



The changing face of football: Stadiums and communities

John Bale

To cite this article: John Bale (2000) The changing face of football: Stadiums and communities, Soccer & Society, 1:1, 91-101, DOI: [10.1080/14660970008721251](https://doi.org/10.1080/14660970008721251)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14660970008721251>



Published online: 18 Apr 2007.



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



Article views: 2230



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 27 View citing articles [↗](#)

The Changing Face of Football: Stadiums and Communities

JOHN BALE

Football is regarded as a 'representational' sport. Professional football clubs represent places large and small – villages, towns, cities and nations. Football communities exist in a number of forms. A community of fans is a social network of interacting individuals but it is not necessary for such a community to be concentrated in a defined territory such as a city. The development of television, international transportation and the Internet has meant that today and in the future fandom can and will exist as a community without propinquity. Football possesses its own community of followers but the sport also imposes itself on broader communities, upon which it has various impacts. This essay will not deal with national or global football communities but will focus on the urban scale where the notion of 'community' can be conceptualized in two forms. The first is the urban community in which the club is located, after which it is invariably named, and which the club can be said to 'represent'. The second is the smaller community within which the club is sited. This second community is made up of the people and businesses lying in proximity to the football stadium. I will explore the relationship between club and community by first making some general observations about such a relationship and secondly by focusing on changes that have taken place since the Taylor Report. The implications of such changes are clearly relevant to the map of British football in the twenty-first century.

Though 'community' is a central theme in this study, it is almost impossible to deal with club–community relations without focusing on the changing geographical and social role of the football stadium. The stadium has always exemplified a facility that generates both positive and negative effects. These impact on both the broader urban community and the local community situated around stadiums. Drawing on ideas from welfare geography it becomes clear that location and distance are crucial variables in understanding the different effects that football may have on local and regional communities. This is an important point to bear in mind in what follows.

SOCCER AND THE CITY

The presence of a professional football club of league status can create both benefits and disbenefits to the urban area that it nominally represents. The football club does (re)present the city. It publicizes it in a way that no other cultural entity can. Almost all clubs in England are named after places (exceptions include Port Vale) and consequently they are announced each week of the football season as their performances are broadcast to the nation and beyond. This free advertising has often led city managers to welcome the elevation of their local football club to Football League status. Benefits also come from revenues generated by the club – directly and indirectly – and the ‘psychic income’ generated by the success – or even the presence – of the club on the well being of (at least some of) the population. Some studies have alluded to the increased work rate of the urban workforce following the success of the local team.¹ Some retail outlets, notably pubs, benefit considerably from the presence of a soccer match nearby. The psychological benefits to be derived from football have led the stadium to be seen by some as a source of topophilia – a love of place.² Those who regularly frequent their ‘home ground’ articulate such a feeling. For example, talking about Easter Road, the home ground of Hibernian FC in Edinburgh, a supporter stated: ‘that piece of land is wrapped into my Saturday you know, in the sense that it is consistent with how I conduct Saturday, where I go before the game, who I meet up with, what time I leave’.³ Moving to a new ground would ‘be like losing someone in the family’ noted another fan,⁴ typifying the strength of feeling that can be attached to a football ground as a place, an emotional tie which can take the stadium beyond a simple functional space for the production of football matches. The stadium is also a source of ‘geographical memories’. A study by E. Hague and J. Mercer revealed that the Scottish football club Raith Rovers served as ‘a reference that triggers wider memories of friends, relatives and people living in the urban space that is Kirkcaldy’.⁵ This modestly sized town, through its football team, is provided with a focal point for local pride and awareness and a source of dynamic geographical memories.⁶ Football fans living in the city that the club represents benefit financially solely by not having to travel out of their town to see a match. However, virtually no studies have been done in the United Kingdom to assess the local economic multiplier effects of football clubs, that is the local income generated by a football club resulting from football-induced expenditure that would not otherwise have been spent locally. This stands in contrast to the experience in the United States where several studies have examined the urban income effects of sports teams in the course of a season.⁷

This is not to say that football fails to create problems for the overall urban community. Policing around grounds imposes costs on the local taxpayer and especially on the substantial number of urban residents with no interest in football. Football-induced nuisances such as traffic congestion, crowding and hooliganism can be felt at considerable distances from the ground but especially

by those living in proximity to it. So while the presence of a football club creates potential benefits across the urban area, it often creates nuisances for those in a relatively small part of it. Members of this latter community are linked together through their nearness to the stadium. The centrality of place in the consumption of football nuisances is summarized by the distinction between urban residents who may benefit from their *accessibility* to a football stadium and others who suffer from their *proximity* to it.

The implication of all this is that for many the football stadium is seen as a 'noxious facility' – something to be avoided so that its negative spill-over effects are not consumed in one's own back yard. Within the urban area, this has led to a number of planning conflicts concerning exactly where new football grounds should be located. In this context, rather than cementing the urban community in support of 'our team', the promised (or threatened) development of a new football stadium in a particular part of the town can serve to fracture the overall community into NIMBY-inspired groups of local activists. Opposition to the location of football grounds in particular parts of the city has always been a problem but has become of particular significance as a post-Hillsborough example of single-issue politics.

The Taylor Report argued for a new generation of football stadiums that would be surveilled, safe and sanitized.⁸ At the same time the growing marketization of football contributed to a new generation of facilities which were more than football stadiums – 'tradiums' was one description used for those public-private spaces that linked leisure with spending. Improved catering and integrated conference and banqueting facilities, museums, hotels and merchandising typified the contents of such multi-functional spaces. Additionally, stadium space would, ideally, be used for sports other than football and for entertainment other than sports. Rugby, rock concerts, religious revivals and a whole range of other activities were seen as providing sources of revenue for the post-Taylor world of British football and all these developments clearly had implications for the communities within which the stadiums were located.

Such developments created different 'ways of seeing' the football ground (indeed the application of the word 'stadium' as opposed to 'ground' could be argued to imply an up-grading of the game's image). Consider the case of the proposal some years ago to provide a new home for Bristol Rovers in the suburb of Mangotsfield in the neighbouring borough of Kingswood. The football club tried to promote its case for a location in a suburban area by evoking the benefits that the stadium would bring to the greater Bristol community. It presented itself in its promotional material as 'the family club', of 'caring for the community', of creating 'a closer tie with local schools', of using stadium facilities for 'Bingo and Tea Dances'. In a detailed environmental assessment of the proposed site, it concluded that a new stadium would not create any deleterious environmental effects. It promoted the stadium as a facility for the entire Bristol community, not merely for residents in the immediate locality. However, the residents who

opposed the stadium in Kingswood also invoked the notion of 'community'. Here the quality of life of the *local* community was seen to be at stake. A football stadium signified violence, parking problems, noise, litter, floodlighting, hooliganism and a negative impact on house prices. It became a case of the *Rovers Stadium Support Committee v. The Kingswood Borough Action Committee*. For the people of Kingswood, a football stadium promised them more football than they would freely choose. They would be forced to bear the costs of the production of a football match; they would be providing a 'free ride' for those living outside the borough who wanted to watch Rovers' games; they would be unwilling consumers of football's 'negative externalities'. The planning proposal to build the stadium was rejected.

A similar situation has been well documented for the proposed relocation of Portsmouth FC from its old inner-urban Fratton Park to a new facility in the leafy suburbs of Framlington and Drayton.⁹ In a public consultation about the relocation, 63 per cent of those in the city as a whole who opposed the planning application came from Framlington and Drayton.¹⁰ Their reasons for objecting to a football stadium were the perceived increase in traffic generation, associated retail developments which would harm the business of local shops, and the loss of amenity. Objectors' comments included: 'Framlington and Drayton are very quiet areas and there are a lot of old people living here. They are all very distressed at the thought of all this noise and pollution not to mention hordes of hooligans bringing carnage and fear into the community.'¹¹ Those supporting the new site saw it from the city perspective. The stadium was seen as 'putting Portsmouth on the map' and 'an asset to the city of Portsmouth'. One respondent said that 'the council should view this matter on a larger scale and with regard to the benefits of the community as a whole'.¹²

These examples illustrate the 'place' of community in the football relocation debate. It can be both invoked and researched at different levels of scale. It is now appropriate to see how stadiums old and new have impacted on the local communities living within 'the shadow of the stadium' and how this impact, which is likely to be characteristic of developments in the twenty-first century, has changed in the post-Taylor generation of UK football stadiums.

IN THE SHADOW OF THE STADIUM

The examples of Bristol Rovers and Portsmouth cited above illustrate a typical public reaction to the thought of living in proximity to a football stadium. It reveals the stadium as a facility to be avoided, a facility to be kept away from one's own back yard. In American terms, the conflicts resulting from the contested terrain of proposed stadiums are examples of (appropriately) 'turf politics'. But the residents of Kingswood and Framlington seem to have had a typically exaggerated image of the environmental reality of living in proximity to a football ground. In the late 1980s, at a time when football hooliganism was providing the

sport with a negative image, a survey of a random sample of 100 people revealed that about 95 per cent thought that if they lived within 500 metres of a football stadium they would experience nuisances on average match days. In addition, 45 per cent thought they would be 'serious nuisances'.¹³ Even living two kilometres from the stadium, 25 per cent believed the stadium would be a nuisance. This highly mediated perception contrasted considerably from the experiences of 4,597 people who actually did live around football grounds. For instance, only 55 per cent of those living within 500 metres of a stadium said that they experienced nuisances on match days while only about 17 per cent described these as 'serious nuisances'. This, however, is a highly generalized picture and the survey revealed considerable variations in the consumption of nuisances around grounds in different divisions and in different parts of the country. Hence, at Crystal Palace where, at the time, games were being played every week as a result of ground sharing between two clubs, around 80 per cent of the population living within 500 metres of the ground claimed to experience football nuisances. On the other hand, in the cases of clubs like Crewe Alexandra and Hartlepool United the nuisance effect was minimal. The extent to which negative effects of football are perceived as a nuisance does of course, depend on whether or not one is a fan. It has been argued, for example, that 'if all local residents were fans, the number perceiving football nuisances would be halved'.¹⁴

Another popular feeling during the 1980s, and one reflected in the responses of the people of Framlington and Kingswood in the following decade, was that hooliganism was the major problem associated with British football. This 'moral panic' was largely media-led and for most local residents football fan violence was not perceived as a problem. The late 1980s survey noted above revealed that only ten per cent of those living in proximity to league grounds perceived hooliganism as a nuisance.¹⁵ This is not to say that hooligan incidents, when they occur, are anything but unpleasant and I do not ignore the fact that the areas around, and indeed inside, some stadiums could be 'landscapes of fear',¹⁶ but more people living near stadiums rated car parking and traffic congestion as a problem (18 and 22 per cent respectively). As early as 1971 it was estimated that a crowd of 60,000 people would generate 10,800 cars parked within a mile of the stadium.¹⁷

The picture painted above is based largely on data and information from the 1980s. How has the situation changed following the publication of the Taylor Report? Since 1989 the relationship between football and its communities has assumed a number of new dimensions. I will deal with four of these. First, there has been the rapid growth in the number of relocated clubs. Secondly, a number of clubs have expanded and redeveloped their grounds in situ, recognizing that the all-seat recommendations of the Taylor Report necessitated ground enlargement. *Thirdly*, what could be seen as a postmodern turn in the football landscape has been the growing multi-functionalism of football stadiums – their use for other sports and other revenue-generating activities. The stadium has become more than a football ground.¹⁸ *Fourthly*, the football industry has

witnessed the emergence of a growing 'voice' for stadium communities. This has been orchestrated, not so much by the traditional supporters' clubs and fanzine movement, but by local groups – usually made up of non-fans who are often anti-football. In many cases these have become members of the nationally organized Federation of Stadium Communities. Each of these developments can be reviewed in turn.

INTO THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

During the last decade a number of football clubs have relocated. From a geographical perspective it is noteworthy that, despite the mooted move of Wimbledon to Dublin, all existing relocations have been over relatively short distances – often under two kilometres from the club's previous site. In some cases, such as Fulham and Charlton, fan resistance has proved crucial in preventing club relocation. These examples imply that there exists a certain territorial imperative as far as both clubs and fans are concerned. Though fan resistance to long-distance moves is a significant factor in deterring such relocations, the balance between the voice of fans and the strictures of the British planning system is not easy to disentangle. Ultimately relocation is dependent on the planning process and applications for stadium developments on greenfield sites have frequently been rejected. There is a feeling, however, that the dislocation of the club from the place bearing its name is anathema to fans and something clubs have tended to avoid, reflecting a local sense of sentiment, place pride or topophilia. All this remains at odds with the logic of a fully marketized industry in modernity. What are basically intra-urban relocations contrast dramatically with intra- (even inter-) national moves that occur in North America. Furthermore UK football clubs have rarely adopted the economic logic of ground-sharing. The potential to achieve such economies of scale, widely achieved in France, Italy and Spain, remain aberrations for the typical British football club. The thought of clubs like Liverpool and Everton sharing the same suburban stadium has been mooted but not realized. The conspicuous lack of interest of both Sheffield clubs in sharing (or even using) the Don Valley Stadium which was built for the 1991 World Student Games reflects British sentiment for the football ground rather than for the multi-sport 'facility'. Charlton Athletic's successful campaign to return to 'The Valley' after ground sharing at Crystal Palace (17 miles away) graphically exemplifies this local conservatism.¹⁹ In the early 1990s the fans of Edinburgh club, Heart of Midlothian, successfully protested against the move of their club from Tynecastle park to an area east of Edinburgh, strongly regarded as Hibernian country.²⁰ More recently, it has been demonstrated that Brighton and Hove Albion – or at least their fans – need to be close to Brighton. After two years' ground sharing with Gillingham in north Kent, the Sussex club moved 'home' and pledged itself to a Brighton location.

In some cases of stadium relocation it is implicit that the nuisances, previously consumed by residents in older, often inner-city sites, will be 'internalized' by the stadium's proximity to compatible land uses – namely open space, warehousing, leisure or manufacturing industry. In several cases these planned locations have been on reclaimed industrial sites, such as the cases of Walsall, Stoke City and Middlesbrough. Planners are well disposed towards these brownfield locations, because they contribute to urban regeneration. However, it is far from clear that negative spill-overs have been fully eliminated by such moves. At the present time the full impact of new, relocated stadiums on local residents has not been researched but what limited evidence exists suggests that urban nuisances have not been fully eliminated. The most detailed study undertaken to date has been into the relocation of St. Johnstone FC in Perth which in 1990 moved from its former inner-urban Muirton Park to the new, suburban McDiarmid Park. A welfare-geographic study compared the nuisances (as perceived by local residents) that were generated by the old stadium with those of the new.²¹ In both cases car parking and traffic congestion were the main nuisances, hooliganism being relatively unimportant. However, the proportion of residents who perceived football nuisances around the new ground was smaller than that recorded for residents who had lived around the old ground. On the other hand, the nuisance effect of the new ground was experienced over a wider geographical area than that of the old, inner-city site. At Stoke City's new stadium problems continue to centre on traffic congestion, parking and danger to crowds taking hazardous short-cuts via dual carriageways and even railway tracks. New stadium developments cannot totally distance themselves from the negative perception of residents if the broader urban infrastructure is lacking. The ability of existing road systems to absorb traffic generated by a new stadium constitutes widespread concern among urban residents. It is anticipated, for example, that a new stadium such as that proposed for inner-urban Southampton, would generate 10,000 additional vehicles on match days.

The refurbishment of existing grounds to meet the all-seat requirements of government legislation, is a second strategy that has been widely adopted in the post-Hillsborough period. This has created new problems in certain communities where the increased height of the stands has resulted in reduced sunlight and increased shadows. A dramatic example is that of Arsenal where a long-running feud has resulted in articulate, middle-class local residents leading a vigorous programme of resistance against the club. There is no reason why the all-seat stadium should reduce traffic congestion and pollution around grounds. Given the actual and planned increased frequency of use at many of the nation's football grounds, it could be argued that car traffic has increased. This is certainly likely to be the case should we witness the construction of peri-urban stadiums. The growth of the number of games played per season and the increased number of mid-week matches also provide a cause for concern to residents in *fin de siècle* soccer. In the Arsenal case, the response of the Islington Society and the

Highbury Community Association can be gauged by the following comment: 'the demolition of homes for a non-essential, private business, though deeply abhorrent to many, is only the tip of the iceberg as far as environmental impact is concerned'.²² Activists point to other clubs such as Leeds United who plan to hold 180 events per year at Elland Road, to Newcastle United which, at the time of writing, were applying for a seven-day-a-week licence in their gigantic inner-city St. James's Park, and Chelsea, where planning permission was being sought to obtain a nightclub licence.

It would be wrong to assume that it is not only the in situ developments associated with internationally known clubs that cause local problems. During the demolition and subsequent reconstruction of the East Stand at unfashionable Darlington FC local residents' lives suffered long disruption. On completion of the project a new pub and entertainment facility, integrated into the ground, generated a doubling of the traffic flow in what had previously been a quiet cul-de-sac.²³

A considerable increase has already occurred in the intensity of the use to which stadiums are put. This has included both their use for sports other than football and, as noted above, their use for non-sporting activities. Banqueting and conference facilities and retail outlets represent gains to the club as pressures have increased to finance improved facilities. They have been major earners in the revenue generation of clubs like Manchester United. The proposal for a new 40,000 seat stadium for Leicester City included three non-food retail warehouses, a hotel, a restaurant/casino, and two fast-food restaurants. The growing multi-functionality of stadiums creates problems as well as gains. The recent ground-sharing scheme between Bristol Rovers and Bristol Rugby Club at the latter's Memorial Ground has created added problems for residents in the Bristol area of Bishopston. These included the usual traffic and parking problems as well as anti-social behaviour by fans. It is worth noting that a report into the situation at Bishopston referred to the football club being less sensitive to community issues than the rugby club.²⁴ However, it is not possible to generalize the extent of such inter-sport variations in such attitudes.

The increased use of stadiums for non-sporting activities such as rock concerts and religious gatherings tends to produce a lower level of nuisance than on days when soccer is played. This is not to say, however, that the impact of late night musical performances in stadiums surrounded by residences should be underestimated. A study of the comparative effects of football and rock concerts is exemplified by research into such effects at Portman Road, home of Ipswich Town FC. A survey undertaken in the mid-1990s revealed that the noise nuisance ('unwanted sound'), generally not rated as particularly significant in surveys of football effects, was the major source of nuisance for rock concerts for those living closest to the stadium.²⁵ However, a study of football and non-football uses of the Kenilworth Road ground, Luton, typified the finding that non-football activities (including other sports events) were perceived by local residents as less of a

nuisance than football-induced effects.²⁶ The intensification of stadium use can be seen as a welcome sign of a growing involvement of football clubs in the community (see the essays by Perkins and Watson in this collection). The potential for club-education links has been developed in some cases. Links with local schools have been facilitated through the provision of stadium-based classrooms. At the same time, however, it seems possible that some local people can be offended by some stadium-based initiatives, naively assumed by the football club to be innocuous (a particular example being an incongruous sex-trade fair at Stoke City's new Britannia Stadium).

The visual and architectural merit of the new generation of stadiums, new or refurbished, varies considerably. At one extreme some stadiums have been almost indistinguishable from DIY superstores; rectangular metallic boxes, anonymous in style and, in the words of Edward Relph, 'placeless'.²⁷ In other cases imaginative and innovative design features have been incorporated in stadium construction. The new stadiums at Middlesbrough, Huddersfield and Bolton might be cited as examples.

A further significant development during the 1990s has been the growth of the Federation of Stadium Communities (FSC). Its regular newsletter, *The Shadow*, publicizes the nature of its activities.²⁸ Established in Sheffield after the Hillsborough disaster but now with its headquarters in Stoke, the Federation grew out of the actions of local activists in Sheffield and Birmingham who sought not only to counter the activities of football clubs, but also seek to build bridges between them. The FSC seeks to serve clubs and communities. It would see Sheffield United's attempts to develop links with the local community, during the redevelopment of its Bramall Lane stadium, as a model of club-community links. By giving preference in job opportunities to those living in the local area of Sharrow and by providing facilities for local groups within the overall stadium complex, a genuine and successful partnership between club and community has been established.²⁹

The FSC offers services such as the undertaking of surveys for local residents, seeking the views of the community on the most acceptable sites for stadium development. It convenes meetings where options can be debated within the community. It prepares reports for clubs and councils and provides information and advice. The FSC claims to aid the establishment of frameworks and timetables for proper consultation and participation in the planning process. It also fulfils training for community representatives and offers advocacy and representational skills where appropriate. The FSC has grown significantly in the last decade and can now be regarded as a significant player in drawing up the map of football in twenty-first century Britain.

CONCLUSION

Great strides have been made in changing the map of British football since the publication of the Taylor Report. It is difficult to deny that stadiums are now safer places than they were previously. Improvements in safety may have resulted from increased surveillance as much as the move to all-seat facilities (see the essay by Garland and Rowe in this collection). Yet this piece has suggested that the problems of British football have not yet been fully solved. The new generation of stadiums, while regarded as improvements on their antecedents, have not yet been fully isolated from the anti-social outcomes of the impacts that they generate. As a result, the image of the stadium is one that is not necessarily benign. Such problems cannot be resolved without adequate infrastructure in the urban area as a whole. The sort of spectating experience that will occur in what, at worst, could be dystopian, sanitized 'leisure zones' remains to be seen. One thing seems clear, however: the role of communities, however defined, but often in conflict, will be central in the emerging cartography of the national sport in the twenty-first century.

NOTES

1. E. Derrick and J. McRory, 'Cup in Hand: Sunderland's Self-Image after the Cup', Working Paper 8 (Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Birmingham University, 1973).
2. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974).
3. D. Mackay, 'A Sense of Place: The "Meaning" of Easter Road' (unpublished MA dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Edinburgh, 1995), 25.
4. *Ibid.*, 35.
5. E. Hague and J. Mercer, 'Geographical Memory and Urban Identity in Scotland: Raith Rovers FC and Kirkcaldy', *Geography*, 83 (1998), 105-16.
6. *Ibid.*, 114.
7. J. Bale, *Sport, Space and the City* (London: Routledge, 1993).
8. Lord Justice Taylor (Chairman), *The Hillsborough Stadium Disaster: Final Report* (London: HMSO, 1989).
9. A. Burnett, 'Community, Local Politics and Football', in J. Bale (ed.), *Community, Landscape and Identity: Horizons in a Geography of Sport* (Keele: Department of Geography, Occasional Paper, 20, Keele University, 1994), pp.19-32.
10. In contrast, of 76 individual letters of support for the development of a new stadium in an inner-city area of Southampton, 39 were from people living outside the city. This again illustrates the significance of geographical scale in the exploration of stadium politics. See Federation of Stadium Communities, Southampton St. Mary's: An Appraisal (Southampton: St. Mary's/Northam Stadium Working Group, 1999).
11. Burnett, 'Community, Local Politics and Football', p.27.
12. *Ibid.*, p.26.
13. J. Bale, 'In the Shadow of the Stadium: Football Grounds as Urban Nuisances', *Geography*, 75 (1990), 325-34.
14. *Ibid.*, 328.
15. *Ibid.*, 327.
16. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Landscapes of Fear* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).
17. M. Grayson, 'Travel Generated by a Football Stadium' (unpublished master's dissertation, University of London, 1971).
18. J. Bale, *Landscapes of Modern Sport* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1994).
19. R. Everitt, *Battle for the Valley* (London: Voice of the Valley, 1994); see also Bale, *Sport, Space and the City*.

20. H. Hognestad, 'The Jambo Experience: Identity, meaning and social practice among supporters of Heart of Midlothian Football Club' (unpublished Cand. Polit. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Oslo, 1995), 162.
21. C. Mason and A. Moncrieff, 'The Effect of Relocation on the Externality Fields of Football Stadia: The Case of St. Johnstone FC', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 109 (1993), 96-105.
22. A. Carmichael, 'Arsenal Update', *Islington Society Newsletter* (1998).
23. T. Marshall, 'A Tale of Access and Excess', *The Shadow*, 10 (1999), 8.
24. Federation of Stadium Communities, 'Bishopston, Bristol: The Impact of Ground-Sharing on a Local Neighbourhood' (Report, 1, 1998).
25. J. Chase and M. Healey, 'The Spatial Externality Effects of Football Matches and Rock Concerts', *Applied Geography*, 15 (1995), 18-34.
26. C. Mason and R. Robins, 'The Spatial Externality Fields of Football and Non-Football at Kenilworth Road, Luton', *Applied Geography*, 11 (1991), 251-66.
27. E. Relph, *Place and Placelessness* (London: Pion, 1976).
28. The Federation of Stadium Communities has its headquarters at The Lodge, Burslem Park, Moorland Road, Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent, ST6 1EA.
29. See 'The Sharrow Partnership', *The Shadow*, 10 (1999), 9.