Types of gated communities

Jill Grant
School of Planning, Dalhousie University, Box 1000, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3A 1Y6, Canada;
e-mail: jill.grant@dal.ca
Lindsey Mittelsteadt
Department of Planning, Municipality of Maple Ridge, Alberta
Received 17 November 2003; in revised form 14 June 2004

Abstract. In the last decade the planning literature has reflected growing interest in the topic of gated communities. To date, this relatively new field of research has generated limited theoretical development. Although recent literature has begun to elucidate the social and economic contexts that make gated enclaves a global phenomenon, few works offer an overview of the physical features of gated communities. The key source articulating a framework for understanding gated communities is Blakely and Snyder's, *Fortress America*. Although Blakely and Snyder provide detailed findings on the form of gated projects in the US context, they say little about gating elsewhere. This paper draws on a range of literature on gated enclaves to examine and augment the typology created by Blakely and Snyder. Building theory to explain the form and character of gated communities requires the consideration of a range of historical experiences and international differences in practice. Although classification alone does not constitute theory, it provides an important foundation for those seeking to generate premises and principles for further theoretical development. It also offers useful tools for case studies of practice.

The new gated community
In the late 20th century, an ancient urban form began to reappear in modern settlements (Judd, 1995; Morris, 1994). Fortified and enclave developments have become an increasingly common feature of contemporary suburban building patterns (Blakely, 1999; Blakely and Snyder, 1997). Older neighbourhoods in some cities are closing off streets to enhance local security and reduce traffic (Blakely and Snyder, 1995; Newman, 1995). In general, postmodern cities are becoming more defended, and more defensible, than were industrial cities (Koskela, 2000). What Ellin (1997) calls an "architecture of fear" is turning the urban environment into an enclosed and privatized realm. Gated developments "challenge the spatial, organisational, and institutional order that has shaped modern cities" (Webster et al, 2002, page 315).

Although most extensively documented in the United States (Blakely and Snyder, 1997), gated communities are appearing in many countries, including Argentina (Thuillier, 2003), Australia (Hillier and McManus, 1994), the Bahamas (Gonzalez, 2000), Brazil (Carvalho et al, 1997; Faiola, 2002), Costa Rica (Rancho Cartagena, 1999), Indonesia (Leisch, 2003), Latvia (Medearis, 1999), Portugal (Raposo, 2003), South Africa (Gated communities SA cities, 2003; Jurgens and Gnad, 2003), and Venezuela (Paulin, 1997). Concern over gating has recently heated up in Britain (Arnot, 2002; BBC News, 2002; epxNews, 2002; Oaff, 2003). In Canada as well, gated communities are generating interest and concern among reporters and researchers (Anthony, 1997; Carey, 1997; Dinka, 1997; Golby, 1999; Haysom, 1996; Liebner, 2003; Mittelsteadt, 2003; Yelaja, 2003).

We use the following definition of a gated community: *a gated community is a 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. Our definition thus includes projects with gates across roadways, but would exclude "barricade perches", as Blakely and Snyder (1997) call them, where some streets are closed off for traffic calming while others remain open. We see the key element of gating as the effort to control access to the settlement. Gated developments have an inside and an outside.

Whether gated enclaves are true 'communities' is open to debate; indeed the concept of community generally proves contentious (for example, see Morris, 1996; Talen, 2000). The scale and composition of enclaves vary, and their residents are often engaged in much wider communities of interest. However, for the purposes of this paper, we will argue that gated enclaves are spatially defined residential communities with shared amenities (and thus the potential for developing social networks).

Some gated communities reflect the growing range of choices available to consumers in the postmodern city. The affluent can move to gated enclaves in search of privacy and exclusivity, and in flight from fear (Dillon, 1994; Hubert and Delsohn, 1996; Low, 2001; Marcuse, 1997; Wilson-Doenges, 2000), closing themselves off from the dangers outside. By contrast, the poorest of the poor may find themselves enclosed in gated public housing projects, refugee detention centres, or foreign worker compounds, constrained by their circumstances to be set apart from the fabric of the city. Gates and barriers indicate the depth of the security concerns contemporary cities must address: crime, traffic, loss of sense of community, and fear of mixing. The same issues that generate NIMBYism (that is, concerns about property values, personal safety, and neighbourhood amenities) drive gating (Dear, 1992; Helsley and Strange, 1999; Hornblower, 1988; Rural and Small Town Research, 1992; Shouse and Silverman, 1999). The option of living in gated developments appeals to those who feel they cannot rely on public regulations and political processes to protect their homes or their neighbourhoods from unwanted uses or people (Byers, 2003; McKenzie, 1994).

Developers see gated projects as an important niche marketing strategy in a competitive environment: enclaves can attract consumers searching for a sense of community, identity, and security. By providing beautiful amenities and keeping out undesirables, gating may increase property values (Baron, 1998; Bible and Hsieh, 2001; Blakely, 1999; LaCour-Little and Malpezzi, 2001; Townshend, 2002). Market demand results in a large proportion of new communities in the US being gated (Webster et al, 2002); in other countries, gated projects typically appeal to a relatively small, affluent elite.

In investigating gated communities, we came to recognize that the characteristics that differentiate enclaves outside the USA are not entirely congruent with those described by Blakely and Snyder (1997). Moreover, historical enclaves present even greater variation along several dimensions. Thus we believe it appropriate to examine the model Blakely and Snyder develop, and to consider additional variables that differentiate gated communities. Although scholars are working to elucidate the social and economic contexts that make gated enclaves a global phenomenon (Glasze, 2003; Webster, 2002), few works offer a systematic overview of the physical features of gated communities. Our analysis suggests that gated communities show so much diversity that it may be misleading to consider them as a unified set of urban forms. In this paper we identify the features that differentiate gated enclaves. Typologies alone do not constitute theory; indeed, in seeking to facilitate description, they simplify complex realities. At the same time, though, they provide an important step in the process of theory building around new urban forms by offering a framework for observation and a lens for analysis.

A typology of gated communities

Blakely and Snyder (1997) provided one of the most thorough investigations of gated communities available, and presented the most frequently discussed typology of the phenomenon. Their study of US enclaves, *Fortress America*, suggests that gated communities in the USA housed about three million dwelling units by the mid-1990s; the census count increased that to four million by 2000 (Sanchez and Lang, 2002). Blakely and Snyder described projects from coast to coast, and at all income levels. In developing a classification of the kinds of projects found in the USA, they made a vital contribution to understanding the key characteristics of gated communities.

As table 1 shows, Blakely and Snyder identified three types of gated community: lifestyle, prestige, and security zone communities. In theory, the categories represent ideal types that serve particular markets. In practice, they say, communities may show a combination of features from these types.

Table 1. Blakely and Snyder's (1997) general typology of gated communities.

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	age-related complexes with suite of amenities and activities
		Golf and leisure	shared access to amenities for an active lifestyle
		Suburban new town	master-planned project 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	secured and guarded privacy to restrict access for celebrities and very wealthy; attractive locations
		Top-fifth developments	secured access for the nouveau riche; often have guards.
		Executive middle class	restricted access; usually without guards
Security zone	These projects reflect fear; involve retrofitting fences and gates on public streets; controlling access	City perch	restricted public access in inner city area to limit crime or traffic
		Suburban perch	restricted public access in inner city area to limit crime or traffic
		Barricade perch	closed access to some streets to limit through traffic

Lifestyle communities focus on leisure activities with recreational facilities, common amenities, and shared services at their core. Lifestyle enclaves may include retirement villages, golf communities, or suburban new towns. Developers of such projects seek to commodify community (Hillier and McManus, 1994). They hope to attract residents searching for identity, security, and a shared lifestyle with their neighbours. They seek to create a sense of community through common interests and activities.

Catering to affluent seniors has become a lucrative business for developers. Several chains, such as Leisure World and Sun City, develop gated retirement complexes across the USA. Similar projects, although often on a smaller scale, are appearing in other Western nations with affluent older populations (for example, Grant et al, 2004).

Lifestyle communities often feature golf courses or country clubs. The growth of an affluent cohort of baby-boomers with disposable income and time has created opportunities for developers marketing leisure. Buyers like sharing interests with their neighbours and appreciate the privacy afforded by the gates. Security may be secondary to the amenities offered in the community.

Suburban new towns in the USA are often large master-planned projects containing hundreds to thousands of units with commercial, retail, institutional, and even industrial facilities. Complete towns have appeared in several states. For instance, Green Valley, Nevada, is expected to host 60 000 people by 2005 (Blakely and Snyder, 1997). These enclaves represent security and independence in regions where residents search for safety from crime, drugs, and traffic.

Prestige communities serve as symbols of wealth and status for image-conscious residents. In the late 19th century, prestige developments appeared in many North American cities: homes for industrial magnates and celebrities. Gates prevented the masses from seeing how the wealthy lived. Although these projects featured attractive settings, they did not often include common amenities or facilities.

Blakely and Snyder (1997) identify three types of contemporary prestige communities based on the level of affluence of residents. Homes for the rich and famous provide privacy and seclusion for the most affluent in society. These enclaves feature ornate gates and walls, and are guarded by security forces. They reflect a significant fear of crime against property and person, and the desire of those within to avoid contact with the public. They have become sanctuaries for professional athletes, financiers, and celebrities. Such projects are found near many larger US cities. The attractiveness of the landscape and the quality of security provided are the most important features of these projects. Purchasers are seldom interested in developing a sense of community with their neighbours.

'Top-fifth' projects, as Blakely and Snyder call them, provide options for well-to-do professionals and business people looking for privacy and exclusivity in the residential environment. These projects have attractive gates, and the well-to-do projects employ guards. Promotional material for the developments emphasize security but may not discuss gates. Residents enjoy the comfort of having neighbours who are like themselves. The addresses become a mark of prestige in the local context.

Projects for the executive middle class have gates but usually no guards. These are the lowest end of the prestige community: more expensive than open suburbs, but not offering the level of security enjoyed by higher end enclosed projects.

Security zone communities close off public streets to nonresidents. They reflect a fear of outsiders who disrupt neighbourhoods. Although developers put security in place in the other types of gated communities, in security zones the residents themselves may lobby for and participate in erecting the barriers. As urban problems overwhelm residents, they may request local authorities to close off streets or enclose neighbourhoods to prevent outsiders from gaining access. Walls and gates are erected to deter crime, limit traffic, or maintain property values. Residents generally view gating their streets as a last resort to take back their community. The gates or other barricades are not seen as an amenity, but rather a necessity. These efforts are not without repercussions, as the patterns of movement, especially traffic, are altered to accommodate street closures. Although communities of all income levels have tried to use gating for neighbourhood preservation, wealthy enclaves have proven most successful in achieving their goals of enclosure.

Blakely and Snyder call enclosed urban neighbourhoods 'city perches'. These may be neighbourhoods with particular character or exclusive homes. For instance, areas in Los Angeles have appealed to urban authorities to prevent public access to districts formerly open to through traffic or visitors. 'Suburban perches' reflect the desire of

communities on the urban periphery to prevent access for nonresidents. Both these strategies reflect fear of crime and traffic; residents enjoy the means to provide the infrastructure of enclosure.

The 'barricade perch' is a form which Blakely and Snyder (1997) see as expanding rapidly. These are not fully gated communities. Instead, residents petition the city to close off some streets to restrict access. Grid layouts are thus turned into suburban patterns of cul-de-sac streets. In poor neighbourhoods barricading may reflect a desire to limit drive-by drug dealing or prostitution (Newman, 1995). In middle-class areas it more commonly indicates a wish to reduce through traffic.

The parameters of the model

First and foremost, Blakely and Snyder's (1997) framework differentiates *community function*. Thus their three main categories of enclaves reflect the major purpose of the settlement form. Lifestyle communities attract those for whom common activities and interests prompt home choice. Prestige communities appeal to those for whom status and privacy are paramount concerns. Security zones reflect the fears of neighbourhoods in troubled cities.

Within those categories of functions, the typology adds considerations of the character of *amenities and facilities*, the *level of affluence*, and the *type of security features and spatial patterns*. We note, though, that each of the characteristics apply principally to a single function. For instance, Blakely and Snyder discuss the level of affluence as a key factor in prestige communities, but give it lesser significance in lifestyle and security zone communities. In their model, spatial patterns and security features create subtypes only within security zone communities.

Surprisingly little research has followed up on the landmark study to develop the model further. We would argue that, although Blakely and Snyder made a critically important contribution to the literature, other investigations of gated settlements point to the need for elaborating and refining the simple classification they presented. Most of the literature on contemporary gating has a US focus. As we learn more about the diversity of practice in other countries, and as we look at historical experiences with gating, we can see differences that warrant further consideration. Although classifications will always simplify reality, a useful framework must recognize the degree of variability in gating around the world. We seek to refine the typology of gated communities by adding variables to the classification framework.

The features of gated communities

Our review of the literature on gated communities and the experience with enclaves in Canada leads us to suggest several variables and functions that differentiate kinds of gating. Blakely and Snyder (1997) identified four features in their model.

(1) functions of enclosure,
(2) security features and barriers,
(3) amenities and facilities included,
(4) type of residents.

We propose to add another four dimensions to elaborate the factors that differentiate gated communities.

(5) tenure,
(6) location,
(7) size,
(8) policy context.

These eight characteristics may be expanded into a checklist that would prove useful in case studies of gated projects (see table 2, over).

Table 2. Checklist of features defining gated communities.

Function of enclosure	physical	economic	social	symbolic
	secure people and property	enhance property values	give visual or spatial privacy	display status and power
	create identity for project	protect club amenities	control those inside	control those outside
Security features	*nature of boundary* wall	fence—opaque	physical fence—visually open	symbolic fence—electric
	low fence, chain, or bollard	fence—barbed	speed bumps or chicanes	pavement texture or colour
	faux guard station	mirrored glass on guard house	'private property' signs	'no parking' signs
	hedge or vegetation	topographic feature	water	desert
	swing-arm gate	lift-arm gate	slide gate	swing gate
	nature of security		devices in road bed	guards at designated times
	guards at all times	patrolling guards	card entry	code entry
	auto opener entry	surveillance cameras	armed guards	house alarms
Amenities and facilities	private roads	meeting place	activity centre	recreational facilities
	open space	landscape maintenance	quality design	commercial facilities
	institutional facilities	guards		
Type of resident	homogeneous by age	homogeneous by class	homogeneous by ethnicity, race, status	shared activity (for example, golf)
Tenure	principal residence	secondary residence	seasonal residence	public housing
	fee simple ownership	condominium ownership	land lease	rental
Location	urban	suburban	exurban	rural
	infill	greenfield	resort destination	inner-city
Size	cul-de-sac pod	neighbourhood (tens to hundreds of units)	village (hundreds of units, some commercial)	town (thousands of units and mix of uses)
Policy context	restricts gating	enables gating	growing area	stable or declining area

Function of enclosure

> "In the first instance, discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space."
>
> Foucault (1977, page 141)

Although walls and gates may look similar across cultures, they have a range of functions: physical, economic, social, and symbolic. Gates may keep residents inside, or may keep nonresidents out. Through the course of time, the functions of enclosure may change.[1] Inevitably, though, an enclosure affects the way that people navigate and use space. Following Foucault (1977), we would argue that gates reflect the exercise of power and discipline over space.

Lifestyle developments are common internationally, although they vary in character. Enclosure limits access to shared amenities within the lifestyle community. The walls and gates restrict 'club goods' to community members (Webster, 2002; Webster and Lai, 2003). For seasonally occupied homes, the gates also limit off-season vandalism and theft.

One of the key functions of gating for prestige developments is protecting *property values*. A growing consensus suggests that gating increases the cost of development and return to investors (Bible and Hsieh, 2001; LaCour-Little and Malpezzi, 2001; McGoey, 2003). The developer, then, builds the gates to attract affluent buyers and improve sales. Buyers accept the utility of the gates as a long-term investment.

Walls and gates also provide *visual separation*. In some cultures, walls shelter certain members of society (for example, women) from the curious gaze of strangers. In ancient cities in Asia the nobility often separated themselves from the masses with extensive walls and guarded gates. Privacy clearly has substantial appeal to the most affluent in contemporary cities, and accounts for extensive use of visual barriers. In some cases authorities may elect to keep their agents enclosed: for instance, military bases may include housing for troops, separating soldiers from those they patrol.

Security zone developments have *defensive functions*. In communities around the world, people have used fences and walls to offer domestic security. Enclosed compounds may include only a few houses or entire settlements. The walls may safeguard domestic animals and children. They may keep natural elements at bay: flood waters, drifting sand, dangerous predators. Walls promise to protect inhabitants from crime and chaos. 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 (Landman, 2003a).

In nations plagued by violence or war, walled camps may develop to *separate feuding peoples*, or to *control subject or dangerous peoples*. Greenstein et al (2000) note that segregation can be government enforced or commanded in areas of Latin America. Given the chaos of some regions of the world, the middle and upper classes may feel that they have no choice but to gate themselves off from the disorder outside (*Business Day* 1999; Canin, 1998; Faiola, 2002; Paulin, 1997). In other cases, walls enclose the dangerous elements: whether foreign workers or members of feared minorities. Enforced enclosure has appeared in many cities through history. Ancient Chinese urban authorities locked the gates to residential quarters at night to control workers (Wright, 1967). Within the old cities of the Middle East, ethnic and religious quarters had gates that closed at dusk. In an extreme example the Nazis confined Jews to enclaves, ghettos, and

[1] The wall around a university in Caracas, Venezuela serves as a case in point. First built by an authoritarian government to control and contain student protests, the wall later functioned to protect the campus from traffic and crime in the wider city (personal communication from Enrique Vilas who teaches planning at the University of Venezuela).

camps managed by walls, barbed wire, and machine guns. From the 1940s until 1989, a great wall surrounded Berlin, limiting communication and exchange between those within and outside the wall. Today, refugee-receiving nations may create detention camps to manage migrants waiting for their cases to be considered. In such cases gates functioned not only to keep others out, but to lock a defined group inside. The walls simplify surveillance and signify social distance and control (Lianos, 2003).

Walls have also been built for *personal aggrandizement* (Morris, 1994). For instance, in 604 BC, Nebuchadnezzar built tall concentric walls around Babylon, filling the space between with earth (Benevolo, 1980; Schneider, 1963). The massive wall demonstrated the king's power and authority over a vast empire as he reigned from the magnificent buttressed city. The ornate walls that surround gated enclaves today may be more modest in scale, but they clearly constitute status markers and identity icons for inhabitants.

Judd (1995, page 160) suggests that "The new gated communities are remarkably like the walled cities of the medieval world, constructed to keep the hordes at bay." The walls of medieval towns offered protection against enemies and roving bandits. The strength of the walls reflected the seriousness of the threat. In peaceful and lawful times, the walls deteriorated while the suburbs grew outside. Perhaps the most important function of medieval gates in times of peace was to *control access* to the city to collect taxes and manage trade (Morris, 1994; Pirenne, 1925). Concern about controlling traffic and pedestrian access remains a key issue for the inhabitants of gated enclaves. The gate provides part of what Foucault (1977) might have called the architecture of control, both for those inside and those outside: it reinforces the need for surveillance and the importance of a social order where everyone knows his or her place.

Security features
Blakely and Snyder alluded to the range of technologies available to promote security in US communities in the mid-1990s. Their typology reflects many of the options available to gated projects. We may, however, expand the discussion beyond the types of gates and guarding available to consider also the nature of the boundary used, and the range of security features found.

Nature of the boundary
Boundaries around communities serve several functions: they create visual screening, permit privacy, define property, and limit access. Some are easily permeable, whereas others are high or opaque. Some create character and identity, whereas others inspire fear and loathing. Some are physical, whereas others may be psychological or symbolic.

In many cases natural features such as water, ravines, or forests function as boundaries to enclaves. These do not prevent access for nonresidents, but they regulate the degree of difficulty of access and the distance from any public goods which non-residents may want to share (Webster, 2002). Such boundaries appear commonly in areas where prestige concerns or seasonal vacancy issues encourage gating. Full boundaries with high walls or fences are more common for gated communities where crime or violence generate enclosure. In extreme situations the walls may carry electric current or be topped with barbed wire.

Greenberg and Rohe (1984) demonstrated that communities with well-defined boundaries and less permeable road networks had lower crime rates than did neigh-bourhoods with an open street system. Perhaps homebuyers are correct, then, in believing gated communities safer (Atlas and LeBlanc, 1994). Nostalgia for a physically defined community perimeter also plays a role in convincing residents that community boundaries are important (Greinacher, 1995; Hillier and McManus, 1994; Knack, 1995).

Walls may be reinforced through social barriers. In exclusive gated projects, only those with the means available can become insiders. Rules for dress, grooming, or deportment may make those who belong inside (or outside) the walls instantly identifiable. Guards wear uniforms to confirm their authority to exclude (or to confine). Signs asking "visitors to report to office" discourage access by those who may not look as if they belong. The wall presents a significant psychological device to define who is or is not a member of the club, and to discipline those who may wish to cross the boundary.

Gates and access barriers control entry and egress, especially for vehicles. In some cases barriers do not inhibit pedestrian movement, but simply prevent cars and trucks from entering. The degree of enclosure offered by the gate clearly reflects the level of security, privacy, and traffic concerns of residents. Where fear reigns, gates exclude the uninvited or intern the suspected.

The types of gates used vary considerably. Simple swing arms with padlocks fasten country lanes in areas where people have seasonal homes. Lifting arms or complete swinging gates require electronic mechanisms and may involve key, card, code, or guard operation. Streets may be barricaded to through traffic by chains strung across, fences built, planters arranged, or bollards erected.

Some neighbourhoods find strategies for discouraging visitors without applying full gating. They may use speed bumps or bump-outs for traffic calming. Signs advertising "private road" or "no through traffic" make strangers feel unwelcome. Alternating times or days of gate closures may discourage through traffic (LaCour-Little and Malpezzi, 2001). Parking lots at the entrance to projects, or roads paved with nonstandard materials, also convey the sense that the visitor is entering private space.

Faux-gated entries employ structures to give the appearance of guard houses. Mirrored glass on guard houses prevents visitors from knowing if guards are on duty. The false guard house may provide a receptacle for mail boxes for residents, may store equipment, or may become a play area for children. Should the project be modified, the building could become a real guard station. Oliver (2002) reports that faux gates are on the increase in California; they also appear in Canadian suburbs. They symbolize exclusivity without carrying the maintenance costs of full enclosure.

Nature of security
Features that provide security, privacy, and control are central to many gated communities today. At the high end, projects have 24-hour-a-day roving armed guards and video (closed-circuit television) surveillance. Devices in the road bed may puncture the tires of vehicles trying to crash through the gates. Homes have private alarms tied in to central security services. Although such measures may reassure residents that their homes provide sanctuary from the risks of the world, they also expose the fear of community members (Caldeira, 2000; Low, 2003).

Gated communities in insecure areas tend to employ more expensive and extensive security devices than gated communities in low-crime areas. Where gating is used as a niche marketing strategy in Canadian urban regions, for instance, it may involve only a simple lift or swing gate that impedes car entry by strangers (Carey, 1997; Elton, 1999). Isolated developments in rural areas may have little need for elaborate security measures: distance provides reassurance that a simple arm gate is enough.

Maintaining security has proven a challenge to residents' associations and developers. Gate codes quickly pass to nonresidents (Canin, 1998; Dorsett and O'Brien, 1996). Vandals and frustrated motorists damage gates. Managing guards is costly and time consuming. Residents can come to find the gates a nuisance because, for instance, their guests may be turned away. Electronic systems have weaknesses and sometimes fail (Chisdes, 2000). Hence new security options keep appearing.

Table 3. Classifying gated communities through a continuum of 'enclosure'.

Type	Boundary	Road access	Notes
Ornamental gating	no marked boundary	landmark gates at entry	Feature gates showing the subdivision name are placed at the major entries to give identity to an area.
Walled subdivisions	opaque fence or wall	open	Fully walled subdivisions are a common suburban feature in western Canadian cities. Cars and pedestrians may enter.
Faux-gated entries	opaque wall or fence	narrowed entry, removable chains or bollards, guard house	Some subdivisions have physical features that look like guard houses or private entries to discourage uninvited vehicles from entering.
Barricaded streets	no marked boundary	public streets closed by fences, planters, or concrete barriers	Many cities barricade streets creating cul-de-sac streets within the grid as a form of traffic control. Pedestrian access remains open.
Partially gated roads	no marked boundary	lift or swing arm	Rural cottage subdivisions may feature gates that are only closed for part of the year. Communities on First Nations Reserves may have gates but no walls. Pedestrian access is open.
Fully gated roads	natural features such as water or ravines	lift or swing arm	Prestige communities on islands, peninsulas, or remote areas may limit access through combined natural and man-made features.
Restricted entry bounded areas	fence or wall, and/or natural features that limit access	gate with limited control access	Suburban communities may completely restrict public access; video or telephone systems may allow visitors to be vetted by residents.
Restricted entry, guarded areas	fence or wall, and/or natural features that limit access	gate with limited control access; security guards, police or army	Suburban communities may completely restrict public access; video or telephone systems allow visitors to be vetted by residents. US-style gated communities have guards at the gates or patrolling the premises. In some zones guards may carry automatic weapons.

Planners and researchers may use and understand the term 'gated' in a variety of ways. 'Walled' and 'gated' communities are sometimes seen as synonymous, but clearly involve different levels of enclosure. A study of Canadian planners found little consensus on how the term was used (Grant, 2003). This leads us to suggest that we might propose a continuum of enclosure in gated communities, as outlined in table 3. In the continuum the degree of enclosure proceeds from the largely symbolic or psychological, to the fully physical, as the architecture of control becomes more explicit (Foucault, 1977).

Ornamental gating is on the low end of the continuum, with a marked entry way to the development, but no methods for preventing access. A large proportion of new suburbs have some kind of landmark gate feature with the marketing name of the project prominently displayed. This kind of enclosure primarily functions to give identity to that within.

Walled subdivisions have fences or walls that separate them from neighbouring suburbs. Sometimes the walls run alongside collector roads. Local streets into such developments remain open, and are usually public; if they use private roads built to narrower standards than public thoroughfares, then visitors may hesitate to enter. Walled developments can easily be converted to fully enclosed settlements with the addition of gates or guards.

Barricaded streets generally appear in inner-city areas where some streets are closed to reduce traffic. Pedestrians can still move through the development, as walls are seldom constructed to accompany the barricades. In some cases the barricades enclose those within, but they may be seen as controlling problems outside the neighbourhood.

Fully gated roads may limit traffic access to developments isolated by natural features such as water, ravines, forest, or mountains. Distance to the homes, or signs limiting trespassing, may dissuade pedestrians from walking around the barriers and eliminate the need for full walls.

Restricted entry roads with full perimeter fencing strictly limit access. In such projects, physical boundaries replace the psychological boundaries and strictly segregate the space. Technological devices managed by the residents control access.

Restricted entry roads with guards controlling access are on the high end of the enclosure continuum, with a full range of security features and continual administrative surveillance. This latter form is rare in the Canadian context (Grant et al, 2004), but common in the USA and Brazil (Caldeira, 2000; Low, 2003). Public housing projects that have implemented full gating also would fall here on the continuum.

Amenities and facilities
Blakely and Snyder identify three key sets of amenities and facilities associated with retirement, golf and leisure, and suburban new town gated communities. As we look at enclaves around the world, the nature of goods shared vary. Civil infrastructure such as private roads are common. In affluent projects, shared meeting spaces and recreational facilities, and management-organized project maintenance are typically offered. In some Third World cities, enclaves may provide potable water or other services not available from public authorities (Webster and Lai, 2003).

Enclaves range from having few amenities to constituting complete towns. Seasonal cottage developments may have private roads that are impassable in winter when routes are covered with snow, and full-service master-planned communities offer shopping malls, schools, industry, recreational departments, and police. The availability of amenities and facilities within the enclave may affect the degree of interaction with the world outside, and so has major implications for social integration and exchange. The more self-contained a community is, the less frequently inhabitants need to venture outside.

We might hypothesize that, in situations where fear is intense, residents are more likely to be interested in full-service settlements full of people like themselves. Risk increases the value of security club goods and augments the size of the group willing to contribute the costs of membership. Alphaville, a gated community outside São Paulo, Brazil, has all of the facilities needed so that people can avoid venturing into the streets, where they worry about crimes such as murder and kidnapping (Caldeira, 2000; Faiola, 2002). Greater availability of facilities and services within the enclave may both reflect and generate greater social distance between the gated community and society outside. In fact, in the largest gated projects, we often find enclosed neighbourhoods within: the walls may limit social mixing even between the classes who can gain admission.

Type of residents

Blakely and Snyder acknowledge the significance of segregation by class, age, and race in US gated communities. Those inside the walls of contemporary gated enclaves fall into two categories. Those who move into walls *by choice* are typically economically privileged, sometimes ethnically or age segregated (Maharidge, 1994); in the USA they are pre-dominantly white and homeowners (Sanchez and Lang, 2002). In some contexts we may find segregation by ethnicity, religion, or ideology. For instance, in Indonesia some members of the ethnic Chinese community are clustering in gated communities (Leisch, 2003). Even street gangs in the USA colonize different enclaves (*The Financial Post* 1997). Those living in gated public housing projects in the USA are typically renters and Hispanic (Sanchez and Lang, 2002); they have relatively few choices in the housing market.

Gated communities may provide a means for people to separate themselves from the unknown or feared 'other' (Byers, 2003), or to congregate with others who share their world view. Instead of dealing with social problems, the residents of gated communities may in some cases resist civic duties beyond the wall (*Business Day* 1999; Faiola, 2002; Greenstein et al, 2000; Kathlene, 2001). Separation "encodes class relations and residential (race/class/ethnic/gender) segregation ... permanently in the built environment" (Low, 2001, page 45). In postapartheid South Africa, middle-class Afrikaans neighbourhoods are rushing to organize to wall themselves off (Landman, 2003b). Although mixed use and promoting diversity may be a common theme in contemporary planning dogma (Grant, 2002), mixing rarely occurs in gated projects. The principal appeals made in advertising, at least for adult communities, talk about homogeneity and commonality of interests among potential residents (Maxwell, 2004).

Age-restricted gated projects prove especially popular with wealthy seniors. 'Young' seniors may move to active adult communities in their late fifties or early sixties. As they age, so does the community. New services and amenities may be required to meet their changing needs. The abilities and needs of the residents have significant implications for the character of the enclave and its impact on neighbourhoods outside.

Some gated communities appeal essentially to immigrants or expatriates, and do not integrate with the local context. In Nova Scotia, Canada, some high-end seasonal communities set their prices in US dollars (Fox Harb'r, 2003; Mittelsteadt, 2003). Projects in resort destinations in the Caribbean also appeal to foreign tourists (Gonzalez, 2000; Rancho Cartagena, 1999). Judd (1995, page 146) says that "... the recent enclosure of urban space replaces organic processes of the marketplace and residential community with hierarchical control by corporate bureaucracies and developers". Moreover, the proliferation of gated communities clearly reveals some of the ways in which the processes of globalization exacerbate the polarization of the haves and the have-nots.

Tenure

The suburban gated new towns and prestige communities in the USA are primarily first homes for the owner-residents. We also see, however, a substantial second-home gated market, especially in age-restricted and leisure communities. Some individuals may have summer homes in northern enclaves and winter ones in southern climes.

The gated community appeals to the seasonal resident because it offers a measure of security against vandalism and theft while the owner lives elsewhere. Seasonal communities generate different requirements than year-round settlements. Their membership and composition can shift dramatically through the course of the year, creating challenges to establishing community and security (Stocks, 2000).

Many gated projects target owner-occupiers. Some enclaves are let on long-term leases; this is a common practice in the United Kingdom, and also on Aboriginal lands in parts of Canada. As Sanchez and Lang (2002) indicate, however, a substantial number of renters live in US gated communities. Some of these rental properties may be social housing, gated for security reasons. In other cases gated projects may appeal to seniors with an interest in renting.

McGoey (2003) notes the challenges of providing security in rental projects where tenants may be young and unreliable. As a consequence, projects aimed at a wealthier segment of the market are more likely to exclude renters than to cater to them. Some communities with on-site management services do, however, help property owners with renting their properties when they are not in residence.

Location

Most of the gated communities Blakely and Snyder describe in the USA are in urban or suburban sites. Elsewhere, enclaves may also appear in exurban areas and rural regions. Mittelsteadt (2003) notes that the rural enclaves found in Nova Scotia are generally small seasonal developments, with just a few houses in each. Projects around golf courses or major leisure amenities tend to be larger, with a few hundred homes. Projects in the commuter-shed of large US urban centres in the west or south may have thousands of homes occupied year round.

Location is clearly tied to other variables that drive gating. For instance, fear of crime and rates of crime vary. Extreme poverty, violence, and lawlessness occur more commonly in some parts of the world than in others, thus encouraging those with means to look for residential solutions to the threats they face. We do find, however, that gated enclaves are appearing both in rich and in poor countries, in the North and South, and in developed and developing nations. The pattern of gating within countries clearly reflects local factors. For instance, in England gating is happening primarily around London and in the southeast (Atkinson et al, 2003). In Europe gating remains remarkably rare. In the USA it hits the south and the west (Blakely and Snyder, 1997), and in Canada is largely a west coast issue (Grant et al, 2004). Understanding the patterns requires considerable knowledge of the political and economic drivers related to local conditions.

Gating creates controversy in some places because enclosures can limit access to public spaces (such as ocean shore), or change traffic patterns on public streets. Enclaves can privatise the public realm, depriving local residents of access to community resources (Gonzalez, 2000; Webster, 2002). Those resources most in demand may be most vulnerable to privatisation. Although, as Webster and Lai (2003) note, societies that respect private property inevitably experience a level of exclusion, democratic discourse provides venues in which those deprived of formerly shared goods may challenge perceived spatial inequities. Thus gating can create social rifts in communities.

Size

Critics of gated communities say they are not real 'communities', whereas those who inhabit enclaves often point to the sense of community they feel within. The issue is far from resolved. We can see, though, that the size of the enclosure clearly affects social functions and characteristics. Some enclaves are small developments of only a few houses; these tend to have few common amenities other than the road and wall. Others may be neighbourhoods of dozens of homes, with shared facilities such as a club house or swimming pool. Village-sized developments will have limited commercial uses. A few gated communities are the size of towns or cities: they have a full suite of facilities and may incorporate as municipal units. The size affects not only the kinds of amenities in the settlement, but also the way in which residents interact, and the level of security provided. The larger the settlement, the greater the chance that it reflects some level of social or economic diversity, and that it may become all encompassing in meeting residents' needs. In the largest enclaves, residents may virtually secede from public life outside.

Policy context

The policy context affects how and under what conditions communities can close themselves off from others. Some jurisdictions place few limits on gating, or lack the police powers to prevent neighbourhoods from enclosing themselves (Landman, 2003b). Some cities essentially encourage it (McKenzie, 2003). In other areas local policy may restrict or limit gating (Grant, 2003).

Gated communities in the USA may be planned under special district provisions (for example, planned unit development) or as condominium (common interest development) projects. They have their own management, first under the project developer, and later under homeowners' associations. The association provides services that in cities would be the responsibility of local government (such as garbage collection, police, and street maintenance). This policy context reflects a distrust of government and a weak planning regime that can enhance commitment to the private community (Egan, 1995; McKenzie, 1994; El Nasser, 2000). Thus the residents of private communities may resist efforts to apply external regulations. Projects that provide their own local services ease pressure on governments which currently lack resources to provide adequate urban infrastructure. In the process the gated community grows distant from the public realm and the rules that govern it (Drummond, 1998); the club realm increasingly takes over essential services (Webster and Lai, 2003).

Nations with a strong tradition of local land-use planning or highly centralized planning authority may react differently to proposals for gated communities than do nations with laissez-faire customs. This may explain the more limited occurrence and size of projects in Europe, the United Kingdom, and Canada than in the USA.

Areas experiencing rapid or uneven growth may be more likely to attract gated developments than areas that are stable or declining. Although regions with strong growth may be more concerned about issues of mix and connectivity, they also have highly segmented and competitive housing markets. Developers are able to position their projects through devices such as enclosure. Local government officials rarely have the power to prevent gating, even if it contravenes local policy.

As authorities look at developing policy to control or manage gated communities, they consider several questions about the potential of the strategy to meet local objectives. Is the project self-governing or a residential enclave within an established political unit? How does the settlement integrate with the larger community? What impact will gating have on the larger community? How might it affect traffic and crime patterns? Will it contribute to urban fragmentation, social segregation, and perceptions of crime? Because communities find different responses to these questions, their approaches to gating vary.

Moving toward theory

In examining practice in the range of nations that have enclosed residential environments, we see that gated communities prove incredibly diverse. Enclaves vary along several dimensions. We suggest that efforts to categorize the physical form of gated communities need to take account of at least eight factors: the functions of enclosure, the security features and barriers employed, the amenities and facilities included, the types of residents accommodated, tenure type, location, size, and the policy context.

Blakely and Snyder (1997) developed a relatively straightforward typology based principally on function. We described another classification (in table 3) that reflects the degree of enclosure identified in gated projects. Each of these categorizations has some utility in differentiating the forms we may find, but alone they offer a limited picture of the varieties of gated communities that exist.

Alternatively, we might use the factors identified to paint a detailed portrait of each gated community. As case studies of practice become increasingly available, we will expect to find that some clustering of attributes occurs. For instance, Canadian gated projects are often relatively small (fewer than 100 units), suburban townhouse complexes, aimed at senior citizens, most often located in southern British Columbia, and with medium-high fences but no guards (Grant et al, 2004). Sanchez and Lang (2002) reveal two models of US gated communities: the first involves affluent white owner-occupied projects in suburban areas of the south and west; the second involves Hispanic renters often in public housing projects in the inner city. We can expect the constellation of characteristics of gated projects in other countries to differ dramatically, as they respond to divergent local circumstances.

Through examining the divergence in gating as an urban form in contemporary globalized culture, we can see that gating is not a unitary phenomenon. At the macrolevel, gating reflects the increasing polarization of the wealthy from the poor and presents a spatial strategy for social segregation based around limited amenities (including privacy and traffic control). At the microlevel, though, we discover that gates are appearing for different reasons, in a range of circumstances, and with contrasting effects. Developing comprehensive theory to both explain and describe the phenomenon requires considerably more case-study information and internationally comparative work in the years to come. This paper contributes to the effort by establishing some of the key factors that differentiate types of gated enclaves.

References

Anthony L, 1997, "Safe and sound behind the gate" *Maclean's* 21 July, page 25

Arnot C, 2002, "Laager toffs" *The Guardian* 30 January

Atkinson R, Flint J, Blandy S, Lister D, 2003, "Fortress UK? Gated communities, the spatial revolt of the elites and time – space trajectories of segregation", paper presented at Gated Communities: Building Division or Safer Communities?, 18 – 19 September, Glasgow, http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/atkinson.doc

Atlas R, LeBlanc W G, 1994, "The impact on crime of street closures and barricades: a Florida case study" *Security Journal* **5** 140 – 145

Baron L M, 1998, "The great gate debate" *Builder* March, pp 92 – 100

BBC News, 2002, " 'Gated' community warning", 29 November, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/2518747.stm

Benevolo L, 1980 *History of the City* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)

Bible D S, Hsieh C, 2001, "Gated communities and residential property values" *The Appraisal Journal* **69**(2) 140 – 145

Blakely E, 1999, "The gated community debate" *Urban Land* **58**(6) 50 – 55

Blakely E J, Snyder M G, 1997 *Fortress America: Gating Communities in the United States* (Brookings Institution Press and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Washington, DC)

Business Day (South Africa), 1999, "You can run, but not hide", 30 April, page 15

Byers M, 2003, "Waiting at the gate: the new postmodern promised lands", in *Suburban Sprawl: Culture, Ecology and Politics* Eds H Bartling, M Lindstrom (Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD) pp 23 – 44

Caldeira T P R, 2000 *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paulo* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)

Canin B C, 1998, "Mastering crime in the master planned community", in *Trends and Innovations in Master-planned Communities* Eds A Schmidt, L W Bookout (Urban Land Institute, Washington, DC)

Carey E, 1997, "Metro joins trend to guarded communities" *The Toronto Star* 15 June, page A1

Carvalho M, Varkki G R, Anthony K H, 1997, "Residential satisfaction in condominios exclusivos in Brazil" *Environment and Behavior* **29** 734 – 768

Chisdes J, 2000, "Gated communities promote false security, segregation" *Content of Character* 20 September, http://www.chisdes.com/gated.html

Dear M, 1992, "Understanding and overcoming the NIMBY syndrome" *Journal of the American Planning Association* **58** 288 – 300

Dillon D, 1994, "Fortress America" *Planning* **60**(6) 8 – 12

Dinka N, 1997, "Gated communities arrive in Canada" *ID Magazine* **6**(20) 24 July – 20 August, http://www.idmagazine.com

Dorsett A, O'Brien S J, 1996, "Special report: gated communities" *Plano Star Courier* 24 November

Drummond D, 1998, "On the art of being a citizen" *McGill News: Alumni Quarterly* Fall, http://ww2.mcgill.ca/alumni/news/f98/epilogue.htm

Egan T, 1995, "Many seek security in private communities: the serene fortress" *New York Times* 3 September, pp 1, 22

Ellin N (Ed.), 1997 *Architecture of Fear* (Princeton Architectural Press, New York)

El Nasser H, 2000, "Gated communities frustrate: census methods to reach poor now being used on rich" *USA Today* 9 June, page 03A

Elton S, 1999, "Residents find gateway to haven: gated communities under siege" *The Globe and Mail* 2 December, page E1

epxNews, 2002, "Gated communities 'dividing society' ", http://www.epolitix.com/EN/

Faiola A, 2002, "Brazil's elites fly above their fears: rich try to wall off urban violence" *The Washington Post* 1 June, page A1

Foucault M, 1977 *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* translated by A Sheridan (Vintage Books, New York)

Fox Harb'r, 2003, "Fox Harb'r living", http://www.foxharbr.com/living.html

Gated communities SA cities, 2003, "Specific characteristics of South African cities", http://www.gatedcomsa.co.za

Glasze G, 2003, "Some reflections on the economic and political organisation of private neighbourhoods", paper presented at Gated Communities: Building Division or Safer Communities?, 18 – 19 September, Glasgow, http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/glasze.doc

Golby J, 1999, "Gated communities: the fortress frontier", bachelor's thesis, Department of Geography, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Gonzalez D, 2000, "Bahamians resent the loss of beaches to luxury" *New York Times* 29 February, page A4

Grant J, 2002, "Mixed use in theory and practice: Canadian experience with implementing a planning principle" *Journal of the American Planning Association* **68** 71 – 84

Grant J, 2003, "Do Canadian planners have the tools to deal with 'gated communities'?", paper presented at the Canadian Institute of Planners conference, Halifax, http://www.cip-icu.ca/English/conference/proceedings/grant.pdf

Grant J, Green K, Maxwell K, 2004, "The planning and policy implications of gated communities" *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* **13**(1) supplement: *Canadian Planning and Policy* pp 70 – 88

Greenberg S W, Rohe W, 1984, "Neighborhood design and crime" *Journal of the American Planning Association* **50** 48 – 61

Greenstein R, Sabatini F, Smolka M, 2000, "Urban spatial segregation: forces, consequences and policy" *Land Lines* **12**(6), http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/pub-detail.asp?id=276

Greinacher U, 1995, "The new reality; media technology and urban fortress" *Journal of Architectural Education* **48**(3) 178 – 184

Haysom I, 1996, "Gated communities on the increase—but no armed guards yet", Southam newspapers, Background in depth, National and international news, 14 February, http://www.southam.com

Helsley R, Strange W, 1999, "Gated communities and the economic geography of crime" *Journal of Urban Economics* **46** 80 – 105

Hillier J, McManus P, 1994, "Pull up the drawbridge: fortress mentality in the suburbs", in *Metropolis Now: Planning and the Urban in Contemporary Australia* Eds K Gibson, S Watson (Pluto Press, Sydney) pp 91 – 107

Hornblower M, 1988, "Not in my backyard, you don't" *TIME* 27 June, pp 58 – 59

Hubert C, Delsohn G, 1996, "In age of unease, some appreciate Big Brotherly vigilance" *Sacramento Bee* 3 December, http://www.sacbee.com/news/projects/terror/bigbrother.html

Judd D R, 1995, "The rise of the new walled cities", in *Spatial Practices: Critical Explorations in Social/Spatial Theory* Eds H Liggett, D C Perry (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA) pp 144 – 166

Jurgens U, Gnad M, 2003, "Gated communities in the Johannesburg area—experiences from South Africa" *Parole!* http://parole.aporee.org/work/hier.php3?spec_id=11953&words_id=356

Kathlene L, 2001, "The suburbanators: without special efforts to build civic engagement, suburbs will continue to be social incubators of anti-sustainable behavior" *Alternatives* **27**(2) 36 – 37

Knack R E, 1995, "Master planned lite" *Planning* **61**(10) 4 – 9

Koskela H, 2000, " 'The gaze without eyes': video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space" *Progress in Human Geography* **24** 243 – 265

LaCour-Little M, Malpezzi S, 2001, "Gated communities and property values", manuscript, contact authors at michael.lacour-little@wellsfargo.com, smalpezzi@bus.wisc.edu

Landman K, 2003a *Gated Communities in South Africa: A National Survey. CSIR Pretoria*

Landman K, 2003b, "Alley-gating and neighbourhood gating: are they two sides of the same face?", paper presented at Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?, 18 – 19 September, Glasgow, http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/landman.doc

Leisch H, 2003, "Gated communities in Indonesia" *Parole!*, http://parole.aporee.org/work/hier.php3?spec_11955&words_id=356

Lianos M, 2003, "Social control after Foucault" *Surveillance and Society* **1** 412 – 430 http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles1(3)/AfterFoucault.pdf

Liebner J, 2003, "Downsizers find community spirit at London site" *Toronto Star* online, 4 January http://www.thestar.com

Low S M, 2001, "The edge and the center: gated communities and the discourse of urban fear" *American Anthropologist* **103**(1) 45 – 58

Low S, 2003 *Behind the Gates; Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America* (Routledge, New York)

McGoey C E, 2003, "Gated community; access control issues" *Crime Doctor* http://www.crimedoctor.com/gated.htm

McKenzie E, 1994 *Privatopia: Homeowners Associations and the Rise of Residential Private Government* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT)

McKenzie E, 2003, "Private gated communities in the American urban fabric: emerging trends in their production, practices, and regulation", paper presented at Gated Communities: Building Division or Safer Communities?, 18 – 19 September, Glasgow, http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/gated/mckenzie.doc

Maharidge D, 1994, "Walled off" *Mother Jones* November/December pp 26 – 33

Marcuse P, 1997, "Walls of fear and walls of support", in *Architecture of Fear* Ed. N Ellin (Princeton Architectural Press, New York) pp 101 – 114

Maxwell K D, 2004, "Gated communities: selling the good life", master's thesis, School of Planning, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Medearis S L, 1999, "Riga gets housing villages" *Baltic Times* 15 July

Mittelsteadt L, 2003, "A case study of gated communities in Nova Scotia", thesis, Master of Urban and Rural Planning, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Morris A E J, 1994 *History of Urban Form Before the Industrial Revolutions* (Longman Scientific and Technical, Harlow, Essex)

Morris E, 1996, "Community in theory and practice: a framework for intellectual renewal" *Journal of Planning Literature* **11**(1) 127 – 150

Newman O, 1995, "Defensible space: a new physical planning tool for urban revitalization" *Journal of the American Planning Association* **61** 149 – 155

Oaff B, 2003, "Is Britain about to close the gates?" *The Guardian* 15 March

Oliver M, 2002, "Gated communities: the big bluff" *Planetizen* excerpted from the Los Angeles
Times, 28 May 2002, http://www.planetizen.com

Paulin D, 1997, "Rising crime rate has city dwellers seeking safety in apartments and gated
communities" *The Globe and Mail* 23 September, page A12

Pirenne H, 1925 *Medieval Cities: Their Origins and the Revival of Trade* (Doubleday Anchor Books,
Garden City, NY) reprinted 1956

Rancho Cartagena, 1999, "Rancho Cartagena, Guanacaste, Costa Rica",
http://www.acquirecostarica.com/list_rc_101.htm

Raposo R, 2003, "Gated communities in the Lisbon metropolitan area" *Parole!*
http://parole.aporee.org/work/hier.php3?spec_id=11959&words_id=356

Rural and Small Town Research, 1992, "Guidelines for action: understanding housing-related
NIMBY", Rural and Small Town Studies Program, Mount Allison University, Amherst, NS

Sanchez T W, Lang R E, 2002, "Security versus status: the two worlds of gated communities"
Draft Census Note 02:02 (November), Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech
http://www.mi.vt.edu/Files/Gated%20Census%20Note11-19.pdf

Schneider W, 1963 *Babylon is Everywhere: The City as Man's Fate* (Hodder and Stoughton, London)

Shouse N, Silverman R, 1999, "Public facilities in gated communities" *Urban Land* **58**(6) 54

Stocks C, 2000, "The gate's closed" *Wallpaper* September, pp 71 – 76

Talen E, 2000, "The problem with community in planning" *Journal of Planning Literature* **15**(2)
171 – 183

The Financial Post 1997, "A look behind the fortress gates", 24 September, page 61

Thuillier G, 2003, "Gated communities in the greater Buenos Aires" *Parole!* http://parole.aporee.org/
work/hier.php3?spec_id=11951&words_id=356

Townshend I, 2002, "Age-segregated and gated retirement communities in the third age: the
differential contribution of place – community to self-actualization" *Environment and Planning
B: Planning and Design* **29** 371 – 396

Webster C, 2002, "Property rights and the public realm: gates, green belts, and Gemeinschaft"
Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design **29** 397 – 412

Webster C, Lai L W-C, 2003 *Property Rights, Planning and Markets: Managing Spontaneous
Cities* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, Glos)

Webster C, Glasze G, Frantz K, 2002, "The global spread of gated communities" *Environment
and Planning B: Planning and Design* **29** 315 – 320

Wilson-Doenges G, 2000, "An exploration of sense of community and fear of crime in gated
communities" *Environment and Behavior* **32** 597 – 611

Wright A, 1967, "Chang'an", in *Cities of Destiny* Ed. A Toynbee (Thames and Hudson, London)
pp 138 – 149

Yelaja P, 2003, "Safe and sound as the iron gates swing shut" *Toronto Star* online, 18 January,
http://torontostar.com/