Gated Communities as a Way of Lifestyle

Bülent ÜNAL
Atılım University, Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Department of Industrial Design
bulent.unal@atilim.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
Gated communities represent an urban phenomenon that is spreading all over the world. In 1985 gated communities existed in only a handful of places. However, today they can be found in every major metropolitan area. Thus, gated communities have been studied and defined in a number of ways. These definitions congregate around a housing that restricts public access by the use of gates, walls and fences (Atkinson and Blandy, 2006). Gated communities are response to the fear of crime. In addition, the desire for privacy and prestigious lifestyle are significant aspects of motivation to live behind gates. This study aims to highlights that the needs to live behind the walls and the way gated communities affects the community and citizenship almost the same in each geography by firstly reminds the theoretical background of gated communities and secondly by presenting researches conducted in various geographies.

Keywords: Gated communities, urban violence, fear of crime, urban social segregation, lifestyle communities, prestige communities

1. INTRODUCTION
Gated communities, one of the most dramatic forms of residential boundaries have been come insight since the early 1980s (Blakely and Snyder, 1998). Millions of people have chosen to live in walled and fenced communal residential space for different reasons such as an increasing fear of crime. In 1985 gated communities (hereafter GCs) existed in only a handful of places. However, today they can be found in every major metropolitan area. Due to these developments, the phenomenon of GCs has been studied by researchers a lot. Most of the studies often highlighted the way GCs influence the whole community and citizenship and also the reasons for the segregation need. The current study first reminds the phenomenon of GCs by briefly revealing the development process of GCs, definitions made by different researchers, typologies and reasons behind the formation of GCs. Secondly, this study reveals the findings of the studies conducted in different cities and countries from different geographies. The main purpose of this study is to reveal how the information given in the first and second chapters overlap and to highlight if the need for GCs remains in the field of the same reasons, even in different geographies.

2. GATED COMMUNITIES
GCs represent an urban phenomenon that is spreading all over the world. It has a potential to radically transform the urban environment in the 21st century. The early settlements were walled and defended to protect from attack. Ancient walled towns were designed to protect life and property by keeping the barbarians out. Medieval burgs were not towns, but they were designed with protection in mind (Helsley and Strange, 1999). In the late 20th century, an ancient urban form began to appear again in modern settlements. The enclave developments have become an increasingly identic property of contemporary suburban building patterns. It is mostly extensive in the United States, however GCs are appearing in many countries including Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Brazil, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Portugal, South Africa, Venezuela, Canada (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004), Malaysia, Spain (Landman and Schönteich, 2002) and England (Gooblar, 2002). Although there is no common agreement on a definition or meaning of

GCs, the definitions are not diverse. Some of the considerable and distinctive definitions on GCs are:

"residential areas, with restricted access through some physical barrier such as a fence, wall, security guardhouse, or electronic gate" (Wilson-Doenges, 2000, p.597).

"enclosed neighborhoods that have controlled access through gates or booms a cross existing roads, and security villages and complexes, including lifestyle communities which provide their enclosed residents with a range of non-residential amenities such as schools, offices, shops and golf courses" (Landman and Schönteich, 2002, p.1).

"housing development on private roads closed to general traffic by a gate across the primary access. The developments may be surrounded by fences, walls, or other natural barriers that further limit public access" (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004, p.913).

"closed urban residential areas where public space has been legally privatized. It includes private property, individual houses and collectively used common private property such as clubhouses, and have security devices such as walls, fences, gates, barriers, alarms, guards and cameras" (Roitman, 2005, p.304).

"projects that have an obvious boundary, restricted access by non-residents. The development is usually managed by the residents and there are legal constraints on residents' behavior and use of their properties" (Blandy and Lister, 2005, p.287).

Extending all these definitions, the features of GCs are: firstly, they are residential estates; secondly, they are clearly separated from the surrounded community by a barrier to human movement; and thirdly, they are private entities with private streets, parks and facilities (Burke, 2001). Beside these three features, Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) defined the specific features of GCs that also help to differentiate kinds of gating. For the case studies on GCs that tries to provide a useful gated project, these characteristics should be investigated. These are:

• Functions of enclosure; physical, economic, social and symbolic functions of enclosure,
• Security features and barriers; boundaries, walls, gates, natural features such as water, ravines, forest etc.,
• Amenities and facilities; includes retirement, golf and leisure, and suburban new town gated communities that shared meeting spaces and recreational facilities,
• Type of residents; move into walls by choice or by segregation,
• Tenure; the target of the gated projects are owner-occupiers / owner-residents,
• Location; the site of the gated communities,
• Size; few houses with a few common amenities or dozens of homes with many amenities and facilities,
• Policy context; affects how and under what conditions, communities can close themselves off from others.

The most frequently discussed typology of the phenomenon provided by Blakely and Snyder (1997) (cited in Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004) and then some other studies improve the typology (Burke, 2001). They generally identified three types of gated community: lifestyle, prestige, and security zone communities (see Table 1).

Table 1. Blakely and Snyder's (1997) general typology GCs (p.915).

Type	Features	Subtypes	Characteristics
Lifestyle	These projects emphasize common amenities and cater to a leisure class with shared interests; may reflect small-town nostalgia; may be urban villages' luxury villages, or resort villages.	Retirement Golf and leisure Suburban new town	Age-related complexes with suite of amenities and activities Shared access to amenities for an active lifestyle Master-planned projects with suite of amenities and facilities; often in the Sunbelt
Prestige	These projects reflect desire for image, privacy, and control; they focus on exclusivity over community; few shared facilities and amenities.	Enclaves of rich and famous Top-fifth Developments Executive middle class	Secured and guarded privacy to restrict access for celebrities and very wealthy; attractive locations Secured access for the nouveau riche; often have guards Restricted access; usually without guards
Security Zone	These projects reflect fear; involve retrofitting fences and gates on public streets; controlling access	City perch Suburban perch Barricade perch	Restricted public access in inner city area to limit crime or traffic Restricted public access in inner city area to limit crime or traffic Closed access to some streets to limit through traffic

Lifestyle communities generally related on the leisure activities with recreational facilities, common amenities, and shared services at their core. Retirement villages, golf communities, or suburban new towns may be included in lifestyle enclave. The main purpose is to attract residents searching for identity, security, and a shared lifestyle with their neighbors (Blakely and Snyder, 1997).

Prestige communities serve as symbols of wealth and status for image-conscious residents. These projects featured attractive settings; however they did not often include common amenities or facilities (Blakely and Snyder, 1997).

Security zone communities are close off public streets to nonresidents. These projects reflect a fear of outsiders who disrupt neighborhoods. Walls and gates, which are not seen as an amenity but rather a necessity, are erected to deter crime, limit traffic, or maintain property values (Blakely and Snyder, 1997).

The main reasons for moving to GCs are urban violence, fear of crime and rise of insecurity. This is strongly related to the rise on the crime rates (Wilson-Doenges, 2000; Hook and Vrdoljak, 2002). GCs are in part a response to the fear of crime, real or imagined (Helsley and Strange, 1999; Manzi and Smith-Bowers, 2005). Walls promise to protect inhabitants from crime and chaos, and it works in different ways in different countries. For instance, fear of terrorism forces expatriate workers into compounds in Saudi Arabian cities; fear of crime leads the tenants of public housing to accept enclosure of their communities; fear of rising violence encourages white South Africans to fence their suburbs and hire armed guards to patrol the streets (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004); fear of robberies in New York; fear of kidnapping and illegal Mexican workers in San Antonio encourages people to live behind gates (Low, 2003).

GCs are designed with the intention of providing security to their residents and prevent penetration by non residents. With all the preventions, these projects appeared as homogenous places when compared to the heterogeneity of the open city. Most of their residents are upper- and middle-class families. Laws and regulations, also the price of the land and houses, support this homogeneity that is seen as a visible evidence for secure area (Roitman, 2005). The notion of security is multi-faceted; defensible space not only implies physical security, but also shot through with inferences of social and financial security (Rofe, 2006).

Features that provide security, privacy, and control are central on many gated community. Projects have 24-hour-a-day roving armed guards and video (closed-circuit television) surveillance. In addition, homes have private alarms tied into central security services. All these features and boundaries serves for several functions: they create visual screening, permit privacy, define property, and limit access. Some of them are physical, whereas others may be psychological or symbolic. For instance, natural features such as water, ravines, and forests may function as boundaries to enclaves. However, these do not prevent access for nonresidents. Also, it may be same for the physical features; there is no quarantine that GCs will repel more thieves than they attract. The doors and garages are likely to be unlocked and houses are likely to have valuable objects inside, so once the main wall has been passed; there may not be difficult obstacles to overcome (Roitman, 2005). Therefore, GCs may offer a false sense of security; it may be more illusion than reality (Wilson-Doenges, 2000; Low, 2003). This criticism should be considered in the studies as one of the main functions of GCs providing a security and safety for residents.

The boom in GCs has important social consequences: it changes the distribution of the social groups in the urban space and creates new forms of contacts and relationships between them (Thuillier, 2005). The central problem of the societies is the division among people. That division is increasingly reflected by walls dividing them. Therefore, GCs contribute to the segregationist tendencies that influence social life and social relations (Landman, 2000a; Gooblar, 2002; Landman and Schönteich, 2002; Low, 2003; Le Goix, 2005). In this context the question of "who segregates whom" may appear as the segregationist process has two sides and that both groups of people feel segregated and discriminated against.

GCs creates a barrier to interaction among people of different races, cultures, and classes and add the difficulty of building social networks (Landman, 2000b). In addition, the separation is mostly based on income level and residents' desires but mostly they respond to middle and upper-class individuals desires. The affluent generally move to GCs in search for privacy and exclusivity, in flight from fear and also for showing their status (Sanchez and Lang, 2003). They closed themselves off from the dangers outside. In contrast, the poorest of the poor may find themselves enclosed in gated public housing projects, constrained by their circumstances to be set apart from the fabric of

the city. The difference between social groups is highlighted by the use of physical barriers like fences, walls as well as other security devices such as guards and dogs.

The process of urban social segregation in the case of GCs might be characterized as a positive or negative phenomenon, or whether it has advantage and disadvantages that need to be investigate in details in the studies on GC. Since "it allows their residents to reinforce social homogeneity and sense of community and protect themselves from what they perceive as the danger and violence of the 'open city' " it can be characterize as a positive phenomenon (Roitman, 2005, p.307). On the other hand, the negative impacts of segregation are more dangerous and evident in term of society as a whole. Social segregation might lead to feelings of exclusion, being rootless and worsen problems of social disintegration (p.307). In addition, it has effects on employment. Because, there are fewer possibilities to get information about job opportunities; it reduced opportunities and cause separation and isolation, not just from other members of society, but often from jobs, public services and good schools.

The relations of the GC residents with the wider neighborhoods seem to be adversely affected by the physical from of the GC developments. By the situation, a danger of a "them and us" in other words the creation of "others" developed both amongst residents of the GCs and of the surrounding neighborhoods (Blandy and Lister, 2005). The "others" are the people in the outside and the neighbors in surrounding areas. They are perceived by the residents of the GCs as strangers and as potential aggressors. This situation has an impact on children and their relationship to other people and environments (Low, 2003). With the walls and gates, and the new created sense of security and safety, children gain a sense of fear to the "others". They started to see people outside the communities as danger. But, what about the impact of this feelings on children's psychological health? There is a need for an active debate on this situation.

In addition to the effect of GCs on different ages, gender is another important factor that should be discussed in respect to gated community. In some cultures, walls by providing visual separation shelter certain members of society such as women from curious gaze of strangers. On the other hand, the day residents are primarily women who may not work professionally. They are wasting most of their times in the homes. Men are going to outside the community by day to work. Therefore, GC may create a new pattern of gendering in these spaces (Low, 2003).

Especially in the last decade, the planners and also the planning literature has reflected growing interest in the topic of GCs. Developers and planners observe gated projects as an important niche in marketing strategy in a competitive environment because; the enclaves can attract consumers searching for a sense of community, identity, and security. By providing variety of amenities such as pools, tennis courts, a community center, playground areas, exercise areas etc., and keeping out undesirables, gating may increase property values. The developers provide an environment for building the gates to attract affluent buyers and improve sales, and buyers accept the utility of the gates as a long term investment (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004; Grant, 2005). Therefore, it is also one of the key functions of gating for prestige developments as it protects property values. By all these, GCs may increase housing costs. The factors most commonly used to market GCs are; security and gates, friendliness and the ease of making new friends, social interactions, homogeneity, lifestyle (active lifestyle, the good life, peaceful/relaxed/slow paced, maintenance free), privacy and exclusivity (Maxwell, 2004). These properties can be formed and used as a checklist in the further studies to discover whether they are real or just illusion.

Not only for market planners but also for the town planners gated communities may creates some difficulties. These are huge master-planned projects that include various central and semi-public spaces and amenities, surrounded by various residential gated

neighborhoods, each one aimed at a specific social and economic profile (Thuillier, 2005). In the creation of the gated communities, with all the spaces that may include, town planners face various difficulties. Because, such developments requires huge areas of land that is difficult to control and design in unison with the rest of the environment and city.

3. A GLANCE OF GATED COMMUNITY FORMATIONS IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIES
In the previous section, the definition, historical development process, typologies and reasons behind the formation of GCs are presented with the view of different researchers. In this section, the issues of how gated communities are formed in different geographies, reasons of their need in respect to the specific city or country conditions and how the people living in that city or country perceive these communities are presented in line with the examples from various geographies and brief summaries of these studies are given. Countries and cities kept in the scope of the study are Turkey, Southeast Asia, India, Latin America, Egypt, China, Canada, South Africa and Russia.

Turkey (Ankara, İstanbul)
The case study conducted in Ankara Beysukent (Güzey, 2014) investigated how the state's neo-liberal perspective and actions, local governments, real estate market decision makers, media and consumers affected the formation of GCs. In 1990, by the approval of the zoning plan of the Beysukent district by the municipality as a Housing Estate, the residual demands of the middle and upper classes pave the way for the development of GCs in this district. Angora Houses, the first GC of Ankara, was located beside the Beytepe Forest, 15 km distance away from the city center and has been built on 1.400.000 m2 of land in 1996. It comprises several common facilities, as well as villas, row houses and blocks. The area is surrounded by walls and fences and the entrance is controlled by a private security company. Angora Houses caused a rapid increase in land prices in Beysukent district. Thus, the establishment of two more GCs- Green Park Residences and Ergönül Villas - in the 2000s was inevitable.

Geniş (2007) investigated the neoliberal perspective of the state and its applications with the urban form examined in Kemer Country, which is located in Istanbul. In this study, the development of GCs in Istanbul has been positioned in the political economic context of neo-liberal globalization and analyzed the role of the state, developers and transnational actors in the transformation of this global city form to the local context.

Southeast Asia (Jakarta Indonesia)
According to the findings of a research conducted in Jakarta Indonesia (Leisch, 2002), four main topics determine the development of GCs:

First, rapid economic development has led to the development of a new middle and upper middle class. However, as wealth was not spread evenly, more socioeconomic polarization was experienced, and this leads an increasing difference in income distribution and jealousy within society and an increasing need for security.

Second, belonging to the middle, upper, or even higher class leads to symbolic interactions. People are doing what they are supposed to do. Prestige is particularly important in such strong hierarchical societies. Thus, consumer behavior is sometimes a matter of symbolism rather than practicality. Big houses, two cars in front of the house and an impressive door at the entrance of the GCs are major prestige factors.

Third, a new lifestyle has been established in Southeast Asian countries, including globalized education through globalization. Real estate plans are more or less copies of the American lifestyle. People, like Americans, prefer to live in a modern, air-conditioned world, but most of the time this is just an "outdoor lifestyle". The families still live in the

houses according to the traditions of the generations; they usually do not use the air conditioner due to costs.

Finally, the development of GCs has been a major field of a business in many Southeast Asian countries. The land can be bought very cheaply and sold at a much higher price. Investments in the housing industry seem to be safe in countries with very unstable currencies.

The aforementioned topics and issues are appears to belong to the consumer, but are also produced by suppliers. Partly the desire for better security, more prestigious or a new lifestyle is created by these suppliers and this strategy is successful

India (Mumbai)
The research conducted in Mumbai India (Falzon, 2004) revealed factors related to the development of GCs in Bombay. Two types of colonies that constitute Bombay society are mentioned in the research; cosmopolitan and communal. The "cosmopolitans" are heterogeneous but the "communal" are separated from each other along ethnic, linguistic, regional, caste and / or religious lines. Both types are generally surrounded by walls and are perceived as the boundaries of certain interactive areas. GCs attract attention through three main themes: security, a beautiful environment and lifestyle. The desire to be safe and free from violence is the most important factor in the decision to purchase. Security encompasses three complex dynamics: a rapidly increasing crime rate, organized crime such as extortion that threaten private individuals in society, and the history of social policies that can lead to bloody uprisings. The second reason of Bombay residents want to live in GCs is the charm of a pleasant environment. They are attracting attention because of the population crowd, transportation difficulties and pollution in Bombay. The third and final dynamic is the lifestyle; a growing middle class, the poor class who provide all services for the middle and upper groups for a very low fee and the dense population of Bombay. The study examined these three main factors, and also sought an answer to the question whether GCs are a product of the local conditions of communities or a global event applied to the local environment.

Latin America (Brazil and Argentina)
The study examines examples in Brazil and Argentina (Coy and Pöhler, 2002), demonstrating the expansion of GCs, the change of Latin American cities and suburban areas in recent years. GCs reflects different and new processes compared to the structure of the former elite housing areas, the previous forms of social segregation and the control mechanisms of urban development. According to the results of the study, new GCs are usually large-scale projects planned by private project developers and real estate agents as a whole. Therefore, it is a dynamic product with high return on capital. Secondly, GCs do not only offer high security measures, but also comprehensive education and leisure activity opportunities. It also offers a sheltered, private and socially segregated life to its inhabitants. Thirdly, public life and accessibility to public spaces are designed as much as the European tradition. Fourthly, GCs developed new islands of wealth in the suburban area outside the city center. These developments will affect the urban development of Latin America in the long term. Finally, the globalization of GC phenomena and privileged lifestyles has been expressed in Latin American cities. In globalization and local GC practices, the preference of "English Country House Style" in a campus in Buenos Aires and playing Polo as a leisure activity in Argentina are striking examples of the research.

Egypt (Cairo)
Kuppinger (2004) explored the impact of capital and cultural changes in the case of Cairo at an ever-increasing pace, without being attached to a particular region. Globalization does not belong to one place. In the case of Cairo, the largely re-management of desert soils designed within a framework of neoliberal globalization embodies an unprecedented

explosion of speculation and construction that reflects the characteristics and patterns of a globalized spatial repertoire. Investments are focused almost exclusively on profitable luxury housing and luxury entertainment and entertainment spaces that directly reflect similar experiences in other global cities. Same as the other examples, the increase in social polarization is mentioned in the case of Cairo as well. Rich people have separated themselves even more. As in other globalizing postcolonial metropolises, the belief that less-serviced and neglected cityscapes where poor people competing for smaller public resources will be left behind.

China (Shanghai)
A lot of research has been done for China after socialism. Pow and Kong (2007) examined marketing discourses and themes related to the marketing of newly established GCs in Shanghai. The language of marketing reflects and reinforces the privileged housing demands of middle-class Chinese. Social prestige and an exclusive landscape privilege are used in the visuals prepared for marketing. The homogeneity of the social class and especially families with one child are emphasized in the visuals. The height and scale of the walls are used to emphasize the segregation and disparity. The gardens are marketed as a haven of nature. The meanings and values that are deeply rooted in Chinese / Shanghai history continue to affect even in today's symbolic and cultural capital. As a result, marketing strategies reveal the growing aspirations of the emerging Chinese middle class, using their commitment to tradition.

Canada
Grant (2005) investigated GCs and their developments in Canada. Although GCs are not as common in Canada as they are in the United States, they are increasing in number, especially in western Canada. Many Canadians who go south in the winter have experienced GCs in the United States and found these settlements attractive as they built for serving privacy, security and prestige. The idea of living together with people of similar ages, wealth and lifestyles attracted them. In GC projects in Canada, concepts of privacy, confidentiality, identity, lifestyle, homogeneity are important for both the seller and the buyer. Security is not a top priority in GCs in Canada because it is not as strong as the fear culture that drives GCs in the United States. Although walls and doors are sometimes marketed as a security feature, they are mostly used to keep ordinary visitors and tourists away from this area. In some cases the fences are even lower than 1.2 m. Developers see the elderly as a highly competitive market and work accordingly. Canadian GCs in Canada vary considerably from samples in other countries. Elderly and wealthy regions also attract them.

South Africa
Although GCs are seen as a rational response to increased crime rates, it is not yet known to what extent they reduces the risk of crime exposure of their residents. In their study in South Africa, Breetzke et al. (2014) not only accepted the need of safety as the reason for the formation of GCs, but also investigated the effect of physical characteristics of the walls surrounding GCs to the outcome. First of all, research has shown that GCs do not reduce incidents of theft and may even be attractive. Secondly, it concluded that the physical characteristics of them are important in cases of deterrence of criminal activities or vice versa, and that land size and number of parcels is important criteria.

Russia
Zotova (2012) gave two main reasons for the formation of GCs in Russia. The first is the desire of the wealthy people to protect their private areas, lives and property by organizing after the collapse of the Soviet system. The second reason is again the desire of the rich to stay away from "poor" people and to live in a homogeneous community by avoiding social stratification, income differentiation and social fragmentation. Unlike the Western examples, GCs in Russia are divided into three types according to consumer

structures and building types: very luxurious and flashy complexes, complexes for the upper middle class and complexes for the middle or lower class. As can be seen, all income groups are willing to leave "other" groups. Modern Russian society is not a unified community. The groups want to live in a homogeneous environment and to be separated from the others. GCs in Russia play a symbolic role, but only visually resemble American examples. They offer a closed and isolated life, but they do not create a sense of community. In Russia, GCs can be described as "ghetto" rather than "gated". Here, the term "ghetto" represents social groups living in spatial separation. The concept of GC is a rich society phenomenon, emerged without significant problems and imbalances in the social structure.

4. CONCLUSION

GCs are housing developments that restrict public access by the use of gates, booms, walls and fences. Thus, these communities are residential areas with restricted access, such spaces may normally considered public have been privatized (Bagaeen and Uduku, 2010). In response to fear of crime, the privatization of public space and the fortification of the urban realm have contributed to the rise of the gated community phenomena.

In accordance with the information given within the scope of the current study, through examining the GCs as an urban form in each contemporary globalize culture, one can see that gating has both positive and negative characteristics that should be taken into consideration in the studies on GCs in each various geographies. It reflects the increasing polarization of the wealthy from the poor and represents a spatial strategy for social segregation. They also provide secure and safe environments for inhabitants by using boundaries and physical barriers to access. As the development and increased occurrence of enclosed neighborhoods in different geographies, the effect of physical and social barriers between residents within and outside of the GCs become an important situation in many aspects.

This study aims to highlights that the needs to live behind the walls and the way GCs affects the community and citizenship almost the same in each geography by firstly reminds the theoretical background of gated communities and secondly by presenting researches conducted in various geographies. In line with that, this study establishes some of the key factors that may be useful and important to further studies: for creating healthy environments not only for individuals but also for urban life, criticisms about the GCs have to be considered. The issue of 'fear of crime' with its relation to GC should be investigated in details to understand the real reason behind the creation of these projects; the urban segregationist tendencies should be considered in further studies to draw a useful frame for the 'new way of urbanism'. In addition, the observations and attitudes of the developers and planners on GCs should be examined to understand its importance in marketing strategy.

5. REFERENCES

Atkinson, R. and Blandy, S. (2006). Introduction: International perspectives on the new enclavism and the rise of gated communities. In R. Atkinson & S. Blandy (Eds.), *Gated Communities* (pp.vii-xi). Taylor and Francis: New York.

Bagaeen, S. and Uduku, O. (2010). Gated histories: An introduction to themes and concepts. In S. Bagaeen & O. Uduku (Eds.), *Gated Communities: Social Sustainability in Contemporary and Historical Gated Developments* (pp.1-9). Taylor and Francis: USA.

Blakely, E. J. and Snyder, M. G. (1997). Fortress America: Gated communities in the United States. The Brookings Institution: Washington D.C.

Blakely, E. J. and Snyder, M. G. (1998). Separate places: Crime and security in gated communities ", in Reducing Crime through Real Estate Development and Management. In M. Felson & R. B. Peiser (Eds.), *Urban Land Institute* (pp. 53–70). DC: Washington.

Blandy, S., and Lister, D. (2005). Gated communities: (Ne)Gating community development?. *Housing Studies, 20* (2), 287-301.

Breetzke, G. D., Landman, K. and Cohn, E. G. (2014). Is it safer behind the gates? Crime and gated communities in South Africa. *Journal of House and the Built Environment.* 29:123–139.

Burke, M. (2001). The pedestrian behavior of residents in gated communities. *Walking the 21st Century.* Western Australia: Perth.

Coy, M. and Pöhler, M. (2002). Gated communities in Latin American megacities: case studies in Brazil and Argentina. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 29, 355-370.

Falzon, M.A. (2004). Paragons of Lifestyle: gated communities and the politics of space in Bombay. *City & Society*, 16 (2), 145–167.

Geniş, Ş. (2007). Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 44 (4), 771–798.

Gooblar, A. (2002). Outside the walls: Urban gated communities and their regulation within the British Planning System. *European Planning Studies, 10* (3), 321-334.

Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt, L. (2004). Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 31,* 913-930.

Grant, J. (2005). Planning responses to gated communities in Canada. *Housing Studies, 20* (2), 273-285.

Güzey, Ö. (2014). Neoliberal urbanism restructuring the city of Ankara: Gated communitiesas a new life style in a suburban settlement. *Cities*, 36, 93-106.

Helsley, R. W., and Strange, W. C. (1999). Gated communities and the economic geography of crime. *Journal of Urban Economics, 46,* 80-105.

Hook, D., and Vrdoljak, M. (2002). Gated communities, heteropia and a "rights" of privilege: a 'heterotopology' of the South African security-park. *Geoforum, 33*, 195-219.

Kuppinger, P. (2004). Exclusive Greenery: new gated communities in Cairo. *City & Society*, 16 (2), 35–62.

Landman, K. (2000a). Gated communities and urban sustainability: Taking a closer look at the future. Proceedings from *Strategies for a Sustainable Built Environment.* Pretoria.

Landman, K. (2000b). The urban future: Enclosed neighborhoods?. *The Urban Futures Conference.* Johannesburg: South Africa.

Landman, K., and Schönteich, M. (2002). Urban Fortresses: Gated communities as a reaction to crime. *African Security Review, 11* (4), 1-12.

Le Goix, R. (2005). Gated communities: Sprawl and social segregation in Southern California. *Housing Studies*, *20* (2), 323-343.

Leisch, H. (2002). Gated communities in Indonesia. *Cities*, 19 (5), 341–350.

Low, S. M. (2003). The edge and the center: Gated communities and the discourse of urban fear. In S. M. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga (Eds.), *Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*, (pp. 387-407). Oxford: Blackwell.

Manzi, T., and Smith-Bowers, B. (2005). Gated communities as club goods: Segregation or social cohesion. *Housing Studies, 20* (2), 345-359.

Maxwell, D. K. (2004). Gated communities: Selling the good life. *A Community Apart: Gated Developments in Canada.* Canada.

Pow, C. P. and Kong, L. (2007). Marketing the Chinese Dream Home: Gated Communities and Representat ions of the Good Life in (Post-)Socialist Shanghai, *Urban Geography*, 28 (2), 129-159.

Rofe, M. W. (2006). New landscapes of gated communities: Australia's Sovereign Islands. *Landscape Research, 31* (3), 309-317.

Roitman, S. (2005). Who segregates whom? The analysis of a gated community in Mendoza, Argentina. *Housing Studies, 20* (2), 303-321.

Sanchez, T. W., and Lang, R. E. (2003). Security versus status: The two worlds of gated communities. Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Technology.

Thuillier, G. (2005). Gated communities in the metropolitan area of Buenos Aires, Argentina: A challenge for town planning. Housing Studies, *20* (2), 255-271.

Wilson-Doenges, G. (2000). An exploration of sense of community and fear of crime in gated communities. *Environment and Behavior, 32* (5), 597-611.

Zotova, M. (2012). Emergence of Gated Communities in Russia: Causes and Consequences. *L'Espace Politique*, 17, 2012-2.