

Author Accepted Manuscript

Title: Toward ecological place management in UK housing associations: Organising tomorrow's places

Authors: James Scott Vandeventer, Javier Lloveras, Gary Warnaby

DOI: 10.1108/JPMD-11-2021-0113

To appear in: *Journal of Place Management and Development*

Date accepted for publication: 21 July 2022

Please cite this article as: Vandeventer, J.S., Lloveras, J., Warnaby, G., 2022. Toward ecological place management in UK housing associations: Organising tomorrow's places. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. doi: 10.1108/JPMD-11-2021-0113

Structured Abstract:

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to conceptualise how place management practices in UK housing associations involve processes of ecological place management.

Design/methodology/approach

Ethnographic fieldwork focussing on how communal spaces are organised on a housing estate in a UK city revealed the importance of negotiation with other actors, including a housing association which is responsible for managing the estate. We draw on extensive participant observation with residents, as well as interviews with both residents and employees of the housing association, to show the wider forces and complexities involved in these ecological place management practices.

Findings

The paper identifies hybrid socio-ecological, socio-political, and political-economic dynamics unfolding as places are managed and organised. These widen the scope of place management research and practice to account for multiple ways places are organised.

Originality

The paper contributes to unveiling the complexity involved in place management and organisation, thereby encouraging place managers to embrace ecological thinking capable of addressing future challenges.

Research implications

The paper offers a critical perspective on place management, developing an ecological approach that is applicable both to the relatively new context of housing and to more established sites in town and city centres.

Practical implications

The paper's findings point to ways that housing and place management practitioners, both in the UK and elsewhere, can use an ecological approach to reframe their strategic and practical actions with regards to 'place.'

Keywords: ecological place management; housing; housing associations; organising; ethnography; critical perspective

This author accepted manuscript (AAM) is deposited under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial International Licence 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0). licence. Any reuse is allowed in accordance with the terms outlined by the licence. To reuse the AAM for commercial purposes, permission should be sought by contacting permissions@emeraldinsight.com.

For the sake of clarity, commercial usage would be considered as, but not limited to:

- Copying or downloading AAMs for further distribution for a fee;
- Any use of the AAM in conjunction with advertising;
- Any use of the AAM by for promotional purposes by for-profit organisations;
- Any use that would confer monetary reward, commercial gain or commercial exploitation.

Toward ecological place management in UK housing associations: Organising tomorrow's places

I. Introduction

A discourse of 'place' is increasingly being mobilised, and finding a receptive audience, among UK housing practitioners (McKee, 2015; Wainwright and Marandet, 2018). In 2018, for example, the National Housing Federation (NHF) – an industry body representing housing associations across England which together provide homes for over 6 million people – formed the Great Places Commission (GPC) to examine 'how housing associations, working with national and local government and other partners, can create thriving and successful places' (GPC, 2019:5). Its final report urged multiple policy and practice changes aimed at integrating housing into place-specific policy frameworks (such as Local Industrial Strategies) and institutions (such as Local Enterprise Partnerships), as well as developing new sector-wide approaches to partnerships, local procurement, sales of housing stock, and asset-based community development. Such proposals reaffirm that housing associations (HAs) are increasingly expected to serve as place-based anchors in communities (McKee, 2015) – an expectation which seems set to continue as the UK housing sector endeavours to negotiate a new post-pandemic state of affairs (Gurney, 2021). Yet, extant literature shows that the notion of 'place' is a contested one (Warnaby and Medway, 2013) which, despite its seductive appeal among practitioners, is often deployed in managerial contexts with the purpose of promoting unacknowledged political agendas and associated interests (Lucarelli, 2018; Lloveras et al, 2021). Consequently, we posit that the translation of 'place' into HAs' managerial practice should not be treated as self-evident, and warrants a critical scrutiny that is overdue. In other words, how should we understand the assertion of HAs as place management actors? And what have been the consequences?

1
2
3
4
5 This paper investigates these important questions in the context of an empirical case: a HA which
6 recently adopted a 'place' strategy and restructured to create new employee positions explicitly
7 oriented toward 'place.' This case emerged as part of an ethnography on a housing estate in a
8 UK city, where we examined how residents organise communal spaces in negotiation with other
9 actors, particularly the landlord – the HA in question. During fieldwork, we learned about the HA's
10 ongoing internal restructuring and the implementation of its first 'place' strategy. So, in addition to
11 ethnographic research and interviews with residents, we also interviewed managers at various
12 levels of the HA to explore its place management practices in conjunction with those of residents.
13
14 What we found led us to conceptualise a more holistic understanding of place management, one
15 which not only includes the more 'traditional' practices of managing places, but also involves a
16 wide array of practices encompassing economic, political, social, and ecological considerations.
17
18 Together, these revealed the potential for what we term 'ecological place management,' which
19 we develop in terms of its implications for theory and practice.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The paper proceeds as follows. First, we contextualise the emergence of UK HAs, which may be
36 less familiar to the readers of this journal. We then offer a sympathetic critique of existing place
37 management literature (e.g. Yanchula, 2008; Ntounis, 2018), with a particular focus on existing
38 ways housing is understood therein. While UK HAs increasingly exhibit characteristics associated
39 with place management actors (e.g. town centre management organisations and business
40 improvement districts), we reflexively question *how* HAs' uptake of place notions is unfolding. To
41 interrogate this further, we introduce our research site – both the housing estate and HA which
42 manages it – and our methodology for gathering and analysing data. This leads to the
43 presentation of our findings, where we demonstrate the socio-ecological, socio-political, and
44 political-economic dynamics involved as the HA, residents, and other actors participate in what
45 could be regarded as place management practices. In our discussion, we highlight several
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implications of our findings, drawing on interdisciplinary research to account for the multiple forces
4 involved in processes of ecological place management. Importantly, we urge greater attention to
5 the ecologies of *both* managing and organising places. We conclude by reflecting on the
6 implications of this ecological frame for both theories and practices of place management more
7 generally. Thus, in the context of UK housing, our paper contributes to understanding the
8 complex ways that place management and organisation are ecologically underpinned
9 (Heikkurinen et al, 2021), calling for place managers to embrace ecological thinking capable of
10 confronting future challenges.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **II. The emergence of housing associations**

25
26
27
28 In the UK, HAs emerged as a mechanism to provide housing to those whose needs were unable
29 to be met by the state (typically local authorities) or the private housing market, co-existing
30 alongside both as part of the 'third sector' (Malpass, 2000; Pawson and Mullins, 2010). Beginning
31 in the 1980's, the widespread model of 'council housing' (wherein local authorities owned and
32 managed most of the publicly available housing stock) was subjected to financial constraints as
33 local authorities became increasingly pressured to reduce their balance sheets, driven by central
34 government's neoliberal ideology (Meek, 2014). However, in contrast to local authorities, HAs had
35 the ability to access financial markets and thereby fund the building and maintenance of housing
36 stock – while, importantly, still operating in a not-for-profit manner and serving a legally obligated
37 social purpose (Manzi and Morrison, 2017). As a result, a series of housing asset transfers from
38 local councils expanded the HA sector considerably, developing into a national policy (Malpass
39 and Mullins, 2010) that has continued in recent years (Marsh, 2018). As Manzi and Morrison,
40 (2017) note, this was a self-reinforcing process: HAs were praised as more financially prudent
41 managers of housing than local authorities (while still fulfilling a social purpose), leading to more
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pressure from central government for housing stock transfers from councils to HAs, which in turn
4
5 enabled HAs to expand their asset base and remain financially viable. Nevertheless, the
6
7 challenge of balancing competing financial and social demands has become an increasing
8
9 dilemma in recent years. Changes to both government policy (McKee et al, 2017; Manzi and
10
11 Morrison, 2017) and the housing market mean that HAs are having to cope with greater portfolio
12
13 risks (Manzi and Morrison, 2017), financialisation (Madden and Marcuse, 2016; Jacobs and
14
15 Manzi, 2020), and the continued influence of neoliberalism (Christophers, 2018).
16
17
18
19

20 Today, HAs' substantial role as owners, managers, and providers of housing has meant that their
21
22 social role has expanded concomitantly, a process both constituted through their historical
23
24 development and circumscribed by law. Their not-for-profit status means that any surplus
25
26 generated is reinvested in the organisation's activities, including in efforts to deliver socially
27
28 beneficial outcomes. And, while explicitly *not* government-run, HAs maintain close ties to local
29
30 authorities – often by local councillors allocated a set number of seats on boards (Marsh, 2018)
31
32 – although their governance practices are inevitably more 'messy' in specific contexts (McKee,
33
34 2010). Moreover, legal obligations shape HAs' commitments to: (1) deliver public benefit while
35
36 achieving 'value for money' (Marsh, 2018; see also the Public Service (Social Value) Act, 2012);
37
38 (2) introduce fixed-term tenancies that brings security of tenure into question and, as scholars
39
40 have described, undermines residents' 'ontological security' (e.g. Madden and Marcuse, 2016);
41
42 and (3) accommodate the longstanding 'Right to Buy' programme, which since 1980 has allowed
43
44 residents to purchase their 'council house' at a discount (Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2017). The latter
45
46 has meant that HAs are characterised by a mixed tenure of social housing renters, owner-
47
48 occupiers, and private renters (i.e. typically renting from the owners of once publicly-owned
49
50 homes).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Further developments have only added to this complex situation. For example, while still providers
4 of mixed tenure social housing, HAs are increasingly building new homes and diversifying their
5 offer to include market rate, rent-to-buy, and a range of other housing products (e.g. Marsh, 2018),
6 in part responding to the need to remain financially solvent, while also helping the government
7 deliver its targets for homebuilding (Meek, 2014). New UK policy developments such as
8 'devolution' (McKee et al, 2017) and 'levelling up' (Heath, 2022) are also changing the UK housing
9 landscape, relying on the mobilization of HAs (and other third sector organisations) to combat
10 austerity and become 'lead agents of local, *place-based solutions* in tackling the problems facing
11 low-income neighbourhoods' (McKee, 2015:1077, our emphasis). Finally, the sector must also
12 respond to emergent crises, such as working toward decarbonisation due to the climate
13 emergency (NHF, 2021) and addressing the multiple social inequalities exacerbated by the Covid-
14 19 pandemic (Gurney, 2021). Consequently, HAs must grapple with these multiple challenges as
15 they manifest in specific places (e.g. Wainwright and Marandet, 2018). However, the nature of
16 HAs' *placedness* and how this shift toward place as a pillar through which to implement
17 improvements in local areas connects with debates about implementing place management
18 practice have been hitherto underexplored.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **III. The interface of place management and housing: What role for housing** 42 **associations?** 43 44 45 46

47 Place management has been conceptualized as the combination of several practices, including
48 place marketing, place maintenance, and placemaking (Parker, 2008), that are premised on
49 partnership-working with other place stakeholders (Yanchula, 2008). As Ntounis (2018) notes,
50 place management is increasingly focussed on restructuring at the local level toward place-based
51 outcomes. In this context, some scholars have explored the context of housing as a site where
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 place management processes occur (see for example, Mowery and Novak, 2016; Read and
4 Sanderford, 2017). Others shift attention to a more specific emphasis on placemaking efforts in
5 housing (e.g. Benkó et al, 2018), analysing the ways housing constitutes a site where places are
6 *made*, rather than a priori *managed* – a conceptual move that aligns with geographers' enlivening
7 of place imaginaries (e.g. Cresswell, 2015).
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 The housing research reviewed previously offers valuable insights into place management, but it
17 is also important to critically interrogate the extent to which housing is amenable to place
18 management practices in the first place. At its most basic level, housing is a structure comprising
19 a shelter or building wherein some form of dwelling occurs, making it a widely accepted human
20 right (OHCHR, 2009). However, housing is also a multi-actor, multi-scalar *process* involving
21 public/private efforts to ensure that citizens can access and live in suitable homes – to varying
22 degrees of success (Madden and Marcuse, 2016). Considered in this light, housing phenomena
23 become inseparable from broader changes pertaining to the interplay between neoliberal
24 capitalism and urbanisation (Harvey, 2005). Recent years have seen profound changes whereby
25 aspects of urban life, including housing, are increasingly subjected to the deregulation and
26 globalization characteristic of neoliberal capitalism (Madden and Marcuse, 2016). Relatedly, and
27 similar to other kinds of public land, housing has undergone a privatization process that has led
28 to an increasing role for finance (Christophers, 2018). This nexus between liberalisation and
29 financialisation has enabled an explosion of housing development, while also facilitating access
30 to loans for housing construction and refurbishment by a range of entities. One group playing an
31 increasingly important role in these processes within the UK context are HAs (Meek, 2014).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Initially, it would appear that HAs are archetypal place management entities. Recognised as key
52 partners for place-based collaborations (GPC, 2019), HAs operate at the interface of the public,
53 private, and voluntary sectors which Yanchula (2008) argues together manage places. Moreover,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 place management's aims of improving places and benefiting those who use them (Gower, 2008)
4
5 align with the social mission of HAs and their obligations to their users (i.e. residents). However,
6
7 there are also differences. Particularly significant is HAs' locus of activity: whereas place
8
9 management has previously found fertile territory in the retail spaces of town/city centres, HAs
10
11 are concerned with different *kinds* of places – notably, neighbourhoods. Indeed, housing is
12
13 intimately connected to the rhythms of everyday life (Moran, 2004), the local neighbourhood,
14
15 wider urban (as well as rural) contexts, and other multi-scalar spatial arrangements (Heslop et al,
16
17 2020). Additionally, and in contrast with town centre management initiatives, HAs are not (only)
18
19 managing the spaces between individual units. They typically own the totality of a spatial area
20
21 (i.e. the homes and the spaces between/beneath them) making HAs' interest and involvement in
22
23 the places under their jurisdiction arguably far greater than other place management actors.
24
25 Finally, to the extent they can be categorised as users, residents of HAs' homes are also *not*
26
27 solely interested in using places in ways that are (necessarily) foreseeable by HAs. Instead, as
28
29 we have seen, housing is concomitant with everyday life (Moran, 2004), which complicates HAs'
30
31 efforts to manage such places.
32
33
34
35
36

37 Based on this, our central research question is: *how* are HAs becoming place management actors
38
39 in the context of UK housing? By aiming to answer this question, we build from recognition that
40
41 the movement of place management practices across boundaries and into housing contexts
42
43 should not go unexamined (Ntounis, 2018). We do not accept *a priori* the
44
45 correspondence/equivalence between housing and other prevailing contexts for place
46
47 management inquiry – particularly retail, commercial, and town centres (Parker, 2008). Rather,
48
49 our paper *denaturalises* (Fournier and Grey, 2000) the unreflexive translation of place
50
51 management thinking from other domains, and into housing. To investigate this further, we next
52
53 describe our methodology for empirically researching place management practices in one HA and
54
55 a housing estate it manages.
56
57
58
59
60

IV. Research site and methodology

Introducing the research site

Our research focuses on one HA (which we pseudonymise as ‘CityHousing’) that owns and/or manages thousands of homes across a UK city. Specifically, we conducted ethnographic fieldwork on one housing estate within CityHousing’s purview, which contains around 250 flats (i.e. apartments). This estate includes a significant amount of shared spaces where (some of) everyday life on the estate occurs, including: streets, play areas, and large shared gardens; communal halls and entryways; virtual and physical residents’ groups, etc. CityHousing is legally responsible for both the housing stock and land it sits upon, resulting in ongoing negotiations between CityHousing, residents, the local City Council, and others about the best way(s) to manage and organise these areas.

The housing estate and CityHousing serve as an exemplary case for inquiring into recent efforts to implement place management processes in housing, as well as the potential tensions and limitations therein. This is particularly so because CityHousing was implementing its first ‘place’ strategy during fieldwork. We therefore critically scrutinise this and other developments, including the role of residents therein, to explore the multiple factors influencing – and influenced by – these nascent place management practices. While we focussed in particular on the housing estate, our research also examined CityHousing’s broader efforts to reorient toward place, and thus hold relevance for other places, HAs, and housing contexts. Finally, to protect the anonymity of all participants, the HA and our interviewees – both employees of CityHousing and residents of the estate – have been anonymised.

Methodological approach and data analysis

Over the course of 13 months, we undertook an extensive ethnography on the housing estate in question, while also regularly interacting with employees of CityHousing. To gather data, we entered the field as participant observers: of deliberations at meetings of different residents' groups; through joining informal gatherings (e.g. gardening days, monthly give-and-take stall); and by volunteering at events on the estate (e.g. communal meals). Our participant observation also exposed us to CityHousing employees: we attended three two-hour meetings between residents and employees; shadowed employees' scheduled site visits to the estate; and engaged in informal conversations with employees at the CityHousing offices. Furthermore, we employed several other methods: fieldnotes were recorded during and after immersion in the field; photographs were taken; and archival, policy, and legal documents were gathered. We also conducted 16 ethnographic interviews with residents, as well as five semi-structured interviews with employees of CityHousing and one with a local councillor, which were subsequently transcribed. The latter were loosely structured around an interest in how 'place' was understood, and being integrated, into existing practices by the HA. Together, these data enabled an analytical focus on how CityHousing is working to manage places while also accounting for the processes of negotiation with other actors – especially (but, as we shall see, not only) residents.

In our analysis, we inductively coded our data with an interest in identifying the ways CityHousing's management processes are connected with its nascent focus on place. These were condensed into sets of practices, which were further grouped into sub-thematic categories tied to place management (Ntounis, 2018; see *Table 1*). At the same time, we remained attuned to the fact that housing is a relatively new empirical context for place management practices; indeed, we were finding that much of our data did not neatly fit within the identified categories of place management. More importantly, our ethnography had revealed a more complex situation than

1
2
3 these sub-themes were capturing. As a result, we continued coding our data in an effort to provide
4
5 a clearer understanding of how place is being managed on the housing estate. What emerged
6
7 were a wider array of practices, which were again condensed into sub-thematic categories, then
8
9 themes (see *Table 1*), which accentuate the complexity of place management *vis a vis* housing
10
11 by drawing out the ecological, social, political, and economic dimensions therein. We validated
12
13 this widened scope through reference to relevant housing (e.g. McKee, 2015; Madden and
14
15 Marcuse, 2016) and place management (Benkő et al, 2018; Beza and Hernández-Garcia, 2018)
16
17 literatures.
18
19
20

21 -----
22
23 **INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**
24
25 -----
26
27

28
29 As is clear from *Table 1*, while we anticipated our findings would focus on the ‘typical’ actors
30
31 expected to manage places (i.e. managers) in a top-down fashion, our analysis provided evidence
32
33 of an increasingly complex assemblage of practices being deployed by a constellation of actors,
34
35 including CityHousing employees, residents, government, and others, as well as multiple wider
36
37 ecological, social, political, and economic processes informing the management and organisation
38
39 of place. While we were tempted to treat these dimensions as distinct, such an effort would
40
41 mistake conceptual ease for analytical rigour. Instead, we found these different dynamics to be
42
43 unfolding together: boundaries are continually (re)articulated between them, rendering the
44
45 categories themselves fluid and hybrid (Sheller and Urry, 2003). We have therefore hyphenated
46
47 the socio-ecological, socio-political, and political-economic themes emerging from the analysis of
48
49 our case. These themes are presented next, after which we discuss the implications of our
50
51 findings for place management.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

V. Findings: Dynamics of place management in a housing association

In this section, we first provide an account of how CityHousing is strategically shifting toward place management practices, before developing the other themes we identified in our analysis that nuance and complicate this rendering. Each sub-section title uses an interview excerpt to evoke its thematic underpinning, which is subsequently described.

'A bit of a restructure': A place strategy and emerging place management practices

During our fieldwork, CityHousing was in the midst of implementing its first 'place' strategy, which formalised a commitment to providing place-based services. When we spoke with CityHousing employees both informally and in interviews, they repeatedly attributed this shift toward place as a 'steer from the top' of the organisational hierarchy. As 'Daniel,' a senior executive, explains:

My view was there was an opportunity in the areas we work with to take a different role...So our, kind of, vision was to offer a service which was about investing both in people and place, as well as managing their homes and letting them and repairing them, and bringin' them up to full standard. And also concentrating on a high quality design of those particular places sensitive to what that neighbourhood requires.

This aim of not only managing homes, but also seeking to design and invest in places, reflects Daniel's intention of embedding place-based thinking at CityHousing, which echoes the housing strategy articulated by the City Council and, in turn, reflects CityHousing's close political ties. However, as an HA, CityHousing must nonetheless contend with the fact of their substantial interest in housing assets: in other words, they own and/or manage private spaces. This contrasts with prevailing place management approaches, which often rely on the formation of new organisations (e.g. Business Improvement Districts) *external* to their membership and stakeholders. To the extent that a place focus is *internalised* into HAs, their simultaneous private

1
2
3 asset ownership constitutes an added complexity that they must face in striving to implement
4 place management.
5
6
7
8

9 Negotiating – though never fully solving – this private asset/public place paradox requires ongoing
10 work. For example, managers at CityHousing explained how the strategic orientation toward place
11 required some organisational restructuring. ‘Sean’ describes the creation of new place-based
12 ‘area manager’ positions:
13
14
15
16

17
18 *Previously, they had a variety of functions and roles. This year we’ve done a bit of*
19 *restructure and we’ve took some of that role away from the...[area*
20 *managers]...and put it in other parts of the team.*
21

22 It is perhaps inevitable that, to ameliorate the challenge of fitting ‘place’ into its wider managerial
23 remit, CityHousing adapts and adjusts the roles and constituent elements of its organisational
24 structure. This has meant reassigning some of the area managers’ *‘functions and roles’* to other
25 – typically more junior – employees, presumably so they can dedicate more of their time toward
26 place. At the same time, this strategic reorientation is evident in other strategic documents that
27 contain a set of interconnected organisational commitments to ‘place’ – although whether such
28 documents are (non)performative vis a vis institutional action is not self-evident (Ahmed, 2006).
29 Regardless, the integration of ‘place’ into CityHousing’s structure and strategic documents
30 demonstrate its shift in scope and focus to more widely encompass the places where housing
31 stock is located.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Moreover, CityHousing is committed to being involved in a series of partnerships for the benefit
46 of the places concerned, a fundamental place management practice (e.g. Yanchula, 2008). In
47 fact, our examination of local policy documents revealed that CityHousing is explicitly identified
48 as a *lead* partner in particular places: through such governmental strategies and frameworks, they
49 implicated in urban regeneration of the city in question. But CityHousing’s partnership-working
50 goes further. During fieldwork, we observed how CityHousing works with retailers and private
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 companies to direct job training and work opportunities toward local residents (a service not
4 limited to rent-paying tenants), and similarly coordinates with charities to help people access
5 services.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Taken together, CityHousing's activities bear strong resemblance to place management practices
12 in more established arenas (e.g. Millington and Ntounis, 2017; Ntounis, 2018). Nevertheless, the
13 context of housing is not without adaptations; in our analysis, we began to critically explore what
14 other dimensions influence CityHousing's place management practice. Among these, particularly
15 notable was frequent focus on environmental considerations – both at CityHousing and on the
16 housing estate in question.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 *'They've gotta accept that then things will just shift, won't they?': Socio-ecological processes*

30
31 At CityHousing, questions of the natural environment tend to involve interventions in green
32 spaces. Across its housing properties, some residents care for gardens and other green areas,
33 but often this is not the case. Referring to the housing estate where we conducted fieldwork, Sean
34 explains that it:
35
36
37

38
39 *...is quite specific in that there's certain part of that estate residents look after.*
40 *Sometimes they can't for various reasons. But some of our other green areas are*
41 *much bigger and people can't manage them, so we need to think about how we*
42 *break them up. But we need the community to take...ownership because otherwise*
43 *it's easy for us just to come along and cut them, that's a very simple way of us*
44 *managing spaces. But it's not effective, is it?*
45
46

47
48 While CityHousing hopes for residents and *'the community'* to *'take ownership'* of green space,
49 this must be reciprocated by a desire from residents, who we found to have motivations altogether
50 different from a vague notion of *'ownership.'* We were not entirely surprised that the estate of
51 focus in our fieldwork is framed as a *'quite specific'* and successful case of looking after the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 environment. After all, a recurrent problem we heard from residents was the need to take actions
4
5 despite, conflicting with, or resisting CityHousing's efforts.
6
7

8
9 Emblematic of the conflictual tensions regarding environmental care on the estate is residents'
10
11 opposition to the use of herbicides, particularly in several long-standing organic permaculture
12
13 gardens which are maintained by estate residents and where food is annually produced (and
14
15 eaten). We observed how navigating this conflict over herbicides requires sustained resident
16
17 action. Due to residents' opposition, CityHousing's interventions in green spaces are typically
18
19 limited to weed trimming – which itself can inadvertently kill wildflowers, propagated bulbs,
20
21 budding plants, and countless other flora. To address this, some gardeners have drawn maps
22
23 showing which areas should and should not be cut back by CityHousing gardening staff, although
24
25 these have been only partially effective. A more common practice is to demarcate permaculture
26
27 areas containing plants that should not be trimmed using sticks or logs (*Figure 1*). These efforts
28
29 block a weed trimmer's cutting cord and, it is hoped, signal for the user that plants beyond the
30
31 boundary are to be left alone. Further such material interventions abound: for example, we
32
33 observed and participated in converting grass to plant beds, fruit bush pruning, tree planting,
34
35 hand-weeding permaculture gardens, and bucket-watering plants during summer drought.
36
37 Together, these constitute important placemaking practices for residents.
38
39
40
41

42 -----
43
44 **INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE**
45
46 -----
47
48
49

50 Nonetheless, maps, territorial markers, and other material practices also require communication.
51
52 In this respect, a fairly productive dialogue exists between CityHousing and the Tenants'
53
54 Association on the estate. These regular meetings allow for ongoing negotiations about how
55
56 green spaces (as well as other material concerns) will be managed by CityHousing or self-
57
58
59
60

organised by residents. Residents' discussions with CityHousing are premised on a view of their home as not only an intimate and personal space, but also woven together with everyday life, place-based connectedness, and ecological systems. Indeed, in contrast to CityHousing, residents see the natural environment as part of the place itself: plants exist together with – but also alongside – humans. For example, 'Sarah,' a long-time resident and community activist, uses the beautifully evocative notion of '*interfering with the weeds*' to explain her gardening philosophy.

And 'Tim', another resident and gardener, describes his practice as follows:

I go through phases where, you go through phases of goin', 'I like the anarchy,' because I just like to see what happens when things are left to their own devices. I like to – and it is like, actually what happens when this gets left to its own devices. Now, it gets really messy and horrible. So I'm now happy with that. I'm happy that that bit, left to its own devices, just gets a bit messy.

Clearly, Tim makes no effort to impose complete control on the gardens: they get 'messy' on their own, and this is to his preference. In such cases, residents recognise that green spaces on the estate emerge *through* human-plant interferences *with each other*, thereby acknowledging the independent existence of these ecological actors.

Gradually, we began to identify how the active role afforded to plants is extended elsewhere as a way to justify a range of resistive actions. Frustrated by a general perception that CityHousing inadequately consults with residents, Sarah suggests that '*they won't bloody properly engage with people...so they've gotta accept that then things will just shift, won't they?*' She proceeds to describe how several residents fixed a broken door on the estate after CityHousing had failed to act. While residents' impetus to act is present, Sarah's question recognises that '*things*' (and not merely plants) on the estate are also actors that '*will just shift.*' This also highlights the ways that the estate is a place that exists through social-and-ecological connections with elsewhere: the broken/fixed door emerges from sawn trees, forged metals, and petroleum-based paints – which each rely on further agential forces (lumberjacks, saws, forests, extractive industries, industrial processing etc.). Other actors similarly enable residents' placemaking, including ties between the

1
2
3 estate and a local gardening centre which, during fieldwork, regularly supplied plants and
4 gardening equipment to residents. But these relations can also be antagonistic, such as residents'
5 view that the arrival of students at the nearby University brings crime because they make easy
6 targets for thieves, or the disruption caused by multiple carbon-intensive, high-rise apartment
7 buildings being built across the road from the estate.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 Finally, socio-ecological relations influencing the estate also extend to infrastructures of modern
17 life. When a severe plumbing issue occurred in a resident's flat, CityHousing sent out a team
18 several times, then eventually hired a subcontractor to address the overflowing water in the
19 resident's kitchen. However, the problem remained unresolved for an extended period of time, in
20 no small part because the utility company did not have maps of the water mains readily available.
21 We were astonished to learn that the same uncertainty also exists for the natural gas pipes
22 connected to flats. Both were attributed by the CityHousing contractors to being a consequence
23 of the estate's construction in the 1940's. Here, an individual resident's water or gas use is tied to
24 the history of the estate and its construction, as well as the hydraulic and energy infrastructures
25 of Manchester. But these activities are, ultimately, ecologically underpinned: they involve the
26 transformation of nature in the creation of domestic spaces (plumbing, gas, rubbish waste
27 removal), as well as gardens (gardening tools, purchased seeds, consumed fruit) (Kaika, 2004).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Thus, what appears as a hitherto successful case of organising place-based activities becomes
44 complicated when peering beneath the surface of those activities and examining their connections
45 to elsewhere. This set of socio-ecological dynamics is central to CityHousing's efforts at managing
46 place, as well as residents' practices of placemaking. But, in addition to this we also came to
47 understand how these are also tied to social and political dynamics unfolding on the estate, at
48 CityHousing, and more widely.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 *'It's definitely reactive work': Socio-political dynamics and tensions*

6
7 Our analysis identified multiple social and political dimensions to CityHousing's activities and
8 interactions with residents (in conjunction with other place-based actors). Residents interested in
9 improving the estate deem moving beyond a narrow concern with one's home to be a prerequisite
10 for meaningful place-based social relationships. Reflecting on this in an interview, Sarah,
11 describes her recognition that:
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 *...unless you've actually got people in functioning communities, and with a voice,*
19 *then there's... there's no point, really. I dunno, that's just, that's what I keep coming*
20 *back to. And that's the basic thing that needs energy put into helping it work.*
21

22 The very existence of communities, then, is premised on a *need* for organising and participating
23 in a range of relatively effective (i.e. '*functioning*') activities. Our fieldwork uncovered a veritable
24 multitude of such activities, including: organising/attending meetings of the Tenants' Association
25 or other residents' groups; gardening in the large communal green areas; engaging in countless
26 email, text message, and social media exchanges; attending communal meals; donating clothes
27 and unwanted items to the monthly give-and-take stall; and so on. However, what became clear
28 is that the opportunities for engaging are circumscribed by residents' desire to participate. Sarah
29 picks up on this fact, continuing:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *...some of the people are here because they really want to be here, and then lots*
40 *of other people are here because they've got nowhere else to go and they're at the*
41 *bottom of the pile and it's a real mixture of, kind of, intentional community and*
42 *totally unintentional non-community.*
43

44 There is also a (dis)inclination toward involvement based on how and why residents became part
45 of the different communities on the estate. In fact, these multiple communities and their political
46 (non)intentionality are connected – although without strict overlap – to the particular mix of
47 tenancies on the estate, including: social housing tenants, renters of privately-owned flats,
48 residents who own as a result of Right to Buy, and also a housing co-operative. These differing
49 kinds of tenure tend to have corresponding lengths of residence and thus more/less opportunities
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to develop ties, deepen connections, and engage with others. Indeed, during fieldwork we came
4
5 to appreciate the multiple communities and tenancies coming together to generate overlapping
6
7 and diverging relations.
8
9

10
11 While the potential of the place relies on residents' intentionality and tenure, a contrasting view is
12
13 presented by CityHousing employees. During interviews, managers regularly utilised the notion
14
15 of 'community' as a singular phenomenon. For example, as 'Elliot' explains:
16
17

18 *I feel like the business [CityHousing] recognizes so many facets of a community*
19 *and things that can help the community to thrive. I feel like we as a business want*
20 *to be a part of it all.*
21

22 Similar statements abound, from 'Liam' emphasising that the sub-contracted companies
23
24 CityHousing employs must '*give back to the local community,*' to Sean explaining that
25
26 CityHousing's place approach means '*we go out and do stuff in the community.*' Implicit in such
27
28 statements is a homogenising view – note Elliot's shift between articles, from 'a' to 'the' community
29
30 – overlooking the fact that *communities* are multiple in urban life (Blokland, 2017). Leaving such
31
32 nuance unacknowledged in favour of claims about a singular, definable entity generates attendant
33
34 differences in how the spatiality of community is conceived: namely, it allows CityHousing
35
36 employees to construct community as a spatially segregated group amenable to managing. This
37
38 disregard for difference ignores the political potential of both communities (Blokland, 2017) and
39
40 space (Massey, 2005).
41
42
43
44

45 A similar tendency is evident with regards to the uneasy fit of 'place' with the daily activities of
46
47 CityHousing employees. In an informal conversation discussing their move toward a place-based
48
49 approach, several managers shared the view that '*it's definitely reactive work*' before describing
50
51 typical instances when they must respond to issues raised by residents, rather than pre-empt
52
53 them. In the same conversation, Liam shares a joke amongst colleagues: problems inevitably
54
55 seem to arise toward the end of a working week, which has given rise to the adage around the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 office that *'it always happens on a Friday.'* There is a potential contradiction here between
4
5 CityHousing's activities and those of residents: housing and residents' activities are interwoven
6
7 with everyday life (Moran, 2004), which does not fit with the regular office hours of CityHousing's
8
9 employees. As with notions of community, tensions exist between a discourse of managing places
10
11 and the socio-political character of actual practices in places. This has a depoliticising effect,
12
13 which can be explored further by examining the question of scale.
14
15

16
17
18 As CityHousing integrates place into its strategic approach, it has had to reassess the scale of its
19
20 activities: directing its activities toward places – rather than solely housing stock – means
21
22 confronting the question of what constitutes a place. The urban housing which CityHousing
23
24 manages is situated in the dense bricolage of neighbourhoods, communities, retail, infrastructure,
25
26 green spaces, and more comprising urban life, making any delineation of 'place' a complicated
27
28 process. It was this milieu, and how the housing estate of focus in this paper and HA themselves
29
30 are embedded within such complexity, that interested us during our research. In practice, the
31
32 diversity of place is reconciled with the many properties under CityHousing's management in a
33
34 way that is not entirely detached from places themselves. For example, the wider neighbourhood
35
36 where the estate is situated has a strong place identity, a fact recognised by Sean in an interview.
37
38 Still, CityHousing internally compartmentalises that neighbourhood into two 'place areas,'
39
40 indicating a need to manage their private assets. This is particularly clear when, reflecting on the
41
42 250 flats comprising the estate, Sean calculates that *'most of our places have about 1000*
43
44 *properties that we own, so at the best [the estate] is probably a quarter of one, one place.'* Such
45
46 a demarcation of a place, and its fractional division based on number of properties, requires
47
48 overlaying a rigid, rational template over the rich tapestry of place.
49
50
51

52
53
54 Another employee explained how CityHousing is aiming to align its 'place boundaries' so that they
55
56 fit with the City Council's wards (i.e. sub-city districts), which is anticipated to facilitate
57
58
59

1
2
3 communication, collaboration, and access to ward-specific data. The adherence to prevailing
4 political institutions once again relies on a rationalistic practice of hanging discrete boundaries
5 onto place. This obscures recognition of the aforementioned complexity of communities and
6 places, their functioning, or the political intentionalities therein; and it ignores the entanglement of
7 places *with each other*. This, in turn, is connected to, and partly driven by, the particular political-
8 economic context of CityHousing's efforts to manage places.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *'There isn't much point bein' a charity if you're broke': Political-economic considerations*

21
22 Our analysis also revealed the salient influence of the UK's neoliberal political economy on
23 CityHousing's efforts to manage place. As previously stated, HAs can access credit to invest in
24 their public housing stock in ways that local authorities cannot – a policy change aimed at
25 removing assets from government ownership and shifting them to the private sector
26 (Christophers, 2018). Of course, accessing credit has also meant that HAs' ability to deliver a
27 service (i.e. housing) must generate revenue to repay financial loans within their existing not-for-
28 profit, charitable governance framework. This was poignantly evident at CityHousing. Daniel, the
29 senior executive, recurrently focussed on the significance of financial considerations for
30 CityHousing, describing, for example, how *'a housing association like us is an asset-based*
31 *organisation with a stock of a value, which has guaranteed revenue streams through rent, and*
32 *against that you could borrow from the private sector, which the local authority couldn't do.'* Here,
33 notions of 'value' and 'revenue' seep into the description of CityHousing's activities. Indicative of
34 the broader financialisation of housing (Madden and Marcuse, 2016), CityHousing cross-
35 subsidises some of its housing estates through newer, higher quality, attractively-designed
36 developments.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While tapping into shifting capital flows is important for CityHousing, its trajectory with relation to
4 place is also concerned with making a contribution to the locales in which it operates in the form
5 of 'social value.' As mentioned previously, CityHousing and other HAs are *obliged* to deliver 'social
6 value' under the Social Value Act (2012). This materialises in another important guiding document
7 we were repeatedly urged to examine as evidence of their place-based approach: CityHousing's
8 'social investment' strategy. As an indicator CityHousing uses to track its social investment
9 performance, 'social value' typically involves requiring contractors and other organisations they
10 work with to purchase local materials and/or employ local people. The legislation giving rise to
11 this activity (i.e. Social Value Act 2012), is centred on valuing – in practice, measuring – socially
12 beneficial activities. This has a dual impact of both metricising social impacts into quantifiable
13 criteria and measuring the replacement of governmental obligations toward society with those of
14 the private sector, together revealing the deeper ideological commitment to neoliberalism
15 (Christophers, 2018). Such a policy necessarily influences CityHousing's social investment
16 strategy whilst having broader impacts on the services available to local residents, which become
17 counted, tracked, and reported as training classes attended, job placements secured, hours of
18 advice freely given, and so on.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The consequences of a neoliberal political economy extend elsewhere. We encountered multiple
40 instances where CityHousing supports cultural projects, including through help-in-kind, such as
41 free mentoring. However, we found that most of its assistance is financially-oriented: upskilling
42 residents for the job market, helping residents with applications for national and local grant funding
43 schemes, undertaking its own grant-making, and running community events. On the estate we
44 examined, several projects have received substantial financial investment from national grant-
45 funding bodies, the local authority, and CityHousing. Sean articulates this point forcefully:
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *To be brutally honest with you, we have pumped a lot of money into that area, into*
54 *that estate. They've got things that nobody else has ever got, the intranet for*
55 *example. Nobody else in our areas have got any of that, and there's been a lot of*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *hard work tryin' to develop and move that forward, but it all cost a lot of money to*
4 *put in, and to do. We've done it to try and make the estate more engaged and*
5 *better.*
6

7 Here, the effort to help the estate maintain its intranet and internet service (particularly the
8 substantial cost of the project), is seen as emblematic of CityHousing's support for the estate. But
9 it also relies upon conflating increased financial investment with more engagement, improvement,
10 and, ultimately, greater delivery of social value.
11
12
13
14

15
16
17
18 CityHousing's efforts to quantify its activities are reflective of the national context wherein private
19 charities are expected to fulfill roles previously delivered by government – another pillar of the
20 neoliberal project. Yet, interviewees were careful to distinguish CityHousing from local
21 government. After recounting in an interview some of the ways it ensures its own financial
22 resilience, Daniel contrasts CityHousing with government:
23
24
25
26
27

28 *What we're not about is being the local state. It's about enabling people to take a*
29 *bit more control with our help, but not about a subsidy. It's about a helping hand*
30 *but not continually -- and we always have to do things which makes us some*
31 *money as well.*
32

33
34 The organisation must navigate its charitable aim of supporting people and places, a legislative
35 demand for social value, and a financial necessity for profitability – within this neoliberal milieu.
36
37 The result is a sort of ambivalence and confusion about organisational identity. In interviews,
38 employees oscillated between describing the organisation as a charity with the aforementioned
39 social value obligation, and arguing it has to think and act like a business. Daniel states that,
40 'while we may be a charity, there isn't much point bein' a charity if you're broke, cuz you can't do
41 anything.' CityHousing is thus complicit in the political effort of substituting local government with
42 private services *because* it understandably seeks to continue to exist as an organisation in this
43 context. In these ways, neoliberalism's reshaping of government's role in the economy can be
44 located amongst CityHousing's place management practices as it participates in a political
45 economy which is reordering and reorganising the world.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

VI. Discussion: Toward ecological place management

Our findings demonstrate that CityHousing's increasing aspirations to 'manage' places are occurring along with multiple socio-ecological, socio-political, and political-economic considerations, which raises the question of the relationship between these hybrid dynamics and CityHousing's place management practices. In this regard, a paramount implication of our research is support for a more holistic understanding of place management in housing: in addition to CityHousing's organisational restructuring toward a place-based focus, its working in place-specific partnerships, and managerial strategies oriented toward 'place,' an expansive set of other activities are involved. Ecological considerations regarding green spaces or plumbing issues must be socially negotiated; political questions about 'community' or 'place' boundaries exist in tension with the social relations constituting them; and late capitalism is entangled with the prevailing neoliberal political ideology. In these contexts, CityHousing must also contend with resident activities and activism – as well the agential role of other non-human actors, from waste collection to water's domestication and their multiple underpinning material infrastructures. These complex realities that CityHousing, and other HAs, must grapple with in their uptake of 'place' reflect the convoluted state of contemporary housing (Kaika, 2004; Madden and Marcuse, 2016; Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2017).

Yet, while the evidence indicates there is a need to extend our conceptualisation of place management, there are significant challenges associated with accommodating this complexity in practice. Consider how inattention to the socio-ecological aspects highlighted above leaves CityHousing poorly positioned to deal with their outcomes, from unawareness of the water and

1
2
3 gas infrastructure plans to the increasingly catastrophic consequences of environmental changes
4 wrought by urbanisation (Beza and Hernández-Garcia, 2018). Similarly, places are organised
5 in/through multiple socio-political rhythms (Nash, 2020), so any demand on managers to address
6 *place* issues, while nonetheless remaining responsible for housing, may force them into a reactive
7 mode that exhibits an out-of-sync arrhythmia with places (Lefebvre, 2004). Finally, the paradoxical
8 commitment to deliver services more broadly for places – rather than simply for residents – within
9 the constrained operating space afforded by public sector austerity demonstrates the unrelenting
10 pressure of neoliberal political economy on CityHousing and other HAs (e.g. McKee, 2015), which
11 exists for place managers more broadly (Millington and Ntounis, 2017). However, neoliberalism
12 is a *specific configuration*, rather than a totalizing force. The shift toward place-based approaches
13 and broader concerns for public welfare (from providing employment support or community grants
14 to Covid-19 assistance or decarbonisation) demonstrates that the changing nature of public-
15 private distinctions not only includes neoliberal logics but also extends beyond them (Sheller and
16 Urry, 2003). In other words, the uptake of place by HAs is inevitably influenced by neoliberalism,
17 *and also* by the socio-political reconfiguration of HAs' relationship toward public space and socio-
18 ecological processes underpinning urban life.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 An important consequence of the above is that the hybrid dynamics of place management
40 identified in our analysis are not ontologically equivalent. Their relations rest upon recognition that
41 the political and economic dimensions of places are part of – and influence – broader social
42 relations, which are all in turn ultimately reliant upon ecological systems and metabolic flows of
43 matter-energy (Swyngedouw and Kaika, 2014). This imbues (place) management in such
44 contexts with an obligation and normative aim of 'meeting the needs of earthbound actors'
45 (Heikkurinen et al, 2021:32), a constraint which cascades down to the social, political, and
46 economic dimensions. In this way, place management practice can be understood as an ethical
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

endeavor that, while intersecting with political-economic and socio-political processes, exists within the boundaries of social and ultimately ecological systems.

Therefore, we propose an *ecological* frame for capturing these complexities and challenges of extending place management to housing. Lucarelli's (2018; 2019) development of an 'ecological approach' to place branding is instructive, particularly his call for 'analyses to move beyond neoliberalism, seen here as a "mere" contemporary series of events, by recognising place [management] as inextricably linked to modernity' (Lucarelli, 2018:15). This makes space for socio-political and socio-ecological dynamics in contemporary society transpiring *alongside*, *amongst*, and *aside from* the particular neoliberal political-economic configuration. In other words, an ecological understanding of place management in housing incorporates multiple urban governance processes to assess the variegated and novel ways that places, politics, and urban actors are entangled together, situating HAs' management of places within/between/at the center of these wider dynamics. At the same time, ecological place management warrants wariness of reductionist understandings of places which, our findings suggest, tend to privilege managing *at the expense of place*, obviating the tensions intrinsic to places in favour of a productivist mode of management. Instead, an ecological lens captures the need for *moderation* and acknowledges that, ultimately, social relations bear an ecological cost and therefore must be managed with care (Heikkurinen et al, 2021). This aligns with a view of place as relational, open, and interconnected (e.g. Massey, 2005), paving the way for integration of socio-ecological, socio-political, and political-economic *multiplicity* into organisations' place management approaches (Ntounis, 2018). One important means for accomplishing this is through a shift in thinking toward organising, a point we return to subsequently.

How, then, can our conceptualisation of ecological place management apply to practice? What can place managers do to adopt this extended approach to managing places? In HAs, ecological

1
2
3 place management foregrounds the importance, even urgency, of improving the socio-ecological
4 conditions of places. In practical terms, this includes retrofitting existing homes to minimise their
5 carbon footprint, such as through investing in home insulation, installing the most ecologically
6 robust heating and water infrastructure, and adopting measures that encourage residents to
7 reduce material use in line with planetary boundaries (Steffen et al, 2015). Equally, however, HAs
8 should realise the social benefits of ecological engagement by improving access to green spaces,
9 deepening communities' capacity to determine the future of shared spaces, and encouraging
10 participation in local civic life. The political and economic contexts within which these occur have,
11 in the past, tended to subordinate ecological concerns to priorities of the neoliberal state (e.g.
12 McKee, 2015) and/or the capitalist-growth regime (Vandeventer et al, 2019). If HAs want to
13 contribute to maintaining a habitable planet, this cannot continue. Instead, ecological place
14 managers must privilege social and ecological concerns, rather than a reliance on delivering
15 growth and profitability, while also crafting politically actionable narratives about the positive
16 consequences of managing places in an ecologically sound way. The explicit creation of roles
17 with an ecological remit, such as 'ecological place manager' positions, is one way to begin this
18 process, but ultimately ecological considerations must be woven into the very institutional fabric
19 of HAs (as well as local authorities and other place actors). A strategic reorientation toward
20 ecological place management will prove useful in this regard, which should include imbedding
21 ecological thinking and practice in areas such as strategy formulation, employee training, and
22 subcontractor agreements.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Thus, our ecological place management framing refocuses inquiry on both '...the major key (i.e.
48 discourse, institutions) and minor key (i.e. practices, everyday life) of politics' that together
49 assemble in places (Lucarelli, 2018:16). To this end, we find promise in the potential for notions
50 of 'organising' to contribute toward enlivening the imaginaries of ecological place management
51 by recognising that 'managing' is only one mode of organising (e.g. Parker et al, 2014). Seen this
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 way, the multivarious nature of *place organising* involves a wide range of practices which generate
4
5 (temporary) place-based orderings and stabilisations of complex socio-ecological relations, which
6
7 are the foundations upon which socio-political and political-economic systems rely. Organising
8
9 not only accounts for the heterogeneous factors coming together in places, but more forcefully it
10
11 also calls for a radically contingent view of the best way to organise (or manage) places. This
12
13 raises questions that ecological place managers must grapple with, such as: how should places
14
15 (whether in the context of housing, town centres, or elsewhere), understood as ecologically
16
17 underpinned, be accounted for in management practice? Within the context of the climate
18
19 emergency and socio-ecological crises, whose interests should be prioritised? And should the
20
21 processes of organising everyday life be subject to managerial impulses? We do not presume to
22
23 provide readymade answers to these questions, but rather encourage their contemplation,
24
25 discussion, and integration into a form of place management capable of helping organise places
26
27 and transforming them for a socio-ecologically just and sustainable future.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **VII. Conclusions: From ecological place management to organising tomorrow's places**

36
37
38

39 This paper has examined the recent incorporation of 'place' within UK HAs by focusing on the
40
41 emergence of a place-based approach at CityHousing and one housing estate they manage. We
42
43 have scrutinized the hybrid varieties of practices characterising what might be called the *ecologies*
44
45 of place management. In doing so, a key aim of our paper has been to clarify the multiple
46
47 interconnected processes involved as housing practitioners look to implement place
48
49 management: socio-ecological processes in action, combined with socio-political tensions that
50
51 must be navigated and a particular neoliberal political economy. Our proposal to conceptualise
52
53 this as ecological place management contributes to existing debates which acknowledge the
54
55 multiplicity of place itself (Lucarelli, 2018; Ntounis, 2018), while also encouraging housing
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioners to enliven their thinking about the richness, multiplicity, and scalar complexities of
4 the places with which their management practices are increasingly entangled.
5
6
7
8

9 A key implication of our work is that, as place management practices travel to new arenas such
10 as housing, we need to pay attention to the particular kind(s) of practices occurring in specific
11 contexts. To this end, an ecological understanding of place management can better grasp its
12 spatially specific nuances in the case of HAs and other housing practitioners. Equally, however,
13 other place management processes are not static; we call for renewed attention to the ecologies
14 of place management amongst existing place management actors, including town centre
15 managers, business improvement districts, placemaking organisations, and others.
16 Consequently, our paper denaturalises and gives renewed impetus to interrogating the politics of
17 place management.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 While our ethnography did not encounter ecological place management fully realised, we have
31 contributed an empirical case that demonstrates the potential for greater enrollment of ecological
32 thinking in CityHousing, HAs, and place management more generally. Equally, we found that an
33 ecological approach makes room for the richness of everyday life that unfolds in places. The fact
34 is that places are always organising and being organised; managers' temptation to exert control
35 over these stabilisations of socio-ecological life should not be treated as a given, nor should it be
36 the aim of place management. Instead, ecological place management contributes to
37 understanding the multiplicity of ways in which reality is performed through mundane, everyday
38 practices, calling upon anyone seeking to serve and improve places to act as catalysts for
39 organising more socially and ecologically sustainable futures, whether in housing, at the
40 neighbourhood scale (e.g. Beza and Hernández-García, 2018), in town and city centres, and
41 elsewhere. We therefore urge further research on 'place organising' as a concept with potential
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to unsettle place management scholarship and further develop our understanding of the ecologies
4
5 of places.
6
7

8
9 To conclude, we hope that our paper has started to map new trajectories for theorising, studying,
10
11 and practicing place management in more ecologically-minded ways. More ambitiously, our hope
12
13 is that ecological thinking might elevate the tone and pitch of place management debates to match
14
15 the urgency of responding to contemporary interconnected crises as they manifest in places
16
17 (Lloveras et al, 2021). Such a change would reorient place management toward both tackling
18
19 current ecological, social, and political challenges, and better anticipating future emergent ones.
20
21 Here, place managers and place management scholars have a capacity, perhaps even an
22
23 obligation, to act. This paper makes clear that adopting an ecological approach to place
24
25 management can equip us for the hard tasks ahead of addressing the confounding challenges
26
27 society faces and better organising tomorrow's places.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **References**

- 37
38 Ahmed, S., 2006. The nonperformativity of antiracism. *Meridians*, 7(1):104-126.
39
40 Benkő, M., Balla, R. and Hory, G., 2018. Participatory place-making in the renewal of post-
41
42 Communist large prefabricated housing estate: Újpalota case study, Budapest. *Journal*
43
44 *of Place Management and Development*, 11(2):223-241.
45
46 Beza, B.B. and Hernández-Garcia, J., 2018. From placemaking to sustainability citizenship: an
47
48 evolution in the understanding of community realised public spaces in Bogotá's informal
49
50 settlements. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 11(2):192-207.
51
52
53 Blokland, T., 2017. *Community as Urban Practice*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Christophers, B., 2018. *The New Enclosure: The Appropriation of Public Land in Neoliberal*
4 *Britain*. London: Verso.
5
6
7 Cresswell, T., 2015. *Place: A Short Introduction*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
8
9 Fitzpatrick S. and Watts, B., 2017. Competing visions: security of tenure and the welfarisation of
10 English social housing. *Housing Studies*, 32(8):1021-1038.
11
12
13 Fournier, V. and Grey, C., 2000. At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical
14 management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1):7-32.
15
16
17 Gower, R., 2008. People-managed places. *Journal of Place Management and Development*,
18 1(3):315-321.
19
20
21
22 Great Places Commission (GPC), 2019. *Great Places Commission: Ten recommendations for*
23 *creating great places to live*. London: National Housing Federation.
24
25
26 Gurney, C., 2021. Dangerous liaisons? Applying the social harm perspective to the social
27 inequality, housing and health trifecta during the Covid-19 pandemic, *International*
28 *Journal of Housing Policy*, DOI: [10.1080/19491247.2021.1971033](https://doi.org/10.1080/19491247.2021.1971033).
29
30
31
32 Harvey, D., 2005. *Spaces of Neoliberalization: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical*
33 *Development*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
34
35
36 Heath, L., 2022. Levelling Up White Paper: all the housing policies at a glance. *Inside Housing*.
37 Available at: [https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/insight/insight/levelling-up-white-paper-all-](https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/insight/insight/levelling-up-white-paper-all-the-housing-policies-at-a-glance-74120)
38 [the-housing-policies-at-a-glance-74120](https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/insight/insight/levelling-up-white-paper-all-the-housing-policies-at-a-glance-74120)
39
40
41
42
43 Heikkurinen, P., Ruuska, T., Kuokkanen, A. and Russell, S., 2021. Leaving productivism behind:
44 Towards a holistic and processual philosophy of ecological management. *Philosophy of*
45 *Management*, 20(1):21-36.
46
47
48
49 Heslop, J., McFarlane, C. and Ormerod, E., 2020. Relational housing across the North–South
50 divide: learning between Albania, Uganda, and the UK. *Housing Studies*, 35(9):1607-
51 1627.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kaika, M., 2004. Interrogating the geographies of the familiar: domesticating nature and
4
5 constructing the autonomy of the modern home. *International Journal of Urban and*
6
7 *Regional Research*, 28(2):265-286.
8
9 Lefebvre, H., 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*. London: Continuum.
10
11 Lloveras, J., Marshall, A. P., Warnaby, G., & Kalandides, A., 2021. Mobilising Sense of Place for
12
13 Degrowth? Lessons From Lancashire's Anti-fracking Activism. *Ecological Economics*,
14
15 183:106754.
16
17
18 Lucarelli, A., 2018. Place branding as urban policy: The (im)political place branding. *Cities*,
19
20 80:12-21.
21
22 Lucarelli, A., 2019. Constructing a typology of virtual city brand co-creation practices: an
23
24 ecological approach. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 12(2):227-247.
25
26 Madden, D. and Marcuse, P., 2016. *In Defense of Housing: The politics of crisis*. London:
27
28 Verso.
29
30 Malpass, P., 2000. *Housing Associations and Housing Policy: A Historical Perspective*. London:
31
32 Palgrave Macmillan.
33
34 Malpass, P. and Mullins, D., 2002. Local Authority Housing Stock Transfer in the UK: From
35
36 Local Initiative to National Policy, *Housing Studies*, 17(4):673-686.
37
38
39 Manzi, T., and Morrison, N., 2018. Risk, commercialism and social purpose: Repositioning the
40
41 English housing association sector. *Urban Studies*, 55(9):1924–1942.
42
43 Marsh, A., 2018. *Social housing governance: An overview of the issues and evidence*. UK
44
45 Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence.
46
47 Massey, D., 2005. *For Space*. London: SAGE.
48
49 Kim McKee (2011) Sceptical, Disorderly and Paradoxical Subjects: Problematizing the “Will to
50
51 Empower” in Social Housing Governance, *Housing, Theory and Society*, 28(1):1-18.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 McKee, K., 2015. Community anchor housing associations: Illuminating the contested nature of
4
5 neoliberal governing practices at the local scale. *Environment and Planning C:*
6
7 *Government and Policy*, 33(5):1076-1091.
8
9 McKee, K., Muir, J., and Moore, T., 2017. Housing policy in the UK: the importance of spatial
10
11 nuance, *Housing Studies*, 32(1):60-72.
12
13 Meek, J., 2014. *Private Island: Why Britain now belongs to someone else*. London: Verso.
14
15 Millington S and Ntounis N (2017) Repositioning the high street: evidence and reflection from
16
17 the UK. *Journal of Place Management and Development* 10(4):364–379.
18
19 Moran, J., 2004. Housing, memory and everyday life in contemporary Britain. *Cultural Studies*,
20
21 18(4):607-627.
22
23 Mowery, K. and Novak, M., 2016. Challenges, motivations, and desires of downtown
24
25 revitalizers. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 9(1):9-26.
26
27 Nash, L., 2020. Performing Place: A Rhythmanalysis of the City of London. *Organization*
28
29 *Studies*, 41(3):301-321.
30
31 National Housing Federation (NHF), 2021. *Decarbonisation: A guide for housing associations*.
32
33 London: National Housing Federation.
34
35 Ntounis, N.F., 2018. *Place management through different lenses*. Doctoral thesis (PhD),
36
37 Manchester Metropolitan University.
38
39 Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 2009. *The Right to Adequate*
40
41 *Housing*. Geneva: United Nations.
42
43 Parker, C., 2008. Extended editorial: place—the trinal frontier. *Journal of Place Management and*
44
45 *Development*, 1(1):5-14.
46
47 Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., and Land, C., 2014. The question of organization: A
48
49 manifesto for alternatives. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization* 14(4):623-638.
50
51 Pawson, H. and Mullins, D., 2010. *After Council Housing: Britain's new social landlords*.
52
53 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Read, D.C. and Sanderford, D., 2017. Making places and making tradeoffs: mixed-income
4 housing development in practice. *Journal of Place Management and Development*,
5 10(5):461-478.
6
7
8
9 Sheller, M. and Urry, J., 2003. Mobile transformations of 'public' and 'private' life. *Theory*,
10 *Culture & Society*, 20(3):107-125.
11
12
13 Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., et al., 2015. Planetary boundaries: guiding human
14 development on a changing planet. *Science* 347 p. 6223.
15
16
17 Swyngedouw, E. and Kaika, M., 2014. Urban political ecology. Great promises, deadlock...and
18 new beginnings?. *Documents d'anàlisi geogràfica*, 60(3):459-481.
19
20
21 Vandeventer, J.S., Cattaneo, C., and Zografos, C., 2018. A Degrowth Transition: Pathways for
22 the Degrowth Niche to Replace the Capitalist-Growth Regime. *Ecological Economics*,
23 156:272-286.
24
25
26
27 Wainwright, E. and Marandet, E., 2019. Housing Associations as institutional space: Care and
28 control in tenant welfare and training for work. *Area*, 51(2):216-224.
29
30
31
32 Warnaby, G., and Medway, D., 2013. What about the 'place' in place marketing? *Marketing*
33 *Theory*, 13(3):345-363.
34
35
36
37 Yanchula, J., 2008. Finding one's place in the place management spectrum, *Journal of Place*
38 *Management and Development*, 1(1):92-99.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theme	Sub-thematic condensed codes	Indicative practices
Place management practices	Administrative bureaucracy Changing roles/restructuring Management strategies Partnerships	CityHousing's 'place' and 'social investment' strategies Housing partnerships, third sector Restructuring toward place Consultations/negotiations with residents
Socio-ecological processes	Bottom-up activities, activism Comparatives: relational and broader contexts Changing uses of space	Caring for green spaces Gardening, growing food, environmental activism Waste, water, food, and energy use
Socio-political dynamics	Power-laden communication Relations with residents Community Culture, attitudes	Community engagement Everyday life inclusion, and participation Changing policy and political contexts
Political-economic context	Financial focus (money, jobs, capital) Government policies, politics Relations with government	Financialisation and financial viability Quantifying social value Business profitability

Table 1: Themes, sub-thematic condensed codes, and indicative practices

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 1: Sticks as a boundary marker demarcating permaculture gardens