



Dwelling on-the-move together in Sweden: sharing exclusive housing in times of marketization

Karin Grundström

To cite this article: Karin Grundström (2021): Dwelling on-the-move together in Sweden: sharing exclusive housing in times of marketization, Social & Cultural Geography, DOI: [10.1080/14649365.2021.1876909](https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1876909)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1876909>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 25 Jan 2021.



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



Article views: 104



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Dwelling on-the-move together in Sweden: sharing exclusive housing in times of marketization

Karin Grundström

Urban Studies, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

ABSTRACT

For almost a century, Swedes living in shared housing have resided in 'kollektivhus', a form of co-housing that support sharing reproductive work. However, during the past decade, new forms of exclusive shared housing have emerged on the Swedish housing market. In contrast to international trends of vulnerable singles being forced to share housing, this Swedish example shows that also financially privileged singles reside in shared housing. Based on a survey of housing companies and a case study the article argues that mobility has been a driver for this new form of shared housing. In the article, 'dwelling on-the-move together' is identified as a new practice of residing in exclusive shared housing. This practice is characterised by sharing private, exclusive facilities, sharing paid services and sharing spaces for both home and work, in an environment that certifies that residents can come and go as they please while hired staff takes care of their property. While exclusive shared housing is an asset for residents, it also privatise facilities and reintroduces domestic workers to middle-class housing. In all, the marketization of shared housing risks introducing a stratification of shared housing which may reinforce the geographic and social polarisation of Swedish cities.

Vivir juntos en movimiento en Suecia: compartir viviendas exclusivas en tiempos de mercantilización

Durante casi un siglo, los suecos que viven en viviendas compartidas han residido en 'kollektivhus', una forma de co-vivienda que sostiene el trabajo reproductivo compartido. Sin embargo, durante la última década, han surgido nuevas formas de vivienda compartida exclusiva en el mercado inmobiliario sueco. En contraste con las tendencias internacionales de solteros vulnerables que se ven obligados a compartir vivienda, este ejemplo sueco muestra que también los solteros económicamente más privilegiados residen en viviendas compartidas. Basado en una encuesta de empresas de vivienda que ofrecen vivienda compartida exclusiva y un estudio de caso, el artículo sostiene que la movilidad ha sido un motor para el desarrollo de esta nueva forma de vivienda compartida. En el artículo, 'vivir juntos en movimiento' se identifica como una nueva práctica de residir en viviendas compartidas exclusivas. Esta

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 13 February 2019
Accepted 15 November 2020

KEYWORDS

Dwelling on-the-move;
exclusive shared housing;
residential hotel; urban
singles

PALABRAS CLAVE

vivienda en movimiento;
vivienda compartida
exclusiva; hotel residencial;
solteros urbanos

MOTS CLEFS

dwelling-on-the-move;
logement grand standing
partagé; résidence hôtelière;
célibataires citadins

práctica de residir se caracteriza por compartir instalaciones privadas y exclusivas, compartir servicios pagados y compartir espacios tanto para el hogar como para el trabajo, en un ambiente que certifica que los residentes pueden entrar y salir cuando les plazca mientras el personal contratado se ocupa de su propiedad. Si bien la vivienda compartida exclusiva es un activo para los residentes, esta forma de vivienda también privatiza las instalaciones y reintroduce a los trabajadores domésticos en viviendas de clase media. El artículo concluye que la mercantilización de la vivienda compartida corre el riesgo de introducir una estratificación de la vivienda compartida que, a su vez, puede reforzar la polarización geográfica y social existente de las ciudades suecas.

Vivir juntos en movimiento en Suecia: compartir viviendas exclusivas en tiempos de mercantilización

Depuis presque un siècle, les Suédois qui vivent en co-logements ont habité dans des « kollektivhus », un genre d'habitat qui encourage le partage du travail reproductif. Néanmoins, au cours de la dernière décennie, de nouvelles formes de logements partagés grand standing sont apparues au sein du marché immobilier suédois. À l'opposé de la tendance mondiale qui voit les célibataires vulnérables forcés à cohabiter, cet exemple suédois montre également que les célibataires plus privilégiés financièrement vivent en co-logements. Reposant sur une enquête auprès d'entreprises immobilières qui offrent des logements partagés grand standing et sur une étude de cas, cet article soutient que la mobilité a été un vecteur du développement de ce nouveau type d'habitat partagé. Dans l'article, le phénomène appelé « dwelling on-the-move together », ce qui veut dire « habiter en déplacement ensemble », est identifié comme étant un nouveau mode de vie consistant à vivre dans des logements partagés grand standing. Ce mode de vie se caractérise par le partage de luxueuses installations privées, de services professionnels rémunérés et d'espaces pour le domicile autant que pour le travail, dans un environnement qui garantit que les habitants peuvent aller et venir à leur gré tandis qu'une équipe d'employés prend soin de la propriété. Bien que ces logements partagés soient avantageux pour leurs occupants, ce type d'habitation privatise aussi les installations et réintroduit le personnel de maison dans les résidences des classes moyennes. L'article conclut que la commercialisation de l'habitat partagé risque d'introduire une stratification des co-logements, ce qui à son tour pourrait renforcer les polarisations géographique et sociale des villes suédoises.

Introduction

Following the increase in singleton populations, there is a recent, growing trend toward shared housing in advanced economies, calling for explorations of the new geographies and new notions of sharing that are forming (Maalsen, 2020). This trend has led to a variation of the forms of shared housing available. One consequence is an emerging economic profiteering of residents in shared housing. Young professionals in the creative

economy, for example, live in less affordable, shared housing where home is transformed into a 'capital accumulation technology' (Bergan et al., 2020; Nordlander, 2019). Another consequence, as in the case of the Japanese 'Shea Hausu', is that renters are forced into short notice periods and shorter than customary tenures (Druta & Ronald, 2020). In the Swedish case, new forms of shared, exclusive housing contribute to profiteering, although not of residents, but through the reintroduction of domestic workers and through the privatisation of facilities.

In 2020, the Swedish metropolitan regions are experiencing a combination of an increase in singletons residing in cities, a rise in housing costs and an increase in the demand for shared housing. The most well-known Swedish form of shared housing is the kollektivhus, a form of co-housing that has existed since 1935. Kollektivhus is, architecturally, a combination of individual apartments and shared facilities, designed to support sharing reproductive work, such as cooking, child care, maintenance and gardening. It is 'working together' that forms the social bonds in this form of housing (Vestbro, 2010; Westholm, 2019). Sharing reproductive work has meant kollektivhus has been met with some scepticism, being considered a 'leftist' form of housing in which residents are 'forced to share everything – even their toothbrush' (Sandstedt & Westin, 2015). In contrast to this scepticism, Sandstedt and Westin argue that kollektivhus is home to people of varying backgrounds, but fundamental to this housing form is sharing based on 'Bund'. Management as well as 'daily chores are done willingly and with the affective solidarity the residents have for one another' (ibid: 147). Since the 2010s, however, Sweden has also seen a development of exclusive forms of shared, so called 'concept' and 'lifestyle' housing, developed and marketed to specific age and interest groups. These housing complexes are marketed as 'like living in a hotel – but at home' (Victoria Park, 2007) and as fulfilling 'the dream of a life served' (Selvaag, 2016), alluding to luxury and in-house services. This shift in the notion of sharing housing has taken place during a period of deregulation and marketization of the Swedish housing sector (Hedin et al., 2012). Seemingly, the Swedish middle class increasingly opts to buy into shared housing. Similar to other new housing complexes, exclusive shared housing offer individual apartment sizes ranging from 40 to 150 square meters, offer a long-term, permanent form of tenure and are organised as housing associations. One important difference is that exclusive shared housing is marketed especially to those who have international jobs, flexible work hours or travel extensively (Selvaag, 2016), who are part of the so-called 'creative class' (Florida, 2001). These creative individuals take the opportunity to choose whom to share daily life and place with while at the same time leading flexible and mobile lives.

This article sets out to explore exclusive shared housing; why do (primarily) urban singles choose to live in this form of housing, what types of facilities are included, and what does sharing housing actually mean in the context of privatized facilities and in-house services? The aim is to explore how mobility, specifically daily movement, has influenced practices of residing in exclusive shared housing, and, the potential consequences exclusive shared housing may have on residential segregation patterns. Daily movement is contextualised through a case study of Victoria Park, the first example of a luxurious housing complex inaugurated in 2009 in Limhamn, Malmö. Victoria Park is a housing association [bostadsrättsförening, i.e. the major and most common form of ownership apartments in Sweden] that comprises apartments of one to four bedrooms

(40–150 m²) and luxurious, shared facilities. In addition, there is a compulsory service tariff. Since Victoria Park, similar exclusive ‘residential hotels’ (Grundström, 2017a) have also been built in Göteborg and Stockholm. In line with research arguing that ‘the spatial dichotomy of nomad or sedentary understanding, and of fixity and flow needs to be unlocked’, daily movement is in this article interpreted as places ‘linked-in-motion’ (Jensen, 2009). In the article, dwelling on-the-move together is identified as a new practice of residing in exclusive shared housing. This practice of residing is characterised by sharing private, exclusive facilities, sharing paid services and sharing spaces for both home and work, in an environment that certifies that residents can come and go as they please while hired staff takes care of their property. The exclusive shared housing complex Victoria Park serves as a case to show first, that this is an individualist form of housing where *gemenskap* (sense of togetherness) is constructed around middle-class distinction of food, fitness and travel in a context of lounging with like-minded. Secondly, exclusive shared housing reintroduced servants and domestic workers to middle-class housing, and third, it is a form of housing that is designed to support a continuous shift between the presence and absence of residents. The article argues that mobility has been a driver for the development of shared housing. The mobile lifestyle of the creative class has reached middle-class housing. In conclusion, the marketization of housing has increased the variation of shared forms of housing available. This is still a recent development, but the increase in singletons coupled to the increasing housing costs point towards more sharing. While exclusive shared housing is an asset for residents, it also risks introducing a stratification of shared housing, which in turn may reinforce the existing geographic and social polarisation of Swedish cities.

Sharing a mobile everyday life

Housing specifically designed to be shared is grounded in ideas about how to (re-) organize everyday life, about which activities should be carried out in which physical space, and by whom. In order to capture the shifting conceptualisation of shared housing through the relation between individuals, activities and physical space, this article takes a theoretical starting point in everyday spatial practice. The concept of spatial practice is grounded in the writing of scholars such as Lefebvre (1974) and Bourdieu (1995), who have theorized individuals’ everyday life. According to Lefebvre (1974), ‘Spatial practice/... /embodies a close association, within perceived space, between daily reality (daily routine) and urban reality (the routes and networks which link up the places set aside for work, “private” life and leisure). This association is a paradoxical one because it includes the most extreme separation between the places it links together’ (Lefebvre, 1974). The everyday perspective forms a link between the various places where the everyday is practiced and lived, thus questioning the division or categorisation of ‘different’ spaces. In this article, the analysis of shared housing from the perspective of the everyday includes architecture as well as the daily movements and activities of residents.

Considering the shift in Swedish housing towards de-regulation and marketization, mentioned above, and the shift in designing exclusive shared housing for the ‘creative’ middle-class, the analysis is also based on the stratifying factors of consumption and mobility (Bauman, 1998). Bauman developed the personas of the ‘tourist’ and the ‘vaga-bond’ in order to capture evolving social stratification processes of mobility. ‘Situational

control': the 'ability to choose where and with what parts of the world to "interface" and when to switch off the connection' is central to the tourist persona (Bauman, 1996:11). While vagabonds are 'the waste of the world', either restricted from moving or forced to migrate, tourists travel the world because they find it irresistible, for business or for pleasure, as a strategy to sustain a livelihood or fulfil dreams and desires. Tourists travel through life as adventurous consumers of experience: they choose destinations, housing, careers and partners as their hearts desire, and leave everything behind without any effort (Bauman, 1996, 1998). In a world of mobility, the life strategies, or rules of the thumb of the 'tourist' include not getting emotionally attached to people where you stop over; not commit yourself too strongly to places; do not delay gratification – try to get what you want right away (Bauman, 1996). Bauman reminds us, that we all play our roles as tourists and vagabonds, as we are 'plotted according to the degree of freedom we possess in choosing our life itineraries' and the places where we dwell. How we live, where we remain in place and where we move, is undergoing a change. Analysing and understanding these changes in movement of bodies in social and geographical worlds is important, since societies and cultures not only ascribe specific meanings to mobility but also prescribe specific practices (Cresswell & Merriman, 2011). Even though housing has seemingly strong connections to stasis and permanence of residing, no form of housing exists in complete stasis or permanence; mobility is always present. In line with this thinking, residential space is always linked-in-motion (Jensen, 2009).

The frame for analysing exclusive shared housing is thus based in practice (Lefebvre, 1974), the 'doing of housing' in daily life. Dwelling is understood as a notion that opens up for mobility, of housing as spaces linked-in-motion (Jensen, 2009) rather than the Heideggerian notion of dwelling [wohnen] as identity or place belongingness (Haarman & Lefas, 2009). While there are various ways of sharing housing, as for example, kollektivhus, which support ethical and ecological ways of residing, the objective here is not to elaborate on ethics of shared housing, but to investigate the consequences on residential segregation patterns, when mobility is seen as an asset on the housing market.

Methods

Methodologically, the article draws on both quantitative and qualitative material. A survey of Swedish media coverage of the exclusive forms of shared housing that emerged in the 2010s was carried out in 2015. Based on the media survey, a review was carried out of websites, advertisements and marketing materials produced by developers and property agents, where search terms included 'lifestyle housing' [livsstilsboende], 'concept housing' [konceptboende] and 'co-housing' [kollektivhus]. The review revealed what facilities were included and what services were offered to residents. Data from Statistics Sweden (2019) were gathered in order to assess the magnitude of shared housing for urban singles. Overall, Statistics Sweden estimates that close to 500,000 adult, non-family individuals share housing. This figure is quite significant since it excludes individuals in retirement homes, student housing, housing shared between generations and assisted forms of living. However, the statistics do not reveal what types of housing are shared, nor to which extent they include shared facilities.

A case study of Victoria Park in Malmö was carried out in 2011 and 2012. Victoria Park was chosen as a case based on information-oriented selection, representing an extreme case (Flyvbjerg, 2006), as it was the first and largest housing complex in Sweden built as exclusive shared housing. The first phase of construction, including 133 dwellings and 3,500 m² of shared areas, was inaugurated in 2009 and since then four new (of five planned) apartment buildings have been constructed. The shared spaces of Victoria Park comprise a reception, a lounge, restaurant, billiard room, library, wine cellar, cinema, spa, pool, gym, a private park and tennis court. The private park and the housing complex are gated with a low fence, the premises are guarded by a private security company and the first CCTV surveillance system for private housing was installed here. The residence is located at the outskirts of the city, yet it is well connected to national and international transportation infrastructure. The case study started with an interview with one of the first and most active residents, after which a snowball selection procedure was used. Semi-structured interviews with eight residents and a focus group interview with seven residents initiated the case study (Kvale, 1997). Questions addressed everyday life and the reasons behind the choice of housing. In addition, a walk-through interview with eight residents included discussions of residents' use of various facilities and their perception of the aesthetics of the interior decorations and the architectural design. Methods also included participant observations, joining guided tours and walks for visitors and potential residents, mingling over coffee, visiting apartments by invitation, and speaking with residents, housing association board members, receptionists and staff employed at Victoria Park. For ethical reasons, respondents were anonymised and all interviews were transcribed. An empirically based analysis of the interview material was followed by a theoretically induced analysis. In all, the empirical data gathered from the case study, which included interviews, walk-alongs, and notes from observations, together with the marketing material of new forms of shared housing provides a substantial amount of information from which an initial analysis can be made.

Sharing exclusive housing in times of marketization

The construction of shared forms of housing is growing in Sweden (Westholm, 2019). A rise in interest can be identified through discussions and debates in the media (Selvaag, 2016); in the real estate business (Nordlander, 2019) and in the construction of exclusive shared housing, such as the 'residential hotels' (Grundström, 2017). In Stockholm, Svea Fanfar offers luxurious apartments combined with catering and a spa and fitness centre. Sädesärlan, completed in 2013, offers 'a hotel feel through a unique service concept'. Karlavägen 78 offers 'in-house services' and a revived form of 'room service' as well as 'dog walking'. TureNo8 claims to have imported a concept from New York based on 'international design hotels' and comes complete with a logo and a reception to cater to the needs of residents (Melin Lundgren, 2008).

Victoria Park was the first example of 'lifestyle' housing and can be said to represent the introduction of exclusive shared housing on the Swedish housing market. The similar housing complexes that followed were constructed in small groups of 80–600 apartments and in total numbers, the most exclusive complexes only comprise less than one per cent of the units constructed yearly in Sweden. Even though small in numbers they have influenced the market by introducing exclusive, shared facilities. More

importantly, the spatial relations are reconfigured in comparison to the kollektivhus form of shared housing. Practices have changed from sharing daily practices of reproductive work including cooking, gardening and care (Sandstedt & Westin, 2015), to togetherness based on 'situational control' (Bauman, 1996) by individuals who decide when and where to 'interface' and when to move on. New spaces in the form of lounges, receptions and workspaces are introduced and practices formed around sharing private, exclusive facilities, sharing paid services and sharing spaces for both home and work.

Sharing private, exclusive facilities: lounging with like-minded

Exclusive shared housing provides spaces that support an easy way of socialising for residents who lead a daily, mobile life. In Victoria Park, the ground floor of the housing complex comprises an interconnected space of reception and lounge, billiard room and library, a restaurant, pool, sauna, gym and spa area, a small private park and tennis court. A key feature of exclusive shared housing complexes is that they architecturally allude to luxury and draw on exclusive hotel architecture. The residential hotels mimics the 'spaces of collective performances' (Bollerey, 2013) of hotels, by introducing lounges, restaurants and fitness and spa areas to housing.

The lounge plays an important role in the social life of residents. A lounge in a residence mimics the hotel lounge, but in contrast to the (semi-) public space of a hotel, it is a completely private space. In Victoria Park, the lounge is the central meeting place where residents socialise and relax. This is where residents 'bump into others', where they stop and read newspapers on their way from work, chat over coffee or a glass of wine or take part in one of the many clubs set up – these include a cooking club, party committee, theatre and art clubs and many more. The lounge is also a place for events and entertainment; the grand piano signals musical entertainment and decorations signal seasonal festivities. The number of residents socializing here varies annually and daily, but the constant flow of residents lounging and walking through supports daily interaction. Lars, a resident in his mid-sixties, works for only half of the year on his farm; in the winter he enjoys living at Victoria Park due to the lifestyle and the social interaction. Lars specifically mentions the spa and the lounge as the main locus for social interaction.

The Spa is a very good meeting place. And the Lounge of course. We often joke about this being our living room. Not everyone has such a large living room! You can just come here and hang out.

Socialising is important to residents, and several mention that they have more time to socialise than before moving in. Greta, a woman in her late fifties who runs a restaurant, explains that living here has afforded her more time for herself. One reason is that they no longer need to 'mow the lawn'. Several residents use this expression, likely because many did have a lawn to mow at their previous homes, but it's also an expression that summarizes the reduction of caretaking, maintenance and reproductive work that results from living here. When more time is available, it is socialising for the sake of socialising and investment in oneself, in fitness and health, which is most important, as explained by Greta:

... you have no lawn to take care of, so you know, you just don't do that much here, you can spend time on yourself. You can go to the gym, you can swim, you can go and have a cup of coffee [in the lounge] and talk to someone. So, there's such an awful lot of things to do so sometimes I wish there was more time, since I work.

Time available is often spent in the company of co-residents when staying at Victoria Park. Residents frequently mention *gemenskap* [feeling of togetherness] as one thing they appreciate. The sense of togetherness is in part due to the character of the residents, since one key quality people need to enjoy living here is, according to Lisa, to be a social, extroverted person. Lisa is in her mid-thirties and works internationally. She thinks that many of the residents have a similar mindset.

What we have in common is that we appreciate what Victoria Park has to offer. And such people, from what I know, are very open and social and that leads to ... if you have time, you go to the Lounge to talk. You know, people are open, they talk ... I mean when I lived in town, I hardly ever said hello to my neighbours. But here ... we socialise a lot and I think that's very enjoyable.

Having a lounge as the main place for socialising creates the feeling of staying in a hotel (Bollerey, 2013) and instills a public atmosphere. According to Lars, socialising here is grounded in 'common courtesy': residents know how to behave and how to dress. Several residents are dressed as if at work or having a night out. Socialising at Victoria Park is confined to residents and their guests only, thus to some extent ensuring that everyone can be expected to know and adhere to like-minded codes of conduct. 'Lounging with like-minded' is thus a central feature of residing in Victoria Park. In addition, the number of spaces and service available for socialising, and the constant movement between them, offer residents the ability to choose when to interact with others and when to 'switch off the connections' (Bauman, 1996). Residents can enjoy Ayurveda and beauty treatments, have a drink or snack, swim, exercise, relax and mingle in the spa area where bamboo, Buddha statues, tea samovars and sun lamps call to mind Bali, Miami or the Maldives. Socialising in this way is reminiscent of the 'tourist persona' as it takes place in a somewhat distanced sense. At any time residents can choose another place to lounge because they found the previous one boring or not attractive enough, too familiar or holding too few surprises (Bauman, 1996). Sven, a pilot in his early sixties explains how socialising is negotiated here: 'we like being close – but not too close'. When untried opportunities beckon elsewhere, and the world is irresistibly attractive, there is little meaning to being 'too close', since the tourist-resident will soon be on the move.

Sharing paid services: reintroducing domestic workers to housing

A second key feature of exclusive shared housing is that it provides paid services, a prerequisite for residents who may be absent for long periods of time. At Victoria Park, which the first shared housing complex to include a service tariff, private companies provide the services. The main service provider (also named Victoria Park) takes care of cleaning and maintenance and runs the reception desk, while other companies run the restaurant and the spa. But even though several companies are involved, the reception is the main locus for services; it is located at the main entrance by the lounge and it is the primary space for communication, security and control of passage.

The receptionists are in-house staff. They take calls; they deliver daily newspapers and magazines; they say good morning and afternoon; they serve you coffee at three o'clock and pour you a glass of wine should you wish. The receptionists forward messages and store information for residents, they assist with dog-walking, maintenance of the website and provide travel services. Lisa explains that even if there is a fee, it's cheaper than paying separately for going to the gym, to a spa or to the movies. The service is something she enjoys and is prepared to pay for.

For me, this lifestyle means having an indoor pool available all the time ... having the outdoor pool during summer, a cinema where you can watch movies, I love the cinema ... I mean, this feeling of service, it's like living in a hotel ... they take care of your mail when you're on vacation and that sort of thing, you know ... I appreciate that.

Many residents are frequent travellers. Maria and Martin sold their house in the countryside and moved to Victoria Park when Maria retired. The advantage here is they can use their time to go on weekend trips to European capitals without worrying about their property. Other residents, like Lisa and Sven, work internationally, and others like Greta, frequently visit family. One thing that is an advantage of in-house staff, according to Greta, is that they can handle chores when you're away.

Everything here is close at hand. I live near the reception ... so if I'm travelling, you know, I don't have to worry about my flowers and such, like your mail. You just go to the reception and they collect your mail. You don't have to think about those things.

The staffed reception serves as a communication node and a site for assists with daily chores that mobile residents are not willing to, or do not know how to, handle. Also, residents appreciate that the in-house staff keeps an extra key to let workers into the apartments should something need to be fixed. Residents also mention that it is important to know that your apartment is secure when you travel, work or live abroad for long period of time. Because of the services offered and the security of the premises, private property stays safe, since someone would notice if there were a break-in (so far there have been no attempts). In addition, the receptionists, aided by security codes and cameras, make sure that only residents and their guests are welcomed in. Such access restrictions also depend on residents complaining that they have been 'stared at' by curious passers-by. Media attention to Victoria Park has meant that journalists and passers-by are curious about the complex, but the residents want their privacy. In all, the staffed reception function as a buffer that supports the 'bubble of osmosis' that the 'tourist' inhabits. Only those things that the inhabitant of the bubble admits may leak in, and only those things that the inhabitant allows to exit may seep out (Bauman, 1996:11). Sharing paid services is key to residents who choose between being present and absent. One consequence, whether services are provided by in-house staff or online, is that this type of housing re-introduces domestic workers into middle-class housing, albeit in a neoliberal format. The tasks are divided among different groups and businesses and thus made less obvious and less visible.

Sharing work and home: a mobile daily life

A third key feature of exclusive shared housing is that it provides spaces for both home and work, thus supporting a mobile and flexible daily life. Victoria Park was the first

example of housing that also included specific facilities for its residents' income-generating work. The housing complex provides meeting rooms that are let to residents who hold meetings with clients. Peter, an entrepreneur in his fifties, explains that he runs his business from home and he invites his clients here. He thinks the environment is impressive, and finds it practical to have meetings here and then lunch at the restaurant. Many of his clients appreciate the environment, although there are also some who are unwilling to come, since the place is 'too posh', and then meetings take place outside the premises.

Given that several residents have flexible work hours, many take the opportunity to work from home. Lisa works internationally and when in Sweden she has the possibility to work from home. She uses her apartment, but also the other facilities.

Sometimes I work from home ... because then it is quite fun to go the spa during lunch, which I've done quite a lot. In summer, when it's 30 degrees, you don't go to the office to sweat, perhaps not sweat, but at least to be bored ... then I sit at home and work and sometimes I work by the pool as well ... it's a matter of choice how to do it. I'm an Epicurean, I like to enjoy things ... Optimize what you have!

Victoria Park provides a varied environment that can be used for work as well as living. Residents with flexible working hours can choose their preferred location for work; they can work by the pool, in their apartment, receive colleagues and customers in the meeting room or shift between work and leisure during the day. Irrespective of the distance, residents can communicate with colleagues and friends via Internet-based platforms and social media. Flexible work hours and international jobs mean that residents are mobile in their working lives. This seemingly contradictory way of living – having a social life and a work life yet always being able to leave – is mentioned by Greta as one of the reasons why she enjoys residing here:

I believe in this, this lifestyle. You have time left over for yourself and you have people around you./ ... /This is perfect for me, I can meet people when I want and I can come and leave as I choose.

The mobile lifestyle is not restricted to residents who work; several residents own vacation homes, travel, and visit friends and family for long or short periods, thus distributing their dwellings and moving between them. Working, shopping or vacationing takes place for Sven in Dubai, for Martin and Maria in Hamburg and for Greta in Stockholm: 'shopping and nightlife are great and easily accessible while travelling abroad', as Lisa states. The individual choice of being able to leave everything behind at any moment in time, as expressed by Greta, is a practice shared and appreciated by residents. Victoria Park and similar housing complexes are supportive of a life lived in continuous movement, reminiscent of the life of the persona of the tourist. As Bauman (1996, 2000) argues, the point of tourist life is to be on the move, not to arrive.

Dwelling on-the-move together – a new practice of residing

Exclusive shared housing offers the advantages of 'going solo' (Klinenberg, 2012) – while still being in the company of others. This somewhat contradictory practice of residing can be termed dwelling on-the-move together. Residents share many of the traits of the

'tourist persona' (Bauman, 1996) even though they do not belong to the international, creative, cybernetic elite (Pellegrina, 2006). Rather, dwelling on-the-move together is a middle-class phenomenon. Residents in Victoria Park and similar housing complexes belong to a group who can afford to buy exclusive housing. In addition, they choose to share their daily lives with co-residents, while at the same time require the option of being absent.

Architecturally, exclusive shared housing affords the practice of dwelling on-the-move together. The architectural elements that have spread from Victoria Park are the staffed reception, the lounge and the spaces for fitness. These elements signal the 'lifestyle' of the middle class. This is where residents bump into one another and where they can enjoy a place for a cool and glamorous lifestyle, based on middle-class distinctions of travel, food and fitness. Rather than shared kitchens, laundry rooms and nurseries, as in kollektivhus (Vestbro, 2010), these examples sooner recall women's hotels (Hayden, 1981) or the Baden-Baden hotel prototype built in 1807 (Bollerey, 2013), with 'luxurious possibilities of a good kitchen, bath, garden, casino, billiard room and library'. In this sense, exclusive shared housing allude to the temporariness of the hotel, of a place where one stays for shorter period of time, and, that instils a somewhat public atmosphere since all guests are on the move. Also, this form of housing steps back a century to a time when middle-class apartment living included servants and domestic workers. Just as previously, these workers facilitate and support the mobility of residents. In all, residents are provided with housing that afford 'dwelling' for shorter or longer period of time. While this practice also is true of people who own multiple vacation homes and apartments, the difference here is that Victoria Park and similar housing complexes were specifically designed to cater for such practices.

Dwelling on-the-move together comprises notions of a sense of, 'togetherness' as was often mentioned by residents of Victoria Park. In the interviews, it was evident that close friendships were established and that residents would help each other in their daily lives, as part of creating togetherness. Still, what residents wanted was not to share work, but to have a daily social life that including having a coffee, reading the newspaper and making small talk with co-residents. The Victoria Park singles were socially extroverted; they enjoy lounging with like-minded people in an exclusive environment and feel comfortable presenting themselves in its various spaces for collective performances of travel, health and fitness. This form of togetherness is built on socialising in a somewhat distanced sense, by individuals who decide when and where to 'interface' and when to move on. It could be argued that most forms of shared housing include the choice of when to socialise and when not to. However, when togetherness is based on sharing work and maintenance, which is often the case in shared housing, residents need to be present and need to contribute. In contrast, the practice of dwelling on-the-move together is based on the continuous movement of residents, of being present and absent interchangeably, yet adhering to the required courtesy.

Singleton living has the advantage of being able to decide over one's own time and activities (Klinenberg, 2012; Sandstedt, 1991). This was also mentioned at Victoria Park as a positive aspect of being single, but the added value here for residents is their mobility. Leading a life on-the-move, in exclusive shared housing means that residents can choose among different places, for work or leisure interchangeably, and thanks to the in-house staff and security arrangements, they can 'leave everything behind as their hearts desire'

(Bauman, 1998, 2000). Furthermore, these housing complexes are located in wealthier parts of cities and in proximity to high-speed transport infrastructure, and transportation nodes. Exclusive shared housing thus provides a place for multiple activities and serves as a connection point between multiple places of varying scales. The practice of residing brings together the most different spaces, formed around daily movement, in housing with shared facilities and services. The home can be made into a workspace through a digital meeting; the pool area can change from a work-space to a leisure space; time at home is followed by a weekend in Dubai and a visit to family in Stockholm for a couple of weeks. Spaces are thus linked-in-motion (Jensen, 2009) rather than defined by stasis or movement. As a consequence, the 'networks between places set aside for work, private life and leisure' (Lefebvre, 1974) are transformed from the existing separation between places of work or dwelling or leisure, to networks based on continuous movement. Leading this life has the advantage of avoiding the corporeality of a daily life where place and time are fixed, and travel between places is time consuming and tiring.

In sum, exclusive shared housing is constructed around the concentration of assets of high value to mobile, urban singles. It could be argued that living a life on the move does not necessitate a specific form of housing, which is correct. But in these cases, mobility can be seen as a key driving force for singles sharing exclusive housing and it is a central feature of the practice of residing.

Towards a stratified market of shared housing?

Sweden has among the highest number of singleton populations globally. In Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö, 42 to 44 per cent of the population lives in single-person households (Statistics Sweden, 2013) and the numbers of singletons who share housing with non-family members is increasing. The high number of singletons is likely one reason why singleness is not as stigmatized as in other countries. For more than three decades, Swedish singles have, at a young age, the opportunity to move out of their parental home to an apartment of their own (Boverket, 2014; Klinenberg, 2012). The change in the 2010s is that they have started sharing. The exclusive shared housing presented here are still new to Sweden and, so far, limited in extent. Nevertheless, adding spaces of a more exclusive character has also been taken up by housing associations more broadly. As the cost of housing has increased, dwelling size has somewhat decreased and this has led to a demand for spaces that add value to housing, as explained by a realtor in Stockholm (Westholm, 2019). These might be a rooftop sundeck, a sauna, gym, or a shared lounge – spaces for socialising and fitness. Thus, exclusive architectural elements spread to the ordinary housing market, albeit at its higher end. Another example is the type of residence dubbed 'Bovieran' (a Swedish portmanteau for 'Riviera living'), which is an example of housing built around a common, interior garden only accessible to residents. The interior garden has exotic plants, a boule court and furniture for mingling and socialising. Bovieran residences have increased in number in medium-sized cities around Sweden, with around 400 apartments built thus far and another 200 planned and under construction. Svea Fanfar in Stockholm is the third example: this housing complex includes reception, lounge and fitness facilities, with the addition of organized child care and catering as a way to facilitate life for families with children. Finally, co-living apartments built in Stockholm

allude to mobility as an elite form of living and working in shared accommodation and are rented to young professionals in the creative industries (Nordlander, 2019). What is clear is that the rise of singles and the increase in housing designed to be shared is an expression of changing notions about housing and signals a shift towards a larger variation of the types of shared housing in Sweden.

Sharing housing through practices of dwelling on the move together certainly has many advantages for residents, since it provides them with the facilities and services they require. However, the consequence for the neighbourhood and the city are more dubious. The introduction of exclusive shared housing signals a shift in the notion of sharing; what facilities are shared and how they are shared in private or in public. The consequence of housing with private lounges, restaurants and fitness centres is that the middle class can buy access to private facilities and services through housing, while others who can not afford to buy these properties will be left outside. This leads to a risk of increased segregation and challenges for urban planning and design, raising questions about whom the 'public' amenities and services will be planned for. Moreover, the marketization of shared housing risks developing a stratified market of shared housing; an echelon of exclusivity based on mobility.

This article has explored how daily movement, has influenced practices of residing in exclusive shared housing, and, the potential consequences exclusive shared housing may have on residential segregation patterns. Through the case study of Victoria Park and other exclusive housing complexes, this article makes two contributions to our understanding between mobility and housing. First, it shows how daily movement has become an asset (Bourdieu, 1995) intrinsically linked to exclusive shared housing. Daily movement patterns are inscribed in housing design and related to socio-economic difference (Bauman, 1996, 2000), risking the reinforcement of social and geographic polarisation in metropolitan regions. Secondly, taking into account both the architecture and the daily movement of residents, the practice of dwelling on-the-move together is identified as a new form of residing. This is important since it contributes to an understanding of housing theorised as a space linked-in-motion (Jensen, 2009).

In this article, the analysis of the upper echelon of the housing market of shared housing is initiated, but a substantial amount of research remains as the shared housing market expands: what are the respective arguments and strategies of real estate developers and municipal housing companies that invest in shared housing and how is sharing related to socioeconomic factors and ethnicity? These issues are important, since undoubtedly, the population of singletons populations will continue to rise and many will choose to reside in shared housing.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Oana Druta, Richard Ronald and Sue Heath for organising this special issue and facilitating a collegial and supportive workshop in Amsterdam. Thank you also to the anonymous reviewers who helped improve the article.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This research was supported by the Swedish research council Formas [grant number: 2019-00522];

References

- Bauman, Z. (1996). Tourists and vagabonds: Heroes and victims of postmodernity. *Political Science Series No. 30*. Wien: Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS), Wien.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization. The human consequence*. Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.
- Bergan, T. L., Gorman-Murray, A., & Power, E. R. (2020). Coliving housing: Home cultures of precarity for the new creative class. *Social & Cultural Geography*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2020.1734230>
- Bollerey, F. (2013). Beyond the lobby. Setting the stage for modernity, the cosmos of the hotel. In T. Avermaete & A. Massey (Eds.), *Hotel lobbies and lounges, the architecture of professional hospitality* (pp. 237–242). Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Praktiskt förnuft. Bidrag till en handlingsteori* [Raison pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action]. Bokförlaget Daidalos.
- Cresswell, T., & Merriman, P. (eds.). (2011). *Geographies of mobilities: Practices, spaces, subjects*. Ashgate.
- Druta, O., & Ronald, R. (2020). Living alone together in Tokyo share houses. *Social & Cultural Geography*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2020.1744704>
- Florida, R. (2001). *The rise of the creative class, and how it's transforming leisure, community and everyday life*. A Literary Agency.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>
- Grundström, K. (2017). Grindsamhälle: The rise of urban gating and gated housing in Sweden. *Housing Studies*, 33(5), 759–776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2017.1342774>
- Haarman, A., & Lefas, P. (2009). *Dwelling and architecture, from Heidegger to Koolhaas*. Jovis Verlag.
- Hayden, D. (1981). *The grand domestic revolution: A history of feminis design for American homes, neighbourhoods and cities*. MIT Press.
- Hedin, K., Clark, E., Lundholm, E., & Malmberg, G. (2012). Neoliberalization of housing in Sweden: Gentrification, filtering, and social polarization. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 102(2), 443–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2011.620508>
- Jensen, O. B. (2009). Flows of meaning, cultures of movement urban mobility as meaningful everyday life practice. *Mobilities*, 4(1), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100802658002>
- Klinenberg, E. (2012). *Going solo. The extraordinary rise and surprising appeal of living alone*. Penguin Books.
- Kvale, S. (1997). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun* [The qualitative research interview]. Studentlitteratur.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974 (2007)). *The production of space*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Maalsen, S. (2020). 'Generation Share': Digitalized geographies of shared housing. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 21(1), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1466355>
- Melin Lundgren, N. (2008) Livsstilsboende—den nya trenden [Lifestyle Housing—the New Trend]. *Byggindustrin* [Online].
- Nordlander, M. (2019). Bostadsdelningstrenden tar nya kliv [New steps forward for the house sharing trend]. *Fastighetsnytt*, 2019(2), 25.
- Sandstedt, E. (1991). *Att bo ensam. Om enboendliv i Sverige* [Housed alone. Singleton living in Sweden]. Bygghörsningsrådet T12:1991.
- Sandstedt, E., & Westin, S. (2015). Beyond Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. cohousing life in contemporary Sweden. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 32:2(2), 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2015.1011687>

- Selvaag (2016). *Personlig service för en bekvämare vardag* [Personal service for a more comfortable every day]. Information on Lifestyle housing, Stockholm: Plusservice.[accessed 2020 September 01. <https://www.plusservice.se>].
- Statistics Sweden (2013). *Ensamstående utan barn är Sveriges vanligaste hushåll* [Singleperson households with no children is statistically the most common household in Sweden]. Stockholm: Statistics Sweden.[Accessed 2020September 01. <https://www.scb.se/hitta-statistik/sverige-i-siffror/mannis-korna-i-sverige/hushall-i-sverige/>].
- Statistics Sweden (2019, March). Excerpts of data on singles sharing housing. *Personal communication*.
- Vestbro, U. ed. (2010). *Living Together Proceedings from the International Collaborative Housing Conference in Stockholm 5–9 May*. Stockholm: KTH & Kollektivhus NU.
- Victoria Park. (2007) *Victoria Park Prospect*. Available at <http://www.victoriapark.se> [accessed May 2012] Malmö: Victoria Park.
- Westholm, H. (2019). *De byggde gemenskap. Erfarenheter från tio bygg- och bogemenskaper i Sverige* [Building togetherness, experiences from ten co-housing complexes in Sweden]. Centrum för Boendets Arkitektur.