individual/community level, rather than necessarily being a catalyst for neighborhood change.

Reflecting gentrification and limiting the potential for community-led regeneration

In BS3, there was a view that in addition to limiting some of the negative impacts of gentrification, BS3 Community and TSC had also reflected gentrification and potentially limited the potential for

community led regeneration to an extent. For example, in terms of the organization's ethos and development, participants described how the organization was established by a socially mixed group of residents, benefitting from relatively high levels of social and (increasing) economic capital as a result of gentrification. However, participants described how this demographic meant that the organization faced pressure from an early stage to become financially self-sufficient, given increasing affluence locally and the ability of (some) residents to pay for services and activities. This created some challenges in doing community development work, with the organization focusing, at times, on the building and generating sufficient income to survive. Thus, incoming gentrifiers, and the wider process of gentrification, have created both opportunities and challenges for the organization, with some participants feeling that, over time, the challenges and negative impacts may have started to outweigh the positives as more extensive gentrification has taken place.

Moreover, the shifts described earlier in terms of housing and community coincided with the early days of TSC and subsequent private sector investment, particularly the development of a former Tobacco Factory into a theater and mixed-use space.⁸ Erin and Miranda (Local Stakeholders) argued that TSC had catalyzed private investment and gentrification in its early days, with Erin (Local Stakeholder) describing how they could:

trace a trail of events that this project led forward from . . . the Tobacco Factory was pretty much a direct response to what we were doing here and the bits we weren't covering and the opportunities.

Yet, Andrea (Organizational Representative) felt that while the organization and TSC had initially "driven" a lot of change through its community development work, it had later reflected change, including gentrification, becoming more proactive again recently. However, others felt that the organization had played a less significant role, instead arguing that gentrification is driven by structural issues, particularly the housing market; for example, Jonathan (Organizational Representative) commented that TSC is "a product" of change.

There was a view that the organization's community development approach had focused on supporting different groups to address local issues, such as environmental problems, in a self-sufficient way, for example, by establishing parks groups via initial meetings at TSC. This approach has arguably been enabled, in part, by the area's increasing gentrification, with residents having fairly high levels of social, economic and cultural capital (see Bailey, 2012). Harriett (Local Stakeholder) described it "as being like doing community development in a grammar school!"⁹ However, Harriett (Local Stakeholder) was keen to emphasize that if there is a strong ethos of inclusion, positive outcomes can be achieved in terms of sharing "skills and education, confidence" between different parts of the community. Thus, participants described the role of BS3 Community, and TSC as a community asset in particular, in community development and regeneration over the years, potentially reflecting and catalyzing gentrification, making the area more attractive to future gentrifiers and investors, while also helping to mitigate some of its negative impacts, as described in the previous section, playing an ambiguous role (see Fainstein, 2010).

Participants explained how BS3 Community aims to balance the needs of different groups, such as those of long-standing, typically more working-class residents with those of predominantly more middle-class incomers, to reduce some of the cited tensions arising locally from gentrification (see Fainstein, 2010). Yet, there were concerns that the latter group, who tend to have higher levels of social, economic and cultural capital, are likely to vocalize their desires more loudly, and also have a greater ability to pay for services, thus meaning that they may have a larger influence on the organization's aims and activities, potentially limiting the scope for truly representative community-led regeneration (see Somerville, 2016).

Moreover, the introduction of austerity in 2010 by the Conservative–Liberal Democrat coalition government arguably had an adverse impact on BS3 Community's ability to meet the community's needs, affecting the services and activities offered, and potentially meaning less scope to mitigate gentrification's harmful impacts. Participants described challenges sustaining services that generate little or no income but that often address more acute needs, such as those for older people, without

greater public sector support to subsidize these in a context of gentrification, reflecting existing research (Bailey, 2017; Milbourne & Cushman, 2015; O'Brien & Matthews, 2016). Accordingly, Sam (Organizational Representative) explained how, despite good intentions, BS3 Community certainly cannot be expected to meet the needs of “harder-to-reach groups” or “a high level of need” in the way that the welfare state was originally intended to. This reflects existing literature (for example, Amin et al., 2002; DeFilippis et al., 2010) that has highlighted how addressing engrained structural inequalities and the impacts of gentrification are largely outside the capacity of charitable organizations, however well organized, well meaning and “enterprising” they may be. Despite policy rhetoric and the good intentions of many involved, there is a need for far greater resources from the state to address structural issues (O'Brien & Matthews, 2016).

Furthermore, a small but notable number of participants commented that BS3 Community's engagement with less affluent, more working-class community members often occurs outside of TSC, albeit with some exceptions. Andrea (Organizational Representative) explained how, given that the organization's “sustainability model is prefaced on people spending money,” attracting different groups to use TSC may threaten the organization's “ability to be sustainable,” with the need to appease those with economic capital to ensure financial survival. While several participants cited BS3 Community's sustainability as a key achievement, particularly in the context of austerity, some expressed concerns about whether the organization had potentially over-prioritized income-generating services (and service users, often “gentrifiers” themselves, see Schlichtman & Patch, 2017), particularly early education and childcare, over community aims, leading to a risk of “mission drift” (Thompson & Williams, 2014). It is therefore important to consider how far, if at all, the organization, via TSC, can resolve some of the tensions arising from gentrification, for example, by using the asset for a more diverse demographic; or whether this role is more effective if indirect, with TSC generating the surplus for outreach activities.

Overall, the findings presented in this and the preceding section suggest that although BS3 Community and TSC, combined with the efforts of other stakeholders, contributed to and catalyzed community-led regeneration and development in their early days, potentially attracting further private investment, over time they arguably started to reflect gentrification, including the associated tensions, while making efforts to ameliorate some of the challenges created. It is important to consider how far the tensions the organization faces in negotiating this process can be resolved in a synergistic manner through different activities/services to increase the scope and influence of BS3 Community's work; or whether the organization's agency is arguably too limited by structural factors, the challenges associated with gentrification and the finite level of resources, meaning difficult trade-offs must be made (Larner, 2014; Thompson & Williams, 2014).

In Woodside/Maryhill, there was less concern about CCH, as both an organization and community asset, reflecting gentrification, due to the general view that the extent of gentrification was much less significant. CCH's approach to community-led regeneration and development thus reflects the neighborhood context of less advanced gentrification and greater poverty than BS3. Nevertheless, some participants felt that gentrification was a future risk. For example, Sarah (Organizational Representative) thought that gentrification was somewhat “inevitable” due to various factors, including investments in green infrastructure and the area's location close to the University of Glasgow and city center. Therefore, while stakeholders were aiming to address the needs of existing residents, attract investment and develop local social and economic opportunities, the findings suggest a need for very careful negotiation of regeneration and gentrification in the capitalist context; housing and labor markets, which are largely outwith the control of local stakeholders and/or organizations, drive much of this (DeFilippis et al., 2010). The issue of focus for this section about CCH is therefore largely about limits to the potential for community-led regeneration.

While participants described a lesser extent of gentrification, this does not mean that there have not been challenges in terms of the interactions between the organization and community asset with wider processes of neighborhood change. Regarding the organization's ethos, participants described how CCH's governance, working culture and operations had changed drastically over the years,

particularly since the mid-2000s, when there was a change in leadership. This coincided with an increased focus on activities and services that generate a surplus, particularly early education and childcare, as public sector funding declined. Several participants felt that these two shifts had reduced the level of community involvement in CCH's governance and its contribution locally. Some were critical of these changes: "the committee fell down from over 20 to half a dozen. A lot of the good staff just left It's been the ruin of CCH in the community" (Bonnie, Organizational Representative). However, others felt there was little alternative, given declining state support, the professionalization of the sector and the perceived "need" for particular skills sets amongst board members: "[In] other areas . . . you may well find the kind of skills that you need. But you won't in this area; it's one of the poorest in Scotland" (Callum, Organizational Representative).

Nevertheless, some felt that the halls were not used as much as they were in their early days, with a view that their social function had declined, potentially partly as a result of these organizational changes, reducing the potential of the organization and community asset to contribute to community-led regeneration. For example, Duncan (Organizational Representative) explained how, as public sector funding has reduced, CCH "lost a lot of the good [community development] projects," as well as "services for the elderly." He contemplated, "I don't know if we're [at the heart of the community] as much as we say we should be." Participants described how funding changes have led CCH to expand its designated geographical area of benefit to reach more affluent populations in arguably more gentrified areas who can pay for services. Some felt these changes had challenged the organization's community focus, and potentially reduced its ability to meet residents' needs to the extent that it may once have done. In the context of austerity, there can thus be challenges sustaining the CE model, and particularly community assets, in areas that are less gentrified, with less latent economic capital (Bailey, 2017; Spear et al., 2017). This can subsequently limit their potential role in community-led regeneration.

Furthermore, participants described how the organization's emphasis on contributing to the wider regeneration aims described previously had declined somewhat since the late 2000s, partly driven by austerity. Harry (Organizational Representative) described how, at this time, funding cuts and the closure of the café meant CCH had "becom[e] more narrowly focused." In particular, participants described how early education and childcare services have grown as the main income-generator, while older people's services have declined due to funding cuts, recognizing that "not everything can run as a social enterprise" (Rachael, Organizational Representative). Participants expressed ambiguous feelings about the shift in services; while recognizing the need to increase income generation in the context of wider societal and political factors, there was also a great sadness regarding the decline of older people's services.

Participants thus described how while CCH aims to be responsive to local needs in terms of the social/community services and activities offered, thus contributing to community-led regeneration, by necessity these and the use of the space have shifted over time, due to funding and other factors. Some were critical of these shifts. Bonnie (Organizational Representative) commented that the nursery is largely "filled with small children from the . . . [affluent suburbs] of Milngavie and Bearsden, whose parents come in to work in the city and drop them off," rather than benefitting the "traditional" community. Further, Abigail (Local Stakeholder) commented that now, "who can afford, can get in." She was worried that this may lead to "ill will" if traditional residents face difficulties accessing the halls. Others described a risk of "mission drift" as the activities that generate a surplus now dominate the use of the space, while others have been deprioritized (see Thibault, 2007; Thompson & Williams, 2014). Despite these concerns, multiple participants expressed a clear aim to balance social/community and economic/enterprising aims (see Bailey, 2012; Somerville & McElwee, 2011).

These findings again highlight constraints on CEs' agency; while CCH may be less reliant on government funding than it once was, the organization has become more reliant on the market, which can cause challenges in deprived areas, particularly during times of austerity and "welfare reform," as residents may not be able to afford to pay for activities and services (Spear et al., 2017). This has arguably led to an expansion of the area of benefit to include those with greater purchasing power, in

arguably more gentrified areas. Thus, a relative lack of gentrification locally may conversely challenge the viability of the CE approach (Spear et al., 2017). These challenges reflect cautions in academic literature that despite the policy promotion of CEs and community assets as mechanisms for regeneration, policy may actually be exacerbating existing inequalities, privileging those communities which already have high levels of social, economic and cultural capital to establish and maintain CEs and develop their own regeneration approaches, while other communities struggle to do this in the absence of sufficient state support (Bailey, 2017; O'Brien & Matthews, 2016; Rolfe, 2018). As Abigail (Local Stakeholder) explained:

when community groups are not in a position to provide, then there's no one . . . the community is finished. It's drawn out. It's given all it can give—time, money, effort, it's all gone, it's used up . . . it's the government that needs to put its hands in its pockets.”

Therefore, while the halls are an excellent example of the type of long-standing asset managing CE being promoted within Scottish Government policy (for example, Scottish Government, n.d.), the findings indicate that there are also challenges, tensions, and ambivalences regarding their role in neighborhood change over time. It is important to recognize that despite continual aims to remain “community” focused, organizations such as CCH are constrained by the neoliberal, capitalist context they are operating in, in countries such as the UK, with a need to generate a surplus to survive (Bailey, 2012; DeFilippis et al., 2010; Thibault, 2007). This can lead to challenges balancing the social nature of the space as a facilitator of interactions with the increasingly commercial aspects (and necessities) of the organization and the needs of different service users within it, with increasing focus on ensuring the “necessary” economic transactions (see Somerville & McElwee, 2011). The asset is the mechanism through which CCH contributes to regeneration, as well as providing a space for generating surpluses, thus leading to an ambivalent role, given limited space and resources.

Exacerbating gentrification and contradicting community-led regeneration

Regarding BS3 Community Development, some participants expressed concern that the organization might be exacerbating gentrification and contradicting community-led regeneration efforts by other organizations and actors locally. There was little evidence of CCH exacerbating gentrification.

In this regard, participants described how BS3 Community has expanded paid-for services and activities over time to generate a greater surplus due to challenges gaining public sector funding and the more recent impacts of austerity. They explained some tensions balancing these services and activities with those that do not generate an income, such as community development work, complicating the organization's relationship with wider processes of gentrification. They thus explained how meeting varied community needs can be a challenge. Some reflected that those who access fee-paying classes and activities, such as yoga and tai chi, can be fairly homogenous, with a level of affluence needed. Jeremy (Organizational Representative) stated, “that's not the way to be . . . community should be everybody.” Likewise, Charlotte (Organizational Representative) emphasized the aim to ensure that “we don't exclude people on lower incomes.” Some thus described their efforts to increase awareness of existing free or low-cost services and activities and to expand these to mitigate some of the tensions arising from gentrification, highlighting the ambiguities regarding the organization's relationship with gentrification.

Despite these efforts, some cautioned about the impact of increasing exclusivity within TSC as the neighborhood has gentrified, both in terms of the nature/aesthetics of the space and the economic model, with most services and activities being paid for. Rather than simply reflecting gentrification, some were concerned that this could contribute to gentrification and its negative impacts. For example, Taylor (Local Stakeholder) commented, “pretty bunting is OK, but it's not going to attract working-class people . . . it's all very nice for the yummy mummies.” He emphasized the need to remember the different concerns of people within BS3: “some of the middle-class values that most of us espouse, like BS3 Plastic Free . . . are not concerns of people who really hardly have enough money

to live on.” Thus, while many described their intentions to help less fortunate members of the community, the positionality of middle-class residents and some organizational representatives in relation to gentrification means that they may struggle to fully understand others’ needs (see Jackson & Benson, 2014; Schlichtman & Patch, 2017). Nevertheless, overall, this organizational approach can arguably be viewed as one of largely reflecting but occasionally exacerbating gentrification, albeit often in indirect ways, and with an aim to mitigate some of the negative effects.

Discussion and conclusion

In this article, I have explored the roles of two CEs, and their community assets, in regeneration and gentrification, over time, in their socioeconomically unequal neighborhoods. While the analysis is UK-focused, it speaks to wider debates in the international Anglophone literature (for example, DeFilippis et al., 2010; Shaw & Porter, 2009). It updates this existing body of literature, considering these issues in the post-GFC context, importantly examining the recent impact of austerity. Although recognizing the challenges of identifying the underlying causes of gentrification and measuring its impacts, given the many factors and stakeholders involved (for example, Colomb, 2009; Easton et al., 2020; Firth et al., 2020), the findings emphasize the often-ambiguous relationship between CEs, community assets and processes of regeneration and gentrification, with a variety of roles being played at different times, whether that be mitigating/limiting, reflecting or even exacerbating gentrification, with little evidence of resistance in these cases (see Marche, 2015).

Both case studies highlight the ways in which the extent of gentrification locally can impact on CEs’ abilities to deliver services and affect neighborhood change, with the social, economic and cultural capital typical of gentrifiers often playing a crucial role in the work of community organizations and community-led regeneration more broadly (for example, Bailey, 2012; Colomb, 2009; Spear et al., 2017). This is arguably more prominent in the Bristol case study than Glasgow, again highlighting the challenges that can face community organizations operating in more deprived areas (Spear et al., 2017), with disparities in community capacity to deliver regeneration as the state retreats in the context of austerity (Bailey, 2012; Hastings et al., 2015). On the other hand, in Bristol, the higher level of gentrification arguably somewhat limits the potential for more inclusive community-led regeneration as described earlier (SURF, 2016), although efforts are being made to address this challenge.

Expanding upon Marche’s (2015) analysis, I have argued that the case study CEs, via their community assets, have tended to focus on mitigating and ameliorating some of the challenges arising from neighborhood change more broadly, and gentrification specifically, while seeking to enable and/or contribute to community-led regeneration, rather than resisting gentrification. Nevertheless, they have also reflected gentrification and wider inequalities at times, potentially limiting the scope for community-led regeneration. There were some concerns that BS3 Community was exacerbating gentrification in the Bristol case, albeit perhaps indirectly. In the absence of sufficient state intervention in key areas, such as affordable housing, the findings therefore indicate that it can be very challenging for CEs, via their assets, to influence these structural issues and develop wide-scale, sustainable alternatives to gentrification in their localities, with their activities being largely ameliorative at best, corroborating existing research (for example, Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010; Nathan, 2016; Shaw & Porter, 2009). There are thus numerous constraints facing CEs in terms of scale and capacity, limiting this potential, particularly in the context of austerity (see also DeFilippis et al., 2010; Thibault, 2007). CEs will only ever be one part of community-led regeneration efforts, with a crucial role for housing associations (Bailey & Robertson, 1997) and other actors and organizations too (see Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010). The findings nevertheless provide up-to-date empirical evidence regarding the impact of national policy, including austerity, and other factors, such as the local socioeconomic context, on CEs and their roles in regeneration and gentrification over time.

In response to Lees and Ferreri’s (2016) call for research to better understand how “‘true’ urban regeneration” can be developed by grassroots organizations seeking “neighborhood investment without displacement” (p. 22), the findings thus suggest that structural inequalities, and

particularly the last decade of austerity, currently limit the potential role of CEs, and their community assets, in community-led regeneration, leaving little hope for substantial transformation and exacerbating the risks related to gentrification outlined in this article (DeFilippis et al., 2010; Murtagh, 2019). The findings demonstrate the complexities and challenges created by the transfer of resources, services and assets to communities in different urban contexts who are experiencing varying degrees of gentrification. They raise important questions about how far the CE approach, via community assets, can contribute to community-led regeneration in the current policy and political context; or whether government policy in this regard, combined with agendas around austerity and so-called “welfare reform,” may be fueling further gentrification, with insufficient state intervention in key areas, such as affordable housing and welfare, perpetuating and potentially exacerbating socioeconomic inequalities (see Hastings et al., 2015; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016; Rolfe, 2018).

In terms of potential recommendations for CEs, the findings highlight the need in some cases and at certain times for further efforts to diversify organizations’ boards, for example, in terms of age and ethnicity, while ensuring that board members are based locally, to better understand the needs of different parts of the community (see also Henderson et al., 2018). This may also help limit the dominance of incoming-gentrifiers, who typically have higher levels of social, economic and cultural capital. This may, in turn, facilitate the use of community assets by a broader, yet locally based demographic. Participants also highlighted scope for, and the potential of, further partnership-work between different CEs managing community assets, to increase the scale and scope of their roles locally, including in relation to community-led regeneration.

Yet, in both contexts, it is nevertheless vital to recognize the impact of wider factors, particularly austerity and the transfer of responsibility for the provision of services, such as affordable housing and welfare, from the state to the third sector (see Bailey, 2012, 2017; Hastings et al., 2015; Milbourne & Cushman, 2015). This “responsibilization,” combined with reductions in funding and a subsequent increased “need” for “enterprise,” has arguably further limited the capacities of these CEs to deliver community-led regeneration, resist or offer alternatives to gentrification, fill growing gaps in service provision and remain financially sustainable (Bailey, 2017; Colomb, 2009; DeFilippis et al., 2010; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016). While the extent of state withdrawal and the “responsibilization” of community groups is not as extreme in the UK as it is in the U.S. (Bailey, 2012), this is a key issue to consider here (see DeFilippis et al., 2010). The findings thus further problematize policy narratives which often uncritically promote the benefits of CEs and community management/ownership, corroborating and updating existing research (for example, Moore & McKee, 2014; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016). There is a need for a more realistic and nuanced understanding of the potential of this approach, and greater state intervention to address structural inequalities and redistribute economic and social capital to enable and support community-based efforts to reach their potential, within a wider framework of support for those most in need via the welfare state (see also Bailey, 2017; DeFilippis et al., 2010; Moore & McKee, 2014; O’Brien & Matthews, 2016).

Yet, despite these challenges, as Shaw (2009) emphasized over a decade ago, it is now more important than ever that researchers, policymakers, practitioners and others “continually fight” to develop more equitable policies and approaches for regeneration without gentrification (p. 260). I have therefore argued that those of us concerned with gentrification need to take greater consideration of the potential role of community asset management/ownership as a mechanism for enabling more socially just forms of regeneration to be developed, while the extent of gentrification is limited (see also Colomb, 2009; Shaw, 2009). Although there are many limitations facing, and challenges to, this potential in the capitalist context (DeFilippis et al., 2010), it is vital to better understand these possible alternatives, and the support required to enable them, if we are to continue the search for understandings of how “true” urban regeneration” can take place (Lees & Ferreri, 2016, p. 22). This article has contributed to addressing this gap and extends Lees and Ferreri’s (2016) call for further research in this area.

The findings in this article have therefore contributed to knowledge in three distinct areas. Firstly, they have provided qualitative evidence regarding the actual and potential role of asset-managing/owning community enterprises in processes of regeneration and gentrification respectively over time in socioeconomically unequal neighborhoods. Secondly, the findings contribute to knowledge about the role of the community assets managed/owned by CEs in regeneration and gentrification, and specifically the extent to which they can limit/mitigate, reflect or even exacerbate processes of gentrification, building on a limited body of work in this area (see also Colomb, 2009; Ernst & Doucet, 2014) and extending Marche's existing (Marche, 2015) analysis regarding community gardens and gentrification in San Francisco. Finally, the findings contribute to international debates concerning the interrelations between, and nuances of, regeneration and gentrification, extending the work of scholars including Atkinson (2008), Shaw (2005), and Shaw and Porter (2009). The findings thus demonstrate how physical community assets can be a useful lens to explore the complex interrelations between regeneration, gentrification and community enterprise (see also Ernst & Doucet, 2014).

Notes

1. The rent gap is defined as "the disparity between the potential ground rent level and the actual ground rent capitalized under the present land use" (Smith, 1979, p. 545).
2. Please note, while I used some quantitative data (statistics) to describe neighborhood change in the case study areas, the study was not a quantitative, impact assessment aiming to trace causality. Thus, I did not aim to quantitatively measure displacement or gentrification or the role of the organizations and their assets within these processes. This would also be extremely challenging to do, given the wide range of factors and stakeholders involved in processes of neighborhood change, with existing studies having highlighted these difficulties (for example, Easton et al., 2020; Firth et al., 2020; Lees et al., 2008).
3. Please note, Marche (2015, p. 9) identified that these community gardens interacted with gentrification in the following ways: "enhancing," "facilitating," "accompanying" and "resisting." I build on this analysis but use slightly different terminology, reflecting the role of the case study organizations and community assets in their neighborhoods.
4. While this article focuses on CDTs, the term *community enterprise* is used for clarity, as organizations identify with different models over time.
5. Please see <https://centralhall.org/>.
6. Please see <https://bs3community.org.uk/>.
7. There are 1,235 intermediate zones (IZs) in Scotland, containing an average of 4,000 residents. These larger geographies "nest into local authorities," but "do not necessarily delineate communities on the ground" (Scottish Executive, 2005).
8. Please see <https://tobaccofactory.com/>.
9. In the UK, modern-day grammar schools were introduced in Education Act 1944 as selective "state secondary schools" which pupils could attend if they passed an exam aged 11. Those who did not pass this exam attended secondary modern schools, thus creating a two-tier system. This began to be phased out from the mid-1960s due to criticisms that it "reinforced class division and middle-class privilege" (Richardson, 2016).

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Claire Colomb, Dr. Andrew Burns, Dr. Jane Cullingworth and Professor Mike Raco for very helpful comments on earlier drafts. Thanks to Professor Annette Hastings and Dr. Ross Beveridge for their guidance as supervisors for the PhD research on which this article is based. Thanks are also due to Dr. Bernadette Hanlon for her editorial support and the three anonymous reviewers. Finally, I would like to thank all my participants, and the case study organizations in particular, for their time and insights. Any shortcomings remain my own.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This article is based on research completed for my doctoral research, funded by an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) 1+3 grant 2016-2020 [reference ES/J500136/1]. The writing time was made possible by a postdoctoral fellowship at the Bartlett School of Planning, University College London.

About the author

Alice Earley is a research associate at the UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence at the University of Glasgow. Prior to this, she was a BSP research fellow at the Bartlett School of Planning, University College London. She completed her PhD entitled “Community enterprises, community assets and processes of urban regeneration and gentrification” at the Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow in 2020. Her research interests include urban regeneration; gentrification; social, spatial and housing inequalities; social and community enterprise; community asset ownership/management; and urban governance.

ORCID

Alice Earley  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8088-750X>

References

- Aiken, M., Taylor, M., & Moran, R. (2011). *Community organisations controlling assets: A better understanding*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/41246/download?token=sbjQ5ZhV&filetype=full-report>
- Alkon, A., & Cadji, J. (2018). Sowing seeds of displacement: Gentrification and food justice in Oakland, CA. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 44(1), 105–123.
- Amin, A., Cameron, A., & Hudson, R. (2002). *Placing the social economy*. Routledge.
- Angelovski, I., & Connolly, J. (Eds.). (2021). *The green city and social injustice*. Routledge.
- Archer, T., Batty, E., Harris, C., Parks, S., Wilson, I., Aiken, M., Buckley, E., Moran, R., & Terry, V. (2019). *Our assets, our future: The economics, outcomes and sustainability of assets in community ownership*. Power to Change. <https://www.powertochange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Assets-Report-DIGITAL-1.pdf>
- Atkinson, R. (2002). *Does gentrification help or harm urban neighbourhoods? An assessment of the evidence-base in the context of the new urban agenda* (ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research Paper 5).
- Atkinson, R. (2008). Commentary: Gentrification, segregation and the vocabulary of affluent residential choice. *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2626–2636. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008097110>
- Bailey, N. (2012). The role, organisation and contribution of community enterprise to urban regeneration policy in the UK. *Progress in Planning*, 77(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001>
- Bailey, N. (2017). The contribution of community enterprise to British urban regeneration in a period of state retrenchment. In M. van Ham, R. Kleinhan, D. Reuschke, S. Syrett, & C. Mason (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an understanding of the economies of neighbourhoods and communities* (pp. 229–248). Edward Elgar.
- Bailey, N., & Robertson, D. (1997). Housing renewal, urban policy and gentrification. *Urban Studies*, 34(4), 561–578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098975925>
- Barker, B. (2014). *Southville Centre: A long-term community asset*. Academy of Urbanism. Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <https://www.academyofurbanism.org.uk/southville-centre-a-long-term-community-asset/>
- Benson, M. (2014). Trajectories of middle-class belonging: The dynamics of place attachment and classed identities. *Urban Studies*, 51(4), 3097–3112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013516522>
- Berg, J., Kaminer, T., Schoonderbeek, M., & Zonneveld, J. (2009). Introduction. In J. Berg, T. Kaminer, M. Schoonderbeek, & J. Zonneveld (Eds.), *Houses in transformation: Interventions in European gentrification* (pp. 6–13). Nai.
- Bernstein, A. G., & Isaac, C. A. (2021). Gentrification: The role of dialogue in community engagement and social cohesion. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 45(4), 753–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2021.1877550>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Boyden, P. (2013). *Culture, creativity and regeneration in Bristol: Three stories*. Peter Boyden Consultants. https://www.watershed.co.uk/sites/default/files/publications/2013-09-10/CCRB%20June2013.pdf?utm_source=&utm_medium=&utm_campaign=
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- BS3 Community Development. (2018). *Report and Audited Financial Statements 31 March 2018*.
- Butler, T., & Robson, G. (2001). Social capital, gentrification and neighbourhood change in London: A comparison of three South London neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2145–2162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120087090>
- CCH. (2019). *Aspiring communities: End of grant report*. Community Central Hall.
- CCH. (2021). Community Central Hall. Retrieved December 5, 2021, from <https://centralhall.org/>
- Choi, M., Van Zandt, S., & Matarrita-Cascante, D. (2018). Can community land trusts slow gentrification? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(3), 394–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1362318>
- Collins, B. (2020). Whose culture, whose neighborhood? Fostering and resisting neighborhood change in the multi-ethnic enclave. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 40(3), 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X18755496>
- Colomb, C. (2009). Gentrification and community empowerment in East London. In L. Porter & K. Shaw (2009a) (Eds.), *Whose urban renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies* (pp. 157–166). Routledge. (2009a).
- Community Central Hall (CCH). (2003). *Annual report*.
- Crang, M. (2005). Analysing qualitative materials. In R. Flowerdew & D. Martin (Eds.), *Methods in human geography: A guide for students doing a research project* (pp. 218–232). Pearson.
- DCLG. (2019). *Indices of deprivation 2015 and 2019*. Retrieved February 10, 2020, from http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/ioid_index.html
- DeFilippis, J. (1999). Alternatives to the ‘New Urban Politics’: Finding locality and autonomy in local economic development. *Political Geography*, 18(8), 973–990. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(99\)00031-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(99)00031-1)
- DeFilippis, J. (2004). *Unmaking Goliath: Community control in the face of global capital*. Routledge.
- DeFilippis, J., Fisher, R., & Shragge, E. (2010). *Contesting community: The limits and potential of community organizing*. Rutgers University Press.
- DeFilippis, J., Stromberg, B., & Williams, O. R. (2018). W(h)ither the community in community land trusts? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(6), 755–769. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1361302>
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2013). Part 1: Strategies of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 43–60). Sage.
- DTAS. (2012). *Community ownership in Scotland: A baseline study*.
- DTAS. (2021). *About DTAS | Development trusts association Scotland*. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from <https://dtascot.org.uk/about-dtas/about-dtas>
- Earley, A. (2020). *Community enterprises, community assets and processes of urban regeneration and gentrification* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow]. University of Glasgow. Enlighten theses. <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/81722/7/2020EarleyPhDed.pdf>
- Easton, S., Lees, L., Hubbard, P., & Tate, N. (2020). Measuring and mapping displacement: The problem of quantification in the battle against gentrification. *Urban Studies*, 57(2), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019851953>
- Ernst, O., & Doucet, B. (2014). A window on the (changing) neighbourhood: The role of pubs in the contested spaces of gentrification. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 105(2), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12071>
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The just city*. Cornell University Press.
- Fields, D. (2015). Contesting the financialization of urban space: Community organizations and the struggle to preserve affordable rental housing in New York City. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 37(2), 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12098>
- Firth, C. L., Fuller, D., Wasfi, R., Kestens, Y., & Winters, M. (2020). Causally speaking: Challenges in measuring gentrification for population health research in the United States and Canada. *Health & Place*, 63, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102350>
- General Register Office for Scotland. (2001). *2001 census data*. Retrieved February 20, 2017, from <https://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/>
- Gray, N. (2015). *Neoliberal urbanism and spatial composition in recessionary Glasgow* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow]. University of Glasgow. Enlighten theses. <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/6833/1/2015GrayPhD.pdf>
- Hackworth, J. (2002). Post-recession gentrification in New York City. *Urban Affairs Review*, 37(6), 815–843. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107874037006003>
- Hamilton, T., & Curran, W. S. (2013). From “five angry women” to “kick-ass community”: Gentrification and environmental activism in Brooklyn and beyond. *Urban Studies*, 50(8), 1557–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012465128>
- Hastings, A., Bailey, N., Bramley, G., Gannon, M., & Watkins, D. (2015). *The cost of the cuts: The impact on local government and poorer communities*. JRF. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/46465/download?token=wlu0Rj4I&filetype=full-report>
- Hastings, A., & Matthews, P. (2015). Bourdieu and the big society: Empowering the powerful in public service provision? *Policy & Politics*, 43(4), 545–560. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557314X14080105693951>
- Heil, M. (2018). Community development corporations in the right-sizing city: Remaking the CDC model of urban redevelopment. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(8), 1132–1145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1443012>

- Henderson, J., Revell, P., & Escobar, O. (2018). *Transforming communities? Exploring the roles of community anchor organisations in public service reform, local democracy, community resilience and social change*. What Works Scotland. <https://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/WWEExploringTheRolesOfCommunityAnchorOrganisationsInPublicServiceReform.pdf>
- Holifield, R., & Williams, K. C. (2014). Urban parks, environmental justice, and voluntarism: The distribution of Friends of the Parks groups in Milwaukee County. *Environmental Justice*, 7(3), 70–76. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2013.0043>
- Holmes, A. (2020). Researcher positionality—A consideration of its influence and place in qualitative research—A new researcher guide. *International Journal of Education*, 8(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i4.3232>
- Huggins, R., & Williams, N. (2009). Enterprise and public policy: A review of Labour government intervention in the United Kingdom. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 27(1), 19–41. <https://doi.org/10.1068/c0762b>
- Hutton, G. (2005). *Bygone Maryhill*. Stenlake Publishing.
- Hymowitz, K. S. (2013). Bed-Stuy's (Unfinished) revival. *City Journal*, 44–53. <https://www.city-journal.org/article/bed-stuys-unfinished-revival>
- Jackson, E., & Benson, M. (2014). Neither 'deepest, darkest peckham' nor 'run-of-the-mill' East Dulwich: The middle classes and their 'others' in an inner-London neighbourhood. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1195–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12129>
- Johnstone, H., & Lionais, D. (2004). Depleted communities and community business entrepreneurship: Revaluing space through place. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 16(3), 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0898562042000197117>
- Kleinhans, R. (2017). False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: The case of Dutch community enterprises. *Public Management Review*, 19(10), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941>
- Kleinhans, R., & van Ham, M. (2016). *The support paradox in community enterprise experiments in the Netherlands* (IZA DP No. 9625). IZA Institute of Labor Economics.
- Larner, W. (2014). The limits of post-politics: Rethinking radical social enterprise. In J. Wilson & E. Swyngedouw (Eds.), *The post-political and its discontents* (pp. 189–207). Edinburgh University Press.
- Latham, A., & Layton, J. (2019). Social infrastructure and the public life of cities: Studying urban sociality and public spaces. *Geography Compass*, 13(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12444>
- Leccis, F. (2019). Regeneration programmes: Enforcing the right to housing or fostering gentrification? The example of Bankside in London. *Land Use Policy*, 89, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104217>
- Lees, L. (2003). Super-gentrification: The case of Brooklyn heights, New York City. *Urban Studies*, 40(12), 2487–2509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098032000136174>
- Lees, L. (2014a). The Urban injustices of new labour's 'new urban renewal': The case of the Aylesbury Estate in London. *Antipode*, 46(4), 921–947. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12020>
- Lees, L. (2014b). *Staying put: An anti-gentrification handbook for council estates in London*. Calverts Co-operative. Retrieved October 10, 2015, from <http://justspace.org.uk/2014/06/19/staying-put-an-anti-gentrification-handbook-for-council-estates-in-london/>
- Lees, L., & Ferreri, M. (2016). Resisting gentrification on its final frontiers: Learning from the Heygate Estate in London (1974–2013). *Cities*, 57, 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2015.12.005>
- Lees, L., Slater, T., & Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. Routledge.
- Lees, L., Slater, T., & Wyly, E. (2010). *The gentrification reader*. Routledge.
- Levine, M. A. (2004). Government policy, the local state, and gentrification: The case of Prenzlauer Berg (Berlin), Germany. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(1), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.007.x>
- Maantay, J., & Maroko, A. (2018). Brownfields to greenfields: Environmental justice versus environmental gentrification. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(10), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15102233>
- Marche, G. (2015). What can urban gardening really do about gentrification? A case study of three San Francisco Community Gardens. *European Journal of American Studies*, 10(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.11316>
- Marcuse, P. (1986). Abandonment, gentrification, and displacement: The linkages in New York City. In N. Smith & P. Williams (Eds.), *Gentrification of the city* (pp. 121–152). Allen and Unwin.
- Martinez, M. J. (2010). *Power at the roots: Gentrification, community gardens and the Puerto Ricans of the lower east side*. Lexington Books.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Milbourne, L., & Cushman, M. (2015). Complying, transforming or resisting in the new austerity? Realigning social welfare and independent action among english voluntary organisations. *Journal of Social Policy*, 44(3), 463–485. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279414000853>
- Moore, T., & McKee, K. (2014). The ownership of assets by place-based community organisations: Political rationales, geographies of social impact and future research Agendas. *Social Policy & Society*, 13(4), 521–533. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000481>
- Murtagh, B. (2019). *Social economics and the solidarity city*. Routledge.
- Nathan, M. (2016). Microsolutions for Megaproblems: What works in urban regeneration policy? In D. O'Brien & P. Matthews (Eds.), *After urban regeneration: Communities, policy and place* (pp. 61–78). Policy Press.

- National Records of Scotland. (2011). *2011 census data*. Retrieved February 20, 2017, from <https://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/>
- O'Brien, D., & Matthews, P. (2016). Conclusion. In D. O'Brien & P. Matthews (Eds.), *After urban regeneration: Communities, policy and place* (pp. 199–204). Policy Press.
- ONS. (1981). *1981 census*. Retrieved November 29, 2018, from https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/sources/census_1981
- ONS. (1991). *1991 census*. Retrieved November 29, 2018, from https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/sources/census_1991
- ONS. (2001). *2001 census statistics—NOMIS*. Retrieved November 29, 2018, from <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/home/census2001.asp>
- ONS. (2011). *2011 census data—NOMIS*. Retrieved November 29, 2018, from <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011>
- ONS. (2022a). *Local authority data source: Median house prices for administrative geographies: HPSSA dataset 9*. Retrieved December 06, 2022, from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/medianhousepriceforationalandsubnationalgeographiesquarterlyrollingyearhpssadataset09>
- ONS. (2022b). *Ward data source: Median house prices by ward: HPSSA dataset 37*. Retrieved December 6, 2022, from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/medianpricepaidbywardhpssadataset37>
- Paton, K. (2014). *Gentrification: A working class perspective*. Ashgate.
- Pearce, J. (2003). *Social enterprise in anytown*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Polkinghorne, D. (2007). Validity issues in narrative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(4), 471–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406297670>
- Porter, L., & Shaw, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Whose urban renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies*. Routledge.
- Richardson, H. (2016, September 8). *Grammar schools: What are they and why are they controversial?* BBC News. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-34538222>
- Rigolon, A., & Németh, J. (2019). Toward a socioecological model of gentrification: How people, place, and policy shape neighborhood change. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41(7), 887–909. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1562846>
- Roberts, P. (2000). The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration. In P. Roberts & H. Sykes (Eds.), *Urban regeneration: A handbook* (pp. 9–36). Sage.
- Robertson, J., Pateman, R., Dunlop, K., Darling, J., & Timar, M. (1986). *Maryhill Road: From a needle to an anchor*. CCH.
- Rolfe, S. (2016). Divergence in community participation policy: Analysing localism and community empowerment using a theory of change approach. *Local Government Studies*, 42(1), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2015.1081848>
- Rolfe, S. (2018). Governance and governmentality in community participation: The shifting sands of power, responsibility and risk. *Social Policy & Society*, 17(4), 579–598. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746417000410>
- Roy, M., McHugh, N., Huckfield, L., Kay, A., & Donaldson, C. (2015). 'The most supportive environment in the world?' Tracing the development of an institutional 'ecosystem' for social enterprise. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(3), 777–800. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-014-9459-9>
- Savage, M. (2010). The politics of elective belonging. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 27(2), 115–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036090903434975>
- Schlichtman, J., & Patch, J. (2017). *Gentrifier*. University of Toronto Press.
- Scotland's Regeneration Network. (2016). *SURF's 2016 manifesto for community regeneration*. Retrieved March 3, 2016, from <http://www.scotregen.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/SURF-2016-Manifesto-Final-Draft.pdf>
- Scottish Executive. (2005). *Scottish neighbourhood statistics: Intermediate geography background information*. Retrieved July 13, 2016, from <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2005/02/20732/53083>
- Scottish Government. (2020). *SIMD*. Retrieved May 30, 2020, from <http://simd.scot/2016/#/simd2016/BTTTFTT9/-4.0000/55.9000/>
- Scottish Government. (n.d.). *Community empowerment*. Retrieved February 9, 2020, from <https://www.gov.scot/policies/community-empowerment/>
- Scottish Statistics. (n.d.). *House prices*. Retrieved March 23, 2019, from <https://statistics.gov.scot/resource?uri=http%3A%2F%2Fstatistics.gov.scot%2Fdata%2Fhouse-sales-prices>
- Shaw, K. (2005). Local limits to gentrification: Implications for new urban policy. In R. Atkinson & G. Bridge (Eds.), *Gentrification in a global context: The new urban colonialism* (pp. 168–184). Routledge.
- Shaw, K. (2008a). Commentary: Is there hope for policy? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2637–2642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008097131>
- Shaw, K. (2008b). Gentrification: What it is, why it is, and what can be done about it. *Geography Compass*, 2(5), 1697–1728. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00156.x>
- Shaw, K. (2009). Rising to a challenge. In L. Porter & K. Shaw (Eds.), *Whose urban renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies* (pp. 253–260). Routledge.
- Shaw, K., & Porter, L. (2009). Introduction. In L. Porter & K. Shaw (Eds.), *Whose urban renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies* (pp. 1–8). Routledge.
- Shoreditch Trust. (n.d.). *Our spaces*. Retrieved June 10, 2020, from <https://www.shoreditchtrust.org.uk/our-spaces/>
- Slater, T. (2006). The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(4), 737–757. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2006.00689.x>

- Smith, N. (1979). Toward a theory of gentrification: A back to the city movement, by capital not people. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45(4), 538–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944367908977002>
- Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 1–23). Sage.
- Somerville, P. (2016). *Understanding community: Politics, policy and practice* (2nd ed.). Policy Press.
- Somerville, P., & McElwee, G. (2011). Situating community enterprise: A theoretical exploration. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5–6), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2011.580161>
- Spear, R., Teasdale, S., Lyon, F., Hazenberg, R., Aiken, M., Bull, M., & Kopec, A. (2017). *Social enterprise in the United Kingdom: Models and trajectories*. The International Comparative Social Enterprise Models Project.
- Thibault, R. (2007). Between survival and revolution: Another community development system is possible. *Antipode*, 39(5), 874–895. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00556.x>
- Thompson, P., & Williams, P. (2014). Taking your eyes off the objective: The relationship between income sources and satisfaction with achieving objectives in the UK Third Sector. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(1), 109–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9326-5>
- Tuckett, I. (1988). Coin street: There is another way. *Community Development Journal*, 23(4), 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/23.4.249>
- Van Criekingen, M., & Decroly, J. M. (2003). Revisiting the diversity of gentrification: Neighbourhood renewal processes in Brussels and Montreal. *Urban Studies*, 40(12), 2451–2468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098032000136156>
- Varady, D., Kleinhans, R., & van Ham, M. (2015a). *Entrepreneurship in deprived neighborhoods: Comparing UK community enterprises with U.S. community development corporations* (IZA Discussion Paper No. 8777). IZA Institute of Labor Economics.
- Varady, D., Kleinhans, R., & van Ham, M. (2015b). The potential of community entrepreneurship for neighborhood revitalization in the United Kingdom and the United States. In C. Mason, D. Reuschke, S. Syrett, & M. van Ham (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship in cities: Neighbourhoods, households and homes* (pp. 203–228). Edward Edgar.
- Vickers, I., Westall, A., Spear, R., Brennan, G., & Syrett, S. (2017). *Cities, the social economy and inclusive growth: A practice review*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/50288/download?token=-ybik_3U&filetype=full-report
- Walks, A., & August, M. (2008). The factors inhibiting gentrification in areas with little non-market housing: Policy lessons from the Toronto experience. *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2594–2625. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008097102>
- Wyler, S. (2009). *A history of community asset ownership*. DTA.