

# 12

## GENTRIFICATION

Loretta Lees



### Introduction

Despite calls at the dawn of the twenty-first century to allow 'gentrification' to disintegrate under the burden of its reconceptualization (Bondi 1999), the term has not disintegrated; quite the opposite, it has become stronger and more internationally known. The literature on gentrification itself has grown, offering new understandings, and it remains at the centre of critical work in urban theory. Gentrification scholars have not been afraid to 'burden' it with new concepts.

Gentrification studies is trans-disciplinary and this is one of its strengths. Although dominated by scholars from geography, there has been significant cross-fertilization of ideas and concepts between sociology, planning, urban anthropology, urban economics, and policy studies. Perhaps the most significant concept that it has been burdened with recently is the challenge of 'comparative urbanism' (Lees 2012, 2014a, forthcoming; see Chapter 8, this volume) and this means increasing learning across disciplines from around the world. The concern was that gentrification studies in different parts of the world were using a term – 'gentrification' – that had been coined in the Global North, and theorizations/conceptualizations of it that were based on studies of cities in the Global North. Lees (2012) challenged gentrification scholars to move away from an 'imitative urbanism' – the idea that gentrification travelled to the Global South and was copied from the Global North, to a 'cosmopolitan urbanism' which could respond to the postcolonial challenge of how 'gentrification' was constructed in gentrification studies, and of dealing with new forms of urbanism around the globe.

That same year a Greek scholar Thomas Maloutas (2012) asked similarly whether the use of the Anglo-American term 'gentrification' facilitated or impeded understanding of processes of urban restructuring in different contexts. Ley and So (2014) were also concerned about the 'conceptual overreach' of 'gentrification'



from the Anglo-American heartland to the cities of Asia Pacific and specifically Hong Kong, and explored the identification and naming (or absence of naming) of gentrification in Hong Kong. But they concluded that just because the word 'gentrification' is missing from public and academic discourse in Hong Kong it does not mean that it is not happening. Similarly, Lees *et al* (2015), in their global collection on gentrification, show that 'gentrification' with or without the label is affecting cities all over the globe, from Karachi to Abu Dhabi to Beijing. Meanwhile Latin American scholars have begun to assert a specifically 'Latin American style of gentrification' (Janoschka *et al* forthcoming) that could link Mexico, Brazil, Chile and Argentina, due to the colonial legacy of Spain and Portugal.

The term 'gentrification' was coined over 50 years ago now by the British sociologist Ruth Glass (see Lees *et al* 2008, 2010). Her coinage referred to the invasion of middle class people into previously disinvested inner city, working class neighbourhoods in London, where they renovated old properties and displaced working class communities. Half a century later and that same process has mutated beyond the renovation of old properties and beyond London. In what follows I outline, if briefly, what gentrification is today – that is 'planetary gentrification', followed by a discussion of resistance to this socially unjust process.

### Planetary gentrification

In their subsequent book Lees *et al* (forthcoming) go one step further and use the term 'planetary gentrification' (see Case study 12.1 for a definition) to refer to gentrification around the globe today. Key to this process is (re)investment in the secondary circuit of capital – the built environment, real estate. Importantly, in some parts of the Global South this is happening at the same time as investment in the primary circuit of capital (industrial production), for example, in China; whereas in other places (re)investment in the secondary circuit is trumping (re) investment in the primary circuit, for example, Dubai. The book underlines the fact that the planet is living in a 'property moment'. Much of this state-led gentrification is taking place on formerly public land; and like with 'planetary urbanization': 'rural places and suburban spaces have become integral moments of neoindustrial production and financial speculation, getting absorbed and reconfigured into new world-regional zones of exploitation, into megalopolitan regional systems' (Merrifield 2013: 10). As such planetary gentrification is also destroying the old dichotomies between urban and rural gentrification, inner city and suburb, and so on. The process plays out in the form of 'accumulation by dispossession', Harvey's (2003) upgrading of 'primitive accumulation' for the twenty first century neoliberal context, in which urban (also suburban and rural) land is appropriated and value extracted from it to facilitate capital accumulation (see Chapter 18, this volume).

Twenty-first century gentrification in the Global North is continuing unabated. Indeed, even cities like Los Angeles infamous for their suburban sprawl are experiencing gentrification in their old core (Lees 2014). There is no singular type

3

### CASE STUDY 12.1 GLOSSARY OF TYPES OF CONTEMPORARY GENTRIFICATION

*Creative gentrification*: a term coined by Peck (2010) in reference to the gentrification caused by creative city policy.

*Hyper-gentrification*: a heightened, almost frenzied gentrification caused by over-heated property markets, in London, San Francisco, etc.

*Mega gentrification and mega displacement*: the large scale redevelopment of urban land in mega projects and associated massive displacements, usually through mass demolition and eviction (see Lees *et al*, forthcoming).

*New-build gentrification*: a term coined by Davidson and Lees (2005) in reference to new-build developments marketed at gentrifier types.

*Planetary gentrification*: a term coined by Lees *et al* (forthcoming) that takes seriously Merrifield's (2014b) call for a 'reloaded urban studies' that removes centre-periphery binary thinking and acknowledges the emergence of multiple centralities (gentrifications) across space (the planet).

*Rental gentrification*: where the gentrified property/apartments are for rent, not to buy.

*Slum gentrification*: a term coined by Lees *et al* (2015) referring to either the state-led, developer, or individual gentrification of slums.

*Super-gentrification*: a term coined by Lees (2003) referring to the re-gentrification of already gentrified inner-city neighbourhoods by a new breed of much more wealthy gentrifier.

of gentrification – there are multiple types, which have distinctive if inter-related features. The classic, pioneer, first wave or 'sweat equity' gentrification undertaken by 'new' middle class individuals (poor in economic capital but rich in cultural capital) still happens in cities and even rural areas, but it is less significant now. The dominant type of gentrification these days is new-build, and it is state- or developer-led. The big change has been the sale of public land into gentrification – the state-led gentrification of large areas of public housing in London, and in US cities like Chicago, New Orleans, and New York. This 'new' urban renewal (Hyra 2008; Lees 2012) of public housing bears many similarities to the large-scale urban renewals happening elsewhere in the world, e.g. Shanghai and Mumbai (see Weinstein and Ren 2009). Drawing on Merrifield (2013), Lees *et al* (forthcoming) have called these mega-gentrifications 'neo-Haussmannization'.

For Baron Haussmann the plight of the poor was not his administrative responsibility; like European nineteenth-century philanthropists Haussmann assumed the continued poverty of the poor and privilege of the rich. That



assumption continues in some parts of the world, but less so others. In the US and the UK, for example, the ‘renewal’ of public housing is being undertaken through the auspices of ‘mixed communities policy’ – social uplift of the poor via social and economic trickle down effects, even if the end result is gentrification by stealth (see Bridge *et al* 2011). By way of contrast, in China (see Zhang and Fang 2004) and South Korea (Shin 2009) urban renewal is sold to the public as necessary modernization. These differences deserve more attention in the gentrification literature, and there are some suggestions that gentrification in the Global South may be more visceral (see Lees *et al* 2015, forthcoming).

Such schemes can be characterized as slum gentrification in both the Global North and the Global South. Indeed, slum gentrification is taking off globally, and can be found in cities as far apart as Lisbon (Ascensao 2015) and Rio de Janeiro (Cummings 2015). Slum gentrification has also underlined the fact that gentrification scholars need to learn from atypical examples. Lemanski (forthcoming), for example, demonstrates the correlation between gentrification and ‘downward raiding’ in South African slums. Situated in two different literatures ‘gentrification’ and ‘downward raiding’ have been seen until now as two very different processes, but the sale of state-subsidised houses in South Africa has meant that downward raiding has become implicated in gentrification. Lemanski demonstrates how urban theory can learn from diverse empirical sites and warns against the dangers of narrowly, empirically embedded concepts like gentrification and downward raiding. Cummings (2015) talks about the ‘favela chic’ related to slum gentrification in Rio de Janeiro, and this trend is global, for Burnett (2014) talks about poor and marginalized residents in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, Canada, having become a competitive niche for the promotion of distinctive and authentic culinary adventures. These trends for poverty tourism in and around slums demonstrate the commodification of poverty and a more complex type of gentrification.

Planetary gentrification is causing and revealing expanded notions of displacement (see Ghertner 2014) and pushing ‘displacement’ beyond the Euro-American geographies within which it was developed. ‘Displacement’ is a term that can be traced back to early sociological studies on the rapidly urbanizing cities of Europe and work by the Chicago School into the destruction of identity and community in modernizing American cities. As such it has real resonance in terms of researching gentrification in the rapidly urbanizing cities of the Global South. Re-theorizing displacement with respect to planetary gentrification would seem to be an important goal. This means stepping back from the Euro-American conceptualizations of displacement that dominate gentrification studies – e.g. Marcuse (1985). It means unpacking assumptions about ‘accumulation by dispossession’ and asking what such an idea of displacement conceals, neglects, and disavows. The aim is not to move away from generalizations about displacement but to expand the theoretical and conceptual repertoire of it where possible, and to seek methodologically innovative ways of investigating it around the globe.

Other new types of gentrification are emerging too. Rental gentrification is taking off in cities like London, New York and San Francisco, where owner



occupation is out of reach of even the middle classes, as developers realize yet another gentrification niche. As Northern cities have progressed well into post-industrialization, Richard Florida's (2004) 'creative city thesis' has been an attractive one for policymakers and city 'fathers' (sic) because it recasts urban competitiveness between cities as cultural and economic 'creativity'. Creativity is now seen to be the key to economic growth, in a policy sphere where there are few, if any, new ideas. In Europe, hardly any other city has relied on Richard Florida's creative city thesis as heavily as Hamburg. It all began when Hamburg's then science minister, Jörg Dräger, distributed Florida's books to his fellow Hamburg Senate members, claiming that they offered good ideas for Hamburg's future. The city of Hamburg then hired the management-consulting firm Roland Berger to examine how Florida's theory could be applied to Hamburg. The result was a policy document titled 'Hamburg, City of Talent'. The result in many cities has been what Peck (2010) has termed 'creative gentrification', which extends 1990s urban entrepreneurialism into a more fully neoliberal world based on competition, middle-class consumption and place marketing. And as Lees *et al* (forthcoming) show, this thesis has been taken on board in the Global South too, as creativity becomes the new buzzword in the economic redevelopment of East Asian cities, like Shenzhen, and others (see Chapter 11, this volume).

It is evident now that the state (including policymakers) and developers are leading gentrification agendas; the middle classes are the consumers, rather than the producers of gentrification today. Indeed, planetary gentrification urges scholars to revisit the role of the middle classes in gentrification. The emergence of new middle classes in Asia, Africa and Latin America is not the same, the temporality of this emergence differs, as does its relationship to the state, urbanization and (de) industrialization; their politics and ideologies are different too (see Lees *et al* forthcoming). There is a new global middle class that is urban(e), but how it acts in different places and at different times can be quite different. And how they act remains important, less so now in terms of their role in gentrification, perhaps more in their role against gentrification.

It might be that in East Asia where the middle class has been nurtured by the state and where a politics of property has consolidated as the region has urbanized and (de)industrialized the middle classes are less likely to stand up against gentrification. But in other parts of the world, e.g. parts of Turkey, Latin America and South Asia, the middle classes are involved in intra-class battles over gentrification. It might be that the middle classes that do rise up against gentrification are those whose material interests have not been guaranteed. As Weinstein and Ren (2009) argue, any comparative analysis of housing rights needs to focus on the structural conditions shaping housing rights regimes, the fragmented forms of urban citizenship produced by different regimes, and the opportunities for housing activism and resistance emerging in globalizing urban contexts, like Shanghai and Mumbai which they studied (see also Shin 2013).





FIGURE 12.1 Anti-gentrification protests, Taksim Square/Gezi Park, Istanbul, 2013 (Source: Tolga Islam).

### Planetary resistance

The fact that resistance to 'gentrification' is becoming more noticeable around the world underlines the notion of 'planetary gentrification'. Resistance to gentrification made the international headlines in Taksim Square in Istanbul, Turkey, in 2013 (see Figure 12.1; also Angell *et al* 2014). Not since the Tompkins Square Park riots in New York City (see Smith, 1996) had anti-gentrification resistance made international headline news. The protests began when a small group of activists tried to stop the demolition of Gezi Park – one of Istanbul's few remaining green spaces in the larger Taksim Square; however, the protesters were also unhappy with the rapid urban changes in Turkey's larger cities. They criticized Erdogan's government for its neoliberal promotion of gentrification in Istanbul, arguing that the 'urban regeneration' plans hit the neighbourhoods that house the poor, immigrants, Kurds, and the Roma hardest. The police responded with extreme violence and the protests grew, with millions of demonstrators on the street, and copycat protests were held in dozens of cities across Turkey. More than 8,000 people were injured; six demonstrators and one policeman were killed. The struggle for Gezi Park further intensified and diversified unscripted encounters, transforming a public park – through the collective work of anonymous urbanites – into a commons (cf. Harvey 2012: 73; Lees *et al* forthcoming) (see Chapter 6, this volume). Resistance to

7

gentrification has been more active and even successful in cities of the Global South and activists in the Global North could learn from their stories. Two good examples are the case of *barrio* women in Chacao, Venezuela (see Case study 12.2) and of the Pakistan Mahigeer Tahreek in Karachi, Pakistan (see Case study 12.3).

### **CASE STUDY 12.2 BARRIO WOMEN IN CHACAO, VENEZUELA, RESIST GENTRIFICATION (VELÁSQUEZ ATEHORTÚA 2013)**

As a result of the reforms enacted by a socialist government in Venezuela to contest neoliberalism, *barrio* women in Chacao, Caracas, were empowered and mobilized into an urban struggle against the gentrification of their *barrio*. Gentrification began in Caracas in the 1990s with neoliberal decentralization reforms that promoted widespread gentrification, fed by oil revenues that concentrated global capital in Caracas. There were redistribution policies that helped the poor somewhat, but the rich benefited more from luxury housing and shopping and from zero-tolerance policing models imported from New York City (courtesy of a visit from William Bratton, ex NYC Police Chief), and the police protected the interests of the wealthy. This revanchist urbanism began to be contested. Latin America of course has a rich history of political mobilization from the Movement of Chilean Settlers (Castells 1973) to the Brazilian National Union for Popular Housing and the Uruguayan Federation of Self-help Housing Cooperatives. The Settlers Movement in Caracas had two goals: the inclusion of poor *barrios* in their cities, and to fight against the accumulation of urban land and gentrification. The resistance was peaceful but it was helped by the support of the Socialist majority in the National Assembly who then passed a series of reforms that supported the People's Power (El Poder Popular), in a top-down approach that started from below. The aim was to allow the underprivileged full access to participatory democracy. The result was that the bourgeois could remain and retain its privileges but it had to live with a New Communal Order of the underprivileged. In Caracas, the government allowed them to build a pioneer's camp (a Campamento de Pioneros) on the land, to begin the process of building a Socialist Community for 600 families. They were given 38 million Bolivares (about US \$9 million) from the government. There was fierce push back from the bourgeoisie, forcing Hugo Chavez's government to get the People's Power to govern with presidential Missions. This became a new model of social policy development that involved people contesting neoliberalism through the marginalized being involved in executing government programmes. Unlike in the Global North where public participation in urban renaissance has been a post-political process of inclusion that silences (see Lees 2012, on London), in Caracas it has been more real. There were three institutional building waves in Caracas that allowed *barrio* women in particular to achieve growing agency – in 2002



Urban Land Committees (Comites de tierra Urbana) were formed to regularize urban land; in 2006 Communal Councils were formed in which 150–400 families would formulate, implement and monitor central government public policy, allowing cooperatives to emerge. Then in 2008 Socialist Communes were made from aggregated communal councils, the aim of which was to address extreme poverty and corruption. This created spaces of insurgent citizenship and urbanism (cf. Holston 2009; Miraftab 2009). In addition the Settlers also created their own organizations that worked in the spaces the government had created; these organizations defended housing as a human right and contested the privatization of land, and neoliberalism. In partnership with the Socialist state they could stand up to the power of real estate elites, bankers and developers etc. In so doing they successfully fought off an 'urban renewal' project that wished to gentrify the Old Market in Caracas. There are few such successes in the Global North.

### **CASE STUDY 12.3 THE PAKISTAN MAHIGEER TAHREEK IN KARACHI RESIST GENTRIFICATION (HASAN 2012)**

In Pakistan, since 1999, there have been attempts to gentrify Karachi's coastline using global capital and Dubai- and Malaysian-based real estate companies (see Hasan 2015). In 1999 there was a military coup and General Musharraf came to power. He appointed a Chief Vice Executive of Citibank as Finance Minister, a senior economist from the World Bank as Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan, and another World Bank person as Minister for Finance, Planning and Investment. Devolution saw the election of mayors for Karachi the second of which had international links. Dubai-based companies negotiated with the government of Pakistan and 'projects' replaced 'planning'. One of these projects, Sugarland City, which was initiated in 2006, involved the privatization and development of a number of Karachi's public beaches (a massive 26,000 hectares of land) which were to be developed by Limitless, a Dubai-based company launched by Dubai World, into a new residential, commercial and recreational city at a cost of US \$68 billion. An MoU was signed between the Minister of State and Privatization and Investment and the Dubai World chairman. Limitless was set up in 2005 with the key objective of globalizing Dubai's portfolio of leading development companies by leveraging the know-how and exposure gained by Dubai World's real estate initiatives. But there was opposition to the project from the Pakistan Mahigeer Tahreek (the Movement of the Indigenous Coastal Fisherfolk Communities of Pakistan). They produced a letter titled 'Development to Destroy Nature and Displace People' in 2007, the outcome of discussions between various stakeholders, but especially local communities. As well as outlining the destruction of nature –



from green turtles, to mangroves, to fish and birds, they also were clear that the proposed development would displace people – the fishing communities who had been living on the coast for centuries. The project, it was claimed, would impact their livelihoods, which were based on subsistence fishing and beach leisure activities. Incredibly, despite more than 100 villages being in the project area, their future was not mentioned at all in the project proposal. The letter also claimed that given that lower and lower middle-class Karachiites would not be able to go to the beach this would increase the divide between the rich and poor in society. The letter was followed up by public demonstrations and a press campaign. Meetings were held with the Chief Secretary along with prominent civil society individuals, and, because of opposition from all segments of society, Limitless backed out of the project in 2009.

As said there are few examples of successful resistance to gentrification in the Global North, but Hamburg's plans for a new creative city (mentioned above) came up against an urban social movement of artists (see Novy and Colomb 2013) who did not want creative gentrification. Resistance coalesced around an alliance of activists called 'Right to the City'. Made up of over 20 citizens' initiatives they were united in their fight against gentrification: the deliberate and politically expedient upgrading of poorer neighbourhoods, leading to the displacement of the existing population with more affluent new residents. A manifesto against the branding of the city titled 'Not in Our Name!' (see NION 2010 and [www.nionhh.wordpress.com](http://www.nionhh.wordpress.com)) was published by Hamburg artists, musicians and social activists in October 2009. Here is an excerpt:

Dear location politicians: we refuse to talk about this city in marketing categories. We don't want to 'position' local neighbourhoods as 'colourful, brash, eclectic' parts of town, nor will we think of Hamburg in terms of 'water, cosmopolitanism, internationality', or any other 'success modules of the brand Hamburg' that you chose to concoct. We are thinking about other things. About the million-plus square metres of empty office space, for example, or the fact that you continue to line the Elbe with premium glass teeth. We hereby state, that in the western city centre it is almost impossible to rent a room in a shared flat for less than 450 euro per month, or a flat for under 10 euro per square meter. That the amount of social housing will be slashed by half within ten years. That the poor, elderly and immigrant inhabitants are being driven to the edge of town by Hartz IV (welfare money) and cityhousing-distribution policies. We think that your 'growing city' is actually a segregated city of the 19th century: promenades for the wealthy, tenements for the rabble.

Interestingly the response from the City was not militant, rather they appeared to back down and the Senate decided to buy back the buildings from the Dutch investors they had sold them to, costing them €2.8 million more than the Dutch had paid for the buildings in the first place. NION stated that this extra €2.8 million represented the cost the city incurred for listening to Richard Florida! Novy and Colomb (2013) argue that in cities around the globe there is mounting evidence of growing mobilization by members of the so-called ‘creative class’ in urban social movements, defending particular urban spaces and influencing urban development. In Hamburg, artists have maintained a progressive role in mediating between the City and activists, and some experts, including Richard Florida, now see Hamburg (ironically) as a new model for socially sustainable creative cities.

To date the literature on resistance to gentrification has been very limited (Lees and Ferrerai forthcoming) and dominated by case studies from the Global North, which must now change. If we are to take the charge of comparative urbanism seriously then we must start to learn from the successful resistance to gentrification in cities of the Global South and resistance to new types of gentrification in the Global North too. Cross-planetary learnings on gentrification should be the goal of twenty-first century gentrification studies.

### Conclusion

It is evident then that gentrification as a process has become more complex over time, the interests and actors have diversified and it has become the leading edge of urban policy globally (Smith 2002). Significantly the movement and diversification of gentrification around the globe has not been North to South, but South to South and even at times South to North (Lees *et al* 2015, forthcoming). The emerging work to carry the burden of comparative urbanism into gentrification studies is already teaching us a lot. So what might the key concepts be for a twenty-first century gentrification studies that takes comparative urbanism seriously? I conclude with four suggestions:

1. *Spatial capital*: it is becoming apparent that the concept of ‘spatial capital’ theorized in Swiss core cities by Rerat and Lees (2011) as the locational advantage that gentrifiers use as a mark of social distinction is increasingly relevant in Southern cities where new forms of spatial capital are being created in previously undervalued urban areas (see Cummings 2015, on the *Metrocables* in downtown Rio favelas; López-Morales (2010) on the *Efecto Metro* in Santiago, Chile, which has opened areas to real estate developers and housing consumers, enlarging rent gaps, and enabling new social classes to capture spatial capital, so generating indirect forms of displacement; and Blanco *et al* (2014) on gentrification and mobility in Argentina).

2. *Planetary rent gaps*: rent gaps in cities around the world are being created so as to set up the necessary conditions for gentrification. Lopez-Morales (2011) discusses ‘ground rent dispossession’ in reference to how the local government in Santiago, Chile, has liberalized local building regulations (seeking to increase potential ground rents) and deliberately underinvested in housing upgrading (seeking to



devalue the current ground rent). Shin (2009) has shown the same process to be operating in South Korea, and Lees (2012) has researched the state-led disinvestment of London's council estates leading to what Watt (2009) has called a 'state-induced rent gap'. Slater (forthcoming) argues quite forcefully that we need to confront these new geographies of structural violence.

3. *Planetary Displacement*: 'accumulation by dispossession' is global, but it plays out differently in different places (Doshi 2013; Lees *et al* forthcoming), and these differences are important, both politically and practically, in the fight against gentrification.

4. *Planetary resistance*: collating detailed stories of resistance to gentrification from around the world (old and new) and cross-fertilizing the lessons from them has not yet been done; but if, as gentrification scholars, we believe in social justice in cities then improved conceptualization of resistance to gentrification needs our attention.

This means returning to some old concepts in (Anglo-American) gentrification studies – locational advantages and mobility practices (Berry 1985); rent gap theory (Smith 1979, 1982); conceptualizations of displacement (Marcuse 1985); studies of resistance (Hartman 1974) – and re-theorizing them for a twenty-first century planetary gentrification. This might well mean that we reject these earlier concepts and develop new ones theorizing *from* the South; this would mean 'unlearning' (drawing on Spivak 1993) existing dominant literatures that continue to structure how we think about gentrification, its practices and ideologies (Lees 2012: 156). The future of gentrification studies will be determined by how effectively we can challenge our preconceptions about this mutating process.

Current work in gentrification studies is enriching urban theory by introducing new concepts (like slum gentrification, spatial capital, etc.), by refuting the utility of some old concepts (like the new middle class as producers of gentrification), and, importantly, it is listening to ideas from urban scholars around the world, doing the real comparative learning that is necessary, not just for the future of gentrification studies, but also for urban theory itself.

## Key reading

Lees, L., Shin, H. and López-Morales, E. (forthcoming) *Planetary Gentrification*, Polity Press: Cambridge.

The launch text of a new series by Polity Press on the future of cities, this monograph discusses gentrification around the world in terms of planetary urbanization. It introduces some new concepts, e.g. slum gentrification, mega gentrification and mega displacement.

Lees, L., Shin, H. and López-Morales, E. (Eds) (2015) *Global Gentrifications: Uneven Development and Displacement*, Policy Press: Bristol.

This edited collection provides detailed case studies of gentrification from around the world, from cities as diverse as Lagos, Damascus and Athens. All the cases are from cities beyond the usual suspects in the Global North.

Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wyly, E. (2010 first edition; second edition forthcoming 2017) *The Gentrification Reader*, Routledge: London.

This reader provides students with the key classic essays written in Anglo-American gentrification studies to date.

Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wyly, E. (2008) *Gentrification*, Routledge: New York.

This is the first, and remains the only, textbook on gentrification to date, and provides an accessible introduction to gentrification studies.

12