

In the mix

A review of mixed income,
mixed tenure and mixed
communities



English Partnerships
The National Regeneration Agency



**JOSEPH ROWNTREE
FOUNDATION**



**HOUSING
CORPORATION**

In the mix

A review of mixed income, mixed tenure and mixed communities: what do we know?

Written by Rebecca Tunstall and Alex Fenton

Copyright: Housing Corporation, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, English Partnerships and the authors, 2006

This paper is one of a series commissioned in 2004 and 2005 to look at the issue of 'mixed communities'. This one has been supported by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Housing Corporation and English Partnerships, however the contents do not necessarily represent the views of the three organisations.

The authors would like to thank Harriet Baldwin, Julie Cowans, Russell Dixon, Elaine Dorricott, Ruth Lupton, Adrian Moran, Tony Manzi, Sue Parkinson, Emily Silverman, Sarah Ward and Laura Wilkie for interesting discussions and comments on earlier drafts. The authors would particularly like to thank Adrian Moran for overseeing the project. The views expressed in this report and responsibility for any errors or omissions are, however, solely those of the authors.

Contents

Foreword	2
Executive summary	3
Introduction	4
The mix agenda	5
The evidence for what mix can achieve	10
How should mixed communities be?	25
Planning and achieving mix	28
The management of mixed communities	40
Gaps in the evidence and directions for future research	45
Conclusion	47
Glossary	49
Bibliography and further reading	50

Foreword

The Housing Corporation is committed to delivering affordable homes in thriving, sustainable communities. Our 2006-08 National Affordable Housing Programme is the biggest ever, helping to build communities with a mix of housing types and tenures that are attractive to a wider range of households.

But delivering a vision of mixed communities is not just about building new homes. The Housing Corporation is working with partners at national, regional and local level to develop solutions to tackle remaining mono-tenure estates. Our ambition is to ensure that all homes are part of decent and diverse neighbourhoods and that no-one should have to live in communities affected by concentrations of worklessness, deprivation and dependency.

A significant body of research has been conducted around the different aspects and objectives of mixed communities, much of it supported by our partners, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. This review, aimed at policy makers and those charged with delivering the vision of mixed communities, brings together the best UK research to date on the subject. It has been commissioned jointly with Joseph Rowntree Foundation and English Partnerships, and I am grateful to them for their support.



Peter Dixon

Chairman

March 2006

Executive summary

The idea that communities ought to contain a greater mix of housing types and residents is a key component of the current Government's policies on housing and neighbourhoods. The idea appears in a number of related policy strands such as inclusion, sustainability, cohesion and balance. In the last ten years, a substantial body of research has emerged on mix, its effects and means to create it. This research finds that a variety of types of housing and social mix are being pursued. The reasons for pursuing mix vary widely, and include:

- delivering social housing;
- meeting other social policy goals; and
- principled opposition to division between different types of people.

A review of the evidence suggests that some of these goals are more likely to be achieved than others. There are tensions between different goals; pursuing one aim may frustrate another. There are lessons for the practical implementation of planned changes to mix and for the management of new and existing mixed areas. There are some gaps in knowledge, but although they raise questions for implementation, the most common rationales for mixed communities remain valid.

Introduction

This paper presents a summary of evidence about the promotion of communities with mixes of incomes, of housing tenures and of other important social characteristics. It draws primarily on recent research from the United Kingdom, though there is a well-established interest in mixed communities in other countries, such as Australia, France, Ireland, the Netherlands and, in particular, the US, which has produced a rich seam of research. This report is intended to provide an accessible overview of the key debates to provide a firm basis for strategy. Rather than providing how-to practical advice it sets out the issues and questions to raise in relation to individual schemes.

The mix agenda

The idea that mixed communities are better places to live lies at the heart of some of the central agendas of the current administration, such as inclusion, cohesion, sustainability and balanced housing markets³. Housing has been the policy area most clearly influenced by the promotion of mixed communities. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)⁴ and its predecessor departments have played a key role in promoting more mixed developments. Other active agencies have included the devolved national governments and their agencies⁵, the Home Office⁶, the Housing Corporation, English Partnerships⁷, RSLs, local authorities and non-governmental organisations such as Demos⁸ and the IPPR⁹. The idea has been collectively endorsed by housing ministers across the EU¹⁰.

Some of these agencies have been involved in developing new mixed residential communities, or altering the mix in existing housing areas. However, mixed communities are not only being developed as an end in themselves, but also as a side effect of other policies. The most notable example is how the planning system is being used to support construction of affordable housing. The use of section 106 agreements and local polices requiring a substantial proportion of affordable housing on larger new private development sites are leading to a new generation of mixed tenure and mixed income developments¹¹.

³ Blenkinship and Gibbons, 2004

⁴ A glossary of terms is provided on page 2.

⁵ Communities Scotland and its predecessor Scottish Homes have published a number of key pieces of UK research.

⁶ VantagePoint/Home Office, 2004 summarises work of the Home Office's social cohesion pathfinder projects

⁷ For example, English Partnership's Millennium Communities programme.

⁸ Jupp's 1999 Demos report remains an important source of information on the characteristics and outcomes of mixed tenure housing.

⁹ Maxwell, 2005 addresses low cost home ownership and mixed developments.

¹⁰ FEANTSA, 2001

¹¹ Crook et al., 2002 and Monk et al., 2005 track the growing role of s106 agreements in social housing development. Their role in creating socially mixed neighbourhoods is discussed below.

What does it mean to be ‘mixed’?

So far, we have used the term ‘mixed’ without specifying exactly what is – or ought to be – mixed about the places people live. A consistent finding from studies of mixed communities is the need to understand the different dimensions and levels over which there may be mixing¹².

A place may be mixed in terms of its buildings, their built form, size, designated uses, tenure (if housing), market value or rent levels. Inner urban areas, for example, may contain a variety of building types and residential and commercial uses. Residential areas may be made up almost exclusively of one built form, size or tenure of homes. These housing characteristics can be targeted by policy, particularly in new developments, with tools including planning policy and subsidies for house building and neighbourhood regeneration.

A place may also be mixed in terms of the people who live there, by their social characteristics and attitudes. Dimensions of social mix that have been researched and that policy has tried to affect include income, employment status, age, ethnicity and household types – such as size and whether the household has children. Less commonly, research and policy has also been concerned with the spatial mixing of genders, religions and people of different physical abilities.

Further evidence follows on what kinds of concentration and segregation are thought to be problems, and how and why more mix might be beneficial. As we will see, some of these potential benefits are predicated on active interaction between different groups of people, as well as shared residence.

¹² See, for example, Smith, 2002 and Tunstall, 2003, general reviews of the concept and policies for mixed tenure and income from the US and UK respectively.

So, while mixed communities are mainly being promoted through housing and planning, mix is not only about tenure. Housing mix, in fact, is frequently being used as a means to alter the economic or social mix of an area. Indeed, in research and policy literature, the following terms are often used interchangeably:

- mixed tenure;
- mixed income; and
- mixed community.

Are housing characteristics such as tenure only being used as proxies for the social characteristics of those that will dwell in the housing? Is policy directly concerned with tenure mix itself or does it use tenure as it is easily affected by policy and easily measurable?

Some research, mainly in the US, has tried to investigate the contribution of tenure itself to goals of mixed communities¹³. Most, however, concludes that tenure's prominence is for pragmatic reasons. It is a key dimension firstly because it links planning policy to subsidy regimes with

the clear distinction between 'market rate' and 'affordable' housing, and secondly because tenure has a strong – though not perfect – correlation with income¹⁴. Even when mixed tenure is being used as a means to achieve mixed income places, it is not always income itself that policy makers envisage being more mixed. As we show below, income is itself being used as a proxy for other characteristics and attitudes of households and individuals. Finally, note that not all mix policies are based in housing; some work on social cohesion, for example, aims to encourage interaction in existing communities, without altering who lives in them or what kind of homes they have¹⁵.

Types of mixed communities

Though the promotion of mixed communities currently has a high profile, these are not the first UK policies to address the area. From the 1940s, the development of the new towns tried to mix new housing with buildings for services and employment, and in housing areas, to mix different

¹³ Smith, 2002

¹⁴ Maxwell, 2005

¹⁵ VantagePoint/Home Office, 2004

¹⁶ Bennett, 2005

tenures and social classes¹⁶. Since the 1970s, experiments in social housing lettings policies have tried to limit concentrations of children or disadvantaged households, to create or preserve ‘balanced communities’. In the 1980s, policies including the Right to Buy, other low-cost home ownership initiatives and regeneration schemes aimed to diversify tenure and to create social mix in council estates. At the same time, constraints on the Right to Buy in small rural settlements aimed to preserve tenure and social mix in these areas. These previous phases of policy produced some of the examples which have supported the current wave of interest¹⁷.

Mixed communities have been created through specific policies and, commonly, through the gradual change and movement of people living in existing housing. Newly developed or recently transformed areas have captured more of the research interest, but the majority of mixed communities have buildings and populations that have evolved over time. The way that places have developed over a period has been strongly

influenced by differences between regional housing and labour markets.

The types of mixed communities found in the UK include many older inner-urban areas that have diverse tenure systems and often have ethnically diverse populations and a wide range of incomes within small areas. These same areas may have less diverse populations in terms of age and household type, with more younger and more single residents. Many rural areas show mixes of tenure, income and household type at a small scale, although there is generally less ethnic diversity outside cities. In high-demand rural areas, income mix may be under pressure, and in both more and less advantaged areas, age mix may be under pressure as younger people move out or older people move in¹⁸. There are also many maturing inter-war and post-war housing areas, including the new towns and the generation of so-called ‘mixed development’ within social housing, that show a range of tenures, building types and residents. Though some of the areas were built to include a mix of tenures

¹⁷ For example, Jupp 1999; DETR, 2000

¹⁸ Newidien, 2003 discusses age mix in rural Wales; see also Murdoch and Day, 1998

from the outset, more did not¹⁹. In these maturing areas, the income and ethnic mix varies by region, and the mix of household types and incomes will be affected by how neighbourhoods are positioned with local housing markets.

Most former council-only estates have become mixed tenure through over 20 years of the Right to Buy and other sales schemes; some are now majority owner-occupation. They have retained and developed a mix of incomes through this and through resale, while social housing generally has become less mixed in terms of incomes and household types²⁰. Demolition and building for sale have also been used to create mixed tenure in some social housing estates. The mix of tenures and people found in these areas varies according to the subsidy scheme and local housing markets, although most remain majority social housing²¹. Finally, as noted, many larger new housing developments are mixed in tenure from the outset.

¹⁹ Allen et al., 2005, note their difficulty in finding case studies of planned mixed-tenure developments more than twenty years old

²⁰ Berube, 2005 summarises some recent evidence on the social polarisation of council housing residents.

²¹ Jupp, 1999 gives examples.

The evidence for what mix can achieve

We have suggested that places and communities can be mixed in a number of different ways at once. The policy reasons for fostering mixed communities are similarly varied, but fall into three main groups.

Firstly, mix may be sought as a means to improve the well-being and circumstances of a place's residents, to bring benefits to the wider community or to reduce social or economic costs in the future.

Examples: prevent or reduce problematic concentration of households with low incomes; improve life chances for residents; improve public or private services; reduce future need for regeneration; reduce conflict between different classes or ethnic groups.

Secondly, mixed communities may be a side effect of the short-term goal of getting new housing built; mixes motivated by profit or the supply of subsidised affordable housing.

Examples: for developers to secure planning permission; for social housing providers to secure subsidy; a means to reduce public or private opposition to social housing development.

Thirdly, mix may be sought on principle, as an end in itself.

Examples: different classes or ethnic groups should live near one another; land or housing wealth ought to be accessible and enjoyed by all.

This section explores the evidence as to whether mixed communities do in fact deliver each of these goals.

Mix as a means to social policy goals

The evidence suggests mixed communities can contribute to specific goals within current social policy, such as community cohesion and sustainability. We now look in detail at some of the claimed benefits. In each case, a number of key questions

arise: what dimensions and type of mix are important? What influence does the context of the area have? Do similar mixes work in high-demand and low-demand markets, or in both new and existing areas?

Deconcentrating poverty

Poor and socially excluded households are not distributed evenly, whether one compares regions or neighbourhoods. It has been argued that ‘neighbourhood effects’ – special cumulative effects of this concentration – can compound the disadvantage of poor families in predominantly poor areas²². Some of these effects are clearly seen to result from the spatial concentration of low-income households, for example the effect on shops and services. However, others, such as disconnection from job-finding networks, high levels of crime, the absence of employed or educated role models, and for children and young people, peer groups lacking educational aspirations, are not directly consequences of low income. They are seen to result from concentrations of people with particular attitudes, resources

and behaviours, and from the way those people interact. Income may be being used a proxy for these attitudes and resources. Finally, other discussed mechanisms for area effects, such as housing unpopularity, high demands on public services and weak lobbying for them, are a consequence of both the internal social mix of a place and its position in wider markets and systems of governance.

In fact the available UK evidence for special neighbourhood effects of concentrated poverty is weak, and the case is not proven²³, though there is strong evidence from the United States and other countries for effects on education, health, crime and attitudes²⁴. Consequently, research on mixed-income areas in the UK has looked for evidence of the benefits to poor residents under all of these headings.

Tenure mix as a means to income mix

If we are concerned with the evidence of benefits arising through increased income mix, we first need to look at the relationship between income and mixed tenure. In

²² Wilson’s 1987 study of neighbourhood effects on poor US inner city residents was a landmark in the US and also the UK. Page’s 2000 report made many of the same arguments for large RSL developments in the UK.

²³ Lupton, 2003 provides a summary.

²⁴ Smith, 2002 and Berube, 2005 provide summaries.

the UK, areas of concentrated poverty are usually – although not only – those with concentrations of social housing²⁵. Housing trends and policies in the 1980s in particular led to a ‘residualisation’ of social housing. As many households moved or bought into home ownership, those remaining and entering in the reduced social sector became poorer and less likely to be employed. The ample evidence of difficulties on some large mono-tenure social housing estates has been one of the main factors convincing politicians of the potential benefits of mixed-income, mixed-tenure communities.

Research shows that mixing private tenures with social and intermediate housing usually reduces the concentration of income poverty and disadvantage. The range of incomes will vary, as the connection between tenure and income is not perfect. Low-cost home ownership and intermediate tenures may attract fairly low-income residents. All depends on how the area fits into the existing local market. Mixed developments on desirable sites in high-demand regions will attract people on high

incomes to the private housing²⁶. Given that most mixed-tenure schemes will affect the income mix, we now look at research on the specific beneficial effects this might have on a place.

Facilities and services

If households on low incomes are concentrated in an area, money available to support local shops and commercial services is likely to be scarce; reliance on local shops with high prices and small ranges has been identified as an aspect of social exclusion. Studies do identify mixed communities which have shops and services that satisfy residents’ needs, but also suggest that this is more a consequence of specific planning provision than an inevitable consequence of mix itself²⁷. There are further cautions. Where developing mix involves extensive physical remodelling, the loss of business through disruption and demolition has sometimes been at least partly responsible for the closure of local businesses. Specific provision is likely to be needed for new shops and services to open. Households’

²⁵ Lee and Murie, 1997, using the UK Census find that “the pattern of deprivation does not coincide neatly with patterns of housing tenure” but note that, with regional variations, that “the general direction .. is that the most disadvantaged areas are most often areas of council housing”.

²⁶ Silverman et al., 2005, for example, find income much more polarised by tenure in their two London case studies

²⁷ Beekman et al., 2001, sought the views of owners and tenants on a range of shops and services on twelve mixed-tenure estates in Scotland

use of and reliance on local shops depends on their age, social networks, employment status and location. Wealthier households may spend a higher proportion of their time and money outside the neighbourhood²⁸. Particularly in regions where housing costs are high in relation to incomes, the disposable income of owner-occupiers may be much lower than gross incomes²⁹. The general trend is for commercial services to be provided through fewer, more centralised outlets, although government policy is trying to address this through support for mixed-use development.

The impact on public services appears similarly complex. Researchers have examined whether the presence of better-resourced families may increase lobbying power and pressure for good performance, reduce the difficulty of management or the management task, or alternatively might increase pressure on overburdened services. There is some evidence that increases in tenure and income mix are associated with improvements in environmental management and cleanliness in residential

areas, though it is hard to say whether this is due to mix itself or the chance to relaunch services after redevelopment. Again, welfare and community services which are used primarily by social tenants do not improve unless specific efforts are made in planning regeneration or new areas³⁰. The greater average affluence of mixed income communities will disqualify them from receiving funding via targeted area-based initiatives such as Sure Start, and may mean the mix of local public and private services generally may be less targeted to the needs and budgets of lower-income households.

Schools and educational achievement
There has been particular interest in the effects of social mix on educational services and attainment, because education is seen as a key element of disadvantage and a crucial route out of it. Individual socio-economic factors are a primary determinant of individual education attainment; however characteristics of the student body as a whole, and to a lesser extent, local areas, are strongly linked to performance at school level³¹.

²⁸ Atkinson and Kintrea found owners and renters in mixed tenure estates in Edinburgh had different lifestyles; owners were more likely to be employed and to have cars; this meant they used shops and leisure facilities in other areas (1998, 2000).

²⁹ Wilcox, 2005, looking at potential markets for low-cost home ownership, supplies detailed data on the relationship between house prices and incomes in different areas.

³⁰ Pawson et al., 2000 and Beekman et al., 2001

³¹ Clark et al, 1999, discuss the impact of social housing allocations on primary schools.

It has been suggested that increased income mix can improve educational attainment in areas of concentrated poverty. Some studies which have addressed education are cautiously optimistic³². However, again, the achievement of these hoped-for benefits from mixed housing depends on whether better off-households have children and whether they make use of local schools. Families may move into private housing in mixed-tenure developments in urban areas, but only if the mix of home sizes includes family-sized homes. In mixed developments in inner-urban, higher-cost and higher-density areas, developers have tended to provide flats and mainly one and two-bedroom homes that may exclude families. Once arrived, families will only use local schools if they are seen to be of good standard compared to alternatives, or likely to improve. Several studies also note that local schools are rarely engaged in new development or redevelopment processes, although this may be changing³⁵.

These caveats relate primarily to the local implementation of changes in tenure and income mix. However, the fact that a wide variety of different mechanisms has been proposed for social mix to benefit educational attainment raises more profound questions about rationales for some schemes. Detailed studies of schools in deprived areas suggest that the additional burden of maintaining discipline and dealing with welfare issues, low aspirations and the challenge of engaging parents are key factors³⁶. We have not found UK studies of mixed communities which have been able to specify what beneficial effect is at work: the higher and better articulated expectations of parents in private tenures, or changes in the composition of the pupil body, or improvements to the learning environment. If disadvantaged schools suffer from inadequate resourcing or the ill-suitedness of nationwide school improvement regimes to their context, it would suggest that altering the social mix around them, with its attendant risks and costs, is not the most obvious route to their improvement³⁷.

³⁵ Crowther et al., 2004

³⁶ Lupton, 2004; see also Thrupp 1999 for comparable research in New Zealand

³⁷ Lupton, 2005 argues that school improvement strategies focused on the performance of managers and staff do not adequately reflect the context of schools in the most disadvantaged areas

Employment levels

Hopes that mixed communities can improve the access of poorer residents to employment have been another key motivation for interest in them. This has been particularly strong in the US, where employment is valued particularly highly as a route out of poverty and the value of welfare payments is low³⁸. It has been argued that if residents who are not employed are able to observe others going to work, acting as role models to reignite aspirations or to demonstrate the daily patterns needed for work, this alone may increase their chances of employment³⁹. Key-worker schemes, for example, may bring traditional role models such as teachers and police into communities without them. However, most of the discussion of effects of mix on employment assumes that residents not only observe each other, but interact with each other, allowing patterns of behaviour and information about job opportunities to rub off.

While mixed communities are likely to have higher average employment rates than mono-tenure social rented estates or places with low incomes, researchers have found little evidence that the employment prospects of unemployed or economically inactive residents have been improved by living in mixed communities, either in cases where existing areas have been altered and new populations added⁴⁰, or where they are living in places that were already mixed⁴⁰. Other factors, such as individual skills or education, or the nature of local labour markets, seem much more important. From the evidence available, we conclude that mixed communities do not on their own significantly increase employment rates for social tenants and the lower income groups⁴².

Unlike in schools where if the roll is mixed, we can assume observation and interaction will take place, we cannot be sure that the co-location of adult residents will lead to meaningful interaction between different types of people. However, there is quite strong evidence to show that interaction

³⁸ Wilson, 1987 was a key text

³⁹ For example Maxwell, 2005

⁴⁰ Harding, 1998; Jupp, 1999; Pawson et al, 2000; Beekman et al., 2001, reporting case studies from across Britain, all found tenure diversification in council estates had little effect on council tenants' employment rates

⁴¹ Hiscock, 2001, in a postal survey in West Scotland found no significant difference in social tenants' employment rates between tenants in mixed-tenure and predominantly social housing areas

⁴² There has been more research on this in the US than in the UK, but few studies there have found significant effects.

between residents from different tenures and income groups in mixed areas is limited. It seems that literally living next door provides the best opportunity for contact between residents, but many mixed communities schemes are not mixed at this small scale – or ‘pepper-potted’ – but cluster different tenures, particularly, but also home sizes, and group them in different blocks, streets or ends of the site⁴³. Even where different sorts of residents live close to each other, lifestyles and daily patterns of movement may vary a great deal, as has been discussed⁴⁴. Perhaps the most significant potential areas for interaction are nursery and primary schools⁴⁵, but as has been noted, not every mixed community will attract a mix of residents to its education facilities. Other potential sites for casual interaction include community centres, shops, pubs, parking areas, paths and communal areas, which may depend on initial planning and design⁴⁶. Those most likely to interact include those with close to average incomes and who have

lived in the area for a long time⁴⁷. Mixed areas may be little different in this to any other neighbourhoods, and short-term studies may not reveal the full potential of interaction as relationships build up over the long term⁴⁸. Estate management forums and community organisations for the whole development would allow interaction while carrying out their work. However, this suggests that we cannot expect rapid or dramatic progress on goals of mix which rely on interaction. Here we are discussing the social policy goals of mixed communities, but those who support mixed communities for their own sake are also likely to be hoping that as well as sharing neighbourhood opportunities and being able to observe each other’s ways of life, different kinds of residents interact in some way.

⁴³ ‘Pepperpotted’ new developments are the exception rather than the rule: Jupp, 1999; Crook et al., 2002; Silverman, 2005, Allen et al., 2005; Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

⁴⁴ Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; Beekman et al., 2001; also Jupp, 1999; Pawson et al., 2000; Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005; Smith, 2002, summarises similar US findings

⁴⁵ Jupp, 1999

⁴⁶ Jupp, 1999; Allen et al. 2005 attributed some social contact to high quality and pedestrian-oriented design in their cases.

⁴⁷ Jupp, 1999

⁴⁸ Allen et al.’s 2005 case studies were developed in the 1970s and they did find relationships between people in different tenures where they were neighbours.

Crime and anti-social behaviour

The prevalence of crime and anti-social behaviour in certain places is a principal contributor to their poor reputation and unpopularity. It has been suggested that changing the mix of residents may reduce these problems. Private tenures, employed and higher-income residents might affect crime level through greater informal enforcement of social norms, increased community organisation and reduction in the number and proportion of children amongst residents. Researchers have found that crime statistics are not routinely collated at neighbourhood level, and so have used survey measures of residents' perceptions of safety and crime, as well as data for wider areas.

Studies of areas where there has been tenure mixing, suggest that these changes can contribute to reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour⁴⁹. However, tenure changes do not provide a guarantee against crime,

and several studies have found problems emerging in some new and redeveloped areas⁵⁰. Problems may actually be more difficult to tackle in areas with a number of different owners and agencies, each using their own definitions⁵¹.

Neighbourhood popularity and reputation

As well as looking at the evidence of benefits to traditional welfare concerns of mixed-income communities, we should look at whether mixed communities are well-regarded neighbourhoods in which people want to live. As well as negative impacts on residents, for example in the labour market, stigmatisation appears to have knock-on effects to produce a downward spiral of unpopularity. The evidence from neighbourhoods which were originally developed as mixed tenure or which have evolved to be mixed suggests that they do not suffer serious stigmatisation, and that they are generally have at least average

⁴⁹ Pawson et al, 2000, looking at a tenure diversification scheme in Edinburgh, find a measure of success looking at crime statistics, and better perceptions of safety and crime risk in the improved parts of the neighbourhood. Beekman et 2001, comparing ten mixed-tenure areas in Scotland find that at most sites residents saw no change in crime levels.

⁵⁰ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005, Silverman et al., 2005, and Manzi and Bowers, 2005, comparing case studies across the UK, each find one development where anti-social behaviour was seen as a substantial problem

⁵¹ ODPM, 2002

popularity and resident satisfaction⁵². Relatively high popularity means that social housing in mixed areas can reduce voids and attract a wider range of social tenants, including those with employment and on higher incomes. Most studies find the introduction of other tenures on unpopular existing social housing estates can eventually improve how those places are seen. Gradual and small tenure changes, and those such as Right-to-Buy which do not immediately change the social change mix may not have much impact, and changing outsiders' perceptions of the most stigmatised estates can take years, even where radical redevelopment has taken place⁵³. Most studies also find it difficult to distinguish the effects of tenure and mix from other initiatives such as environmental improvements.

The sales and rental values of market rate housing are another indicator of popularity. Several studies note house price rises above city and regional averages in tenure diversification schemes⁵⁴. Evidence from the US suggests that private property values are not affected by mixed-income housing⁵⁵. Whilst the UK evidence on house prices is currently based on case studies, research is currently under way on housing sales and prices in mixed communities

Community cohesion

'Community cohesion' is a relatively new concept which is usually defined as an alternative to segregation between social groups. However, community cohesion goes beyond spatial location to encompass overlapping values, positive perceptions and positive interaction between groups⁵⁶. Recent concern to support and increase community cohesion was sparked by public disorder in a

⁵² Allen et al., 2005 tracked mixed tenure areas over two decades and found most were seen as 'ordinary' areas and fitted into an intermediate position in local housing markets. Hiscock, 2001, found resident satisfaction for mixed tenure areas was lower than for owner-occupied dominated ones but higher than for social housing estates.

⁵³ Hastings et al., 1996 demonstrated the resistance of poor reputations to concentrated efforts to improve estates; Tunstall and Coulter, forthcoming show how tenure change and increasing employment rates contribute to improved estate reputation over a matter of decades.

⁵⁴ Martin and Watkinson, 2003 supply detailed house price information from a scheme in York; Silverman et al., 2005, report above-average increases in sites in Glasgow and Manchester.

⁵⁵ Freeman, 2004

⁵⁶ See for example the practice guides by LGA, 2004, and the Home Office and ODPM, 2005.

number of northern English town and cities in 2001, and the reports and inquiries into the causes of these events⁵⁷. These reports raised concern about increasing spatial segregation of South Asian and White British ethnic groups in these cities, and also about groups living ‘parallel lives’, for example by children attending different schools, or having divergent values, even if they share neighbourhoods. This salience of worries over segregation may have obscured other causes for the disorder, such as competition and inequitable access to resources, such as employment, housing and regeneration⁵⁸. While community cohesion usually refers to relations between different ethnic groups, projects funded recently by the Home Office have sought to improve cohesion between genders, age groups and even between local residents and US forces based in the UK⁵⁹.

There is less experience in trying to alter spatial patterns of ethnicity than patterns of income and employment. Equality

legislation prevents housing policies being applied unequally to different ethnic groups, and in any case, complex relationships between tenure and ethnicity meant that tenure could not be used to affect spatial patterns in the same way as it has been for income and other characteristics. For example, in some areas, particularly London and other major cities, access to social housing contributes to spatial segregation of some minority ethnic groups in estates⁶⁰. In other areas such as the towns which saw disturbances, lack of access by the largest minority ethnic groups contributes to their segregation in lower-cost private housing areas. Patterns of residence by ethnicity result from a complex combination of choice and constraint, including forced ‘choices’ to avoid areas seen as presenting risk of harassment, and constraint through structural inequalities and institutional racism. Some of these factors do suggest potential avenues for policy, where housing providers can act to equalise choices

⁵⁷ Amin, 2002

⁵⁸ Robinson, 2005

⁵⁹ VantagePoint/Home Office, 2004.

⁶⁰ Tunstall and Coulter, forthcoming, track the growing concentration on minority ethnic groups in London council estates over two decades.

or reduce illegitimate constraints. The involvement of black and minority ethnic RSLs in multi-landlord and mixed tenure developments can influence ethnic mixing, although in practice they tend to be active in regions where larger social landlords already house considerable minority populations. The potential for changing the mix across wider neighbourhoods by strategically siting new RSL developments has also been considered⁶¹.

There have been a number of local initiatives to change marketing, allocations and support in social housing in an attempt to increase the ethnic mix in traditionally almost exclusively White British estates. However, evaluators have warned that ‘achieving even modest success is an exacting and resource-hungry challenge’⁶². Landlords’ ability to influence the lettings process may be reducing with the spread of choice-based lettings. While these kinds of initiatives may be seen as controversial, past developer and landlord actions have contributed, whether knowingly or unwittingly, to current ethnic residential

patterns and will continue to do so, whether explicitly or not.

As noted, cohesion is about more than just location. However, there has been much less research into the effect of mixed communities on values and perceptions than on more tangible characteristics such as employment status or school results. The research that has taken place has tended to concentrate on values and attitudes towards work and education, rather than towards other people. This is a potentially valuable area for further research. However, the disturbances themselves confirm the discussions above, that observation may not lead to understanding, and that co-location may not lead to positive interaction. Many initiatives to improve community cohesion have not been directly related to housing but have involved creating structures or opportunities for groups to come together, to discuss tensions but also to develop understanding and also for its own sake. Perhaps some other goals of mixed communities could also be advanced by more active use of these techniques.

⁶¹ See Ratcliffe et al. 2001 on improving Asian access to social housing

⁶² Robinson et al., 2004; Robinson, 2005.

Mixed communities and sustainability

The policy literature on mixed communities frequently describes them as being more ‘sustainable’. In this context, it often seems that ‘sustainable’ is being used merely as a grander-sounding synonym for ‘good’. However, we identify specific senses in which mixed communities may be more sustainable, reflecting the capacity of the neighbourhood to continue to meet the needs of its residents over time⁶³.

Firstly, a neighbourhood with a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures may be more able to meet the changing needs and aspirations of those who live in it through changing life stages, household shapes and sizes or changes in income. Mixed tenure has enabled higher-income social housing tenants to buy without leaving the area⁶⁴. If parents separate or divorce, the inclusion of private rental in the tenure mix has enabled the parent without primary custody to remain close to their children after the breakdown of the relationship⁶⁵. Tenure mix

may have a role in preserving age balance in rural communities⁶⁶.

One argument for home ownership as a form of asset-based welfare relies on older home owners being able to trade down to smaller or rented homes, ideally in their neighbourhood⁶⁷. Some of the individual and neighbourhood effects associated with home ownership and tenure mixes including home ownership may be due to longevity of resident and community stability often associated with that tenure⁶⁸. The private rented sector is associated with easy access and high turnover, and while it provides choice and can house a diverse range of residents, it may build in movement in a community.

Mix as a means to deliver new housing

Some mixed tenure areas arise primarily as a side effect of current funding regimes in social housing and the nature of the planning system. Section 106 agreements

⁶³ Kearns and Turok, 2004

⁶⁴ DETR, 2000 and Pawson et al., 2000

⁶⁵ Allen et al. 2005

⁶⁶ Newidien, 2003 examines this issue for the Welsh Assembly.

⁶⁷ Maxwell, 2005

⁶⁸ Maxwell, 2005

are now the main source of new social housing, though their effect is greatest in the South East⁶⁹. It is increasingly common for new social and affordable housing to be in mixed development. Similarly, there is currently support for intermediate housing and for extending home ownership down the income scale as part of an asset-based welfare strategy⁷⁰.

Such mechanisms can be judged simply by whether they produce housing and whether it is the kind that people want to live in. We identified very few case studies of mixed-tenure communities arising from these processes that were extremely unpopular, which must link to the profit motive that produced them as a side effect.

Mix for its own sake

We have seen how mix is promoted for instrumental reasons – as a means to achieve social policy ends, or to deliver new housing. Finally, there are also arguments that mixed communities are desirable

in themselves, whatever the outcome of research on their effects.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to review the philosophical arguments for mix. But what do potential and current residents think? The views of the general public are hard to research and available evidence is contradictory. Some consumer surveys have suggested that when making a theoretical choice for themselves many house-buyers prefer homogeneous areas of home ownership⁷¹. There is evidence that potential buyers and, on their behalf, RSLs and developers may have concerns about mixed communities, but that perceptions may change and become more positive as all gain more experience of mixed communities⁷². Academic research has shown that only a minority appear spontaneously to consider social mix per se when assessing neighbourhoods, and that it is commonly a matter of little concern to most residents⁷³. There is some evidence that a minority – but only a small one – of people with choice in the housing market, middle-class owner-occupiers, values social mix and

⁶⁹ Crook et al., 2004

⁷⁰ Maxwell, 2005 considers the place of housing in asset-based welfare.

⁷¹ For example, a survey commissioned by the Home Builders Federation, 2002.

⁷² For example, Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

⁷³ Jupp, 1999; Silverman et al., 2005

actively seeks it⁷⁴. Social surveys show that a majority of people are concerned about income inequality generally⁷⁵, although this might not translate into concern about segregation or into seeking or accepting mixed communities. However, many people live in neighbourhoods that are mixed in at least some way, and as we have learnt, these areas can be popular and have satisfied residents.

The benefits of homogeneity?

Do the arguments for mix and the evidence we have seen mean that areas of concentrated wealth, mono-tenure home ownership, high employment levels and advantaged ethnic groups are problematic? If we value mix as a means to develop housing, the answer is clearly no. If we value it for its own sake, the answer is clearly yes. But what if we value mix as a means to achieve social policy ends? In this case, unmixed but economically and socially advantaged areas are indirectly problematic in that they imply that other areas will have greater concentrations of relative disadvantage.

There has not been much research on the individual, neighbourhood and wider effects of the concentration of advantage, which would tell us if concentrated advantage was problematic directly. It would be plausible to argue that this could threaten social cohesion, in the sense of shared values and positive interaction between different groups.

Certainly, there is little policy interest in addressing this question. However, it is important as it raises another issue. Some people have argued that there are benefits from homogeneity, or at least some kinds of it. Some mixes could create additional management problems. It may be that homogeneous populations are easier to provide with either public or private services. For example, minority ethnic households are more likely to find specialist shops and services in neighbourhoods with many households from similar backgrounds as themselves⁷⁶. RSLs may find it easier to manage housing built in clusters rather than dispersed among properties in other tenures⁷⁷. More fundamentally, it has been

⁷⁴ Butler, with Robson, 2003, note such predispositions among fractions of the middle class in gentrifying London neighbourhoods

⁷⁵ The British Social Attitudes Survey, reported in Summerfield and Gill, 2005.

⁷⁶ Silburn et al., 1999; Robinson 2004

⁷⁷ Some RSL staff made this point in Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

argued that creating mix is bad in itself as a form of 'social engineering' that frustrates choice and markets. Perhaps people have a right – a property right or a citizenship right – to live whether they want with neighbours they prefer.

Attempting to include mix could slow or reduce the efficiency of development or regeneration. Radical transformations of existing housing areas entail expense, disruption and possibly displacement for existing residents. Clearly, if such transformations are being considered, policy makers and implementers should be confident that the hoped-for benefits could not be secured by the allocation of resources to more traditional, less drastic welfare measures. It is possible that beyond addressing the most extreme examples of segregated disadvantaged, the benefits of creating mix may not be enough to justify the cost, disruption and intervention in the market or free choice. So how much mix do we need?

How mixed should communities be?

Where are the thresholds?

One of the key gaps in the literature is precise information on the level of mix in any dimension that is needed to achieve benefits. We need to know more about the thresholds and about how they relate to the level of mix we see in typical new and existing neighbourhoods. This is a difficult issue to research and there has been very little work on it in the UK. Some US research shows that, for example, neighbourhood tenure mix is associated with the level of poverty, unemployment and lone-parent families in the area – but that the thresholds mix that triggers the effects was different for each of these different issues⁷⁸. Researchers warn that patterns are very complex and need to be interpreted with caution.

In any dimension of mix that can be described as a continuous variable, the range seen in the neighbourhood is important. For example, areas planned as ‘mixed income’ can have very different income profiles from each other⁷⁹. It seems plausible that communities will be affected differently,

depending on what the highest and lowest incomes are, the gap between them, where the mean and median incomes lie, and how they compare to income patterns in the wider neighbourhood and region. Similar arguments can be made about the shape of the distribution, for example, of resident ages, tenure mixes and household composition, and how it compares to local and national profiles. For example, in one study developers preferred a ‘three-tenure mix’, with the full spectrum of social rented, shared ownership and homes for sale, to a more polarised social renting/ownership split⁸⁰.

Multidimensionality of mix

The evidence presented above suggests that many of the benefits of mixed communities depend on getting the mix right across several dimensions at once.

In practice, especially for new developments, the key dimensions that can be influenced are likely to be tenure and home size.

⁷⁸ Galster et al., 2000

⁷⁹ Silverman et al., 2005 have data on income distributions for case studies; Smith, 2002 does the same with US examples.

⁸⁰ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

However, some goals may contradict each other: rising house prices may indicate increased popularity, but can also frustrate the desires of households to remain in the area as their needs change over time. We also need to be alert to how different dimensions can cluster: a development described as having ‘ a mix of tenures, household types, homes types, ethnicity and income’ could be split into two distinct areas, one with large social rented units mainly occupied by families and the other with small homes for sale mainly occupied by singles and couples⁸¹.

Scale

This example brings up the question of scale of mix. Research suggests that mix within areas of different sizes – in terms of numbers of homes or residents – may be important for different outcomes. Key levels of scale are the level of neighbouring homes, streets or blocks that are parts of a larger development, and neighbourhoods of several hundred homes, typically with an associated cluster of services and shops. Without

pepper-potting of different tenures, or mix at least within the same street, it is hard to gain much interaction between residents of different tenures. However, mix at the level of a five-minute walk or the primary school catchment area may be more important for creating markets for local shops or mixing school peer groups.

What is known about the kind of people that will move in?

The relationship between what areas are like – the homes, prices, services and location – and the kind of people that live in those areas is well studied. The census provides data on tenure, house type, dependent children, employment, though not income. Typologies of neighbourhoods have been developed by combining the census and other spatially based data. Such typologies can incorporate features of the households, their attitudes and consumption patterns, and the housing stock and market to distinguish types of areas at scales as small as postcodes⁸². Case study research of new

⁸¹ This issue was pointed out early in the current phase of development of mixed tenure estates by Page and Boughton, 1997; in London there are examples where this clustering is combined with extremes of income, see for example Silverman et al., 2005; Minton, 2005.

⁸² For example, the ONS Area Classification and ACORN

developments has often elicited similar data from new residents. However, reproducing a given mix of dwelling types and tenures in a major new development will not necessarily produce the same mix of people found in areas of existing similar housing. Some households may seek out or avoid mixed tenure areas; others may dislike or prefer new housing over existing stock⁸³.

Home types, households with children and education

The challenge of attracting families to mixed communities provides an apt example of the problems of thresholds, scale and the multiple dimensions of mix. As noted above, the socio-economic composition of an area has a strong influence on local school attainment; mixing of incomes within the catchment areas of schools appears to have the potential to mitigate these compositional effects. However, the encouragement of higher-density development and the perceived profitability and reliability of demand for smaller private-tenure dwellings in high-demand urban areas may mean that little family-sized

housing for sale is built. The maximisation of income mix by delivering high-value market rate housing may also work to reduce the mix of children across tenures, if it prices lower-middle income families out of the private-sector housing⁸⁴.

It is not clear what threshold or ‘critical mass’ of better-off children in schools is required to produce measurable improvements, and the ways that socio-economic composition affects schools is currently being researched. Furthermore, secondary schools serve much larger areas than primary schools, and parents may send their children further afield. The social heterogeneity of schools may be greater in less densely populated areas, and also depends on the school-place allocations policies of local authorities. Such questions of threshold and scale apply to the achievability of many other policy goals of mixed communities.

⁸³ CABE, 2004 identifies limited internal space and also featureless design as reducing the appeal of new homes to some market segments

⁸⁴ Silverman et al., 2005; see Brophy and Smith, 1997 and Varady et al. 2005 for comparable US findings

Planning and achieving mix

Setting goals

We have looked at the potential goals for mixed communities, the evidence on the impact of mix in practice, and the need to consider different dimensions and scales of mix. This section draws out some practical implications for achieving different goals.

To sustain or increase a market for local facilities and services such as local shops, public transport, mix needs:

- a critical mass of customers;
- knowledge about alternative retail or transport options; and
- consultation with current or potential and potential rival service providers.

To enable a social mix of children in the area and its schools, mix needs:

- a critical mass of numbers of potential students in each year cohort;
- knowledge about current mix in local schools, available places in these and other accessible schools, and likely parent and school attitudes to each other; and

- awareness of current school performance and likely demand for places.

To provide ‘role models’ for behaviour and aspirations, mix needs to:

- avoid a large income/education/class distance between residents;
- provide opportunities and contexts for different residents to observe each other;
- allow people from different groups live next door to or opposite each other (‘pepper-potting’)⁸⁵; and
- design the development to encourage neighbours and other residents to meet through shared parking areas, cul-de-sacs and footpaths⁸⁶.

To increase interaction between people of different groups, mix must:

- provide opportunities and contexts for interaction – layout and design can encourage informal interaction through neighbour relationship and casual meetings.

⁸⁵ Jupp, 1999

⁸⁶ Allen et al., 2005

To avoid creating fear or prejudice or tension between different social groups, or to contribute to improving social relations generally, mix should:

- take account of all the points above, ensuring that social housing and lower-income residents are not all in a hidden or stigmatised part of the site⁸⁷;
- avoid extremely broad ranges across any dimension of mix and clustering the extremes of different dimensions. In particular, it should avoid enabling visible identification of difference and different interests through different architecture but also home location, size for different tenures; and
- encourage estate management forums and community groups around potential common interests such as children or gardening, as these would be valuable.

To provide opportunities for existing residents to create new households, change tenure or home type without leaving the neighbourhood (part of making a ‘balanced housing market’⁸⁸) mix needs to:

- enable common housing paths as households and incomes change size, to ensure a range of different homes sizes, costs and tenures are available; and
- take into account the higher turnover rates among, for example, families with young children or private tenants.

Simply to create a relatively popular, satisfactory living environment for all groups, mix should:

- follow general good practice on housing and community development and management.

Which dimensions of mix are most important and which can be compromised on? To achieve a particular income mix, tenure may not be as important as affordability. For a particular demographic mix, the size of homes may be the most important issue. While decisions about

⁸⁷ Allen et al., 2005

⁸⁸ Blenkinship and Gibbons, 2004

the physical development and tenure are important, how the housing fits into the local market and is marketed or allocated will be crucial.

What kind of mix is possible in any one situation?

Practical realities set parameters to the mix achievable in any one development. The kind of mix that can be achieved will be affected by:

- the local housing markets and demand for housing;
- the perceptions of those involved;
- partners and relationships;
- the location, size and type of site;
- local planning policy and decision making;
- the available subsidy arrangements;
- the development process;
- design and layout; and
- marketing, sales and letting.

The current local housing market and demand for housing

The current local housing market will limit the mix of tenures, housing costs, incomes and types of residents who can be attracted to a development⁸⁹. Attempts to create mix need to be aware of these limits, and conscious of how the new development will fit in to the existing options. As part of efforts to create balanced housing markets and sustainable neighbourhoods that provide housing for different life stages, efforts to develop mixed communities should consider filling in gaps in existing markets⁹⁰.

In strong housing markets where developers expect sale to be easy and profitable, there may be little incentive for them to get involved in complex mixed developments and intermediate tenures, unless they do so as a means to get their development approved. Subsidy to support intermediate housing will not go as far as in other areas⁹¹, but on the other hand there is increased potential for cross-subsidy between homes for sale, intermediate sale and social

⁸⁹ Cole and Shayer, 1999, Tunstall and Coulter, forthcoming

⁹⁰ Blenkinship and Gibbons, 2004

⁹¹ Crook et al., 2002

rent. Section 106 agreements are likely to produce mixes of social rented and market rate housing in these high-demand, high-value areas⁹². In weak housing markets, additional social housing may be difficult to let, higher cost or larger homes may be difficult to sell, and additional homes in any market segment may affect those in nearby neighbourhoods⁹³. In these parts of the country, section 106 agreements are most likely to involve combining home ownership with low-cost or shared ownership.

The potential income, age, household type and ethnic mix will clearly be limited by the nature of the local populations. The South East and London in particular are distinctive contexts for creating tenure, income and ethnic mix, due to the high value and high costs of development, the differing demand for different tenures, and the diversity of the population in income and ethnicity.

Partnerships and relationships

Relationships, the characteristics of the scheme and the nature of the final mix are likely to vary according to the roles played by different organisations the development. These differ according to whether the scheme is new build or redevelopment. For example, in a new build scheme developers may sell land on part of the site to the RSL and then carry out design and build for them, possibly with subcontractors. Developers may buy land, design and build a scheme and then engage an RSL to buy the affordable element homes at a fairly late stage in the work. In redevelopment schemes, it is more likely that the partnership will involve local authority leadership and landownership, with existing residents like to play a role in the process and to have rights to many of the resulting homes. Estate regeneration schemes have often involved novel ways of working and relationships for at least some of the partners. As an example, where local authorities redevelop land or estates, they may select ready-made partnerships incorporating RSLs, developers, construction

⁹² Crook et al., 2002

⁹³ Capita, 1996

companies, architects and others, sometimes through competitions. Often a regeneration agency or partnership with some of its own funding will take on some of these roles.

Complex, varied and incrementally formed partnerships can lead to complication and delay⁹⁴. Clear and formal agreements between partners on roles, individual goals and bottom lines, and timings are important to the success of these schemes⁹⁵. Early identification of partners makes possible early consideration of future marketing and letting, management and governance⁹⁶. Both these process should be made easier through the increasing prevalence of partnering arrangements, although as more developments come to include mix, more organisations are getting involved for the first time, and experience is still developing.

Some of the barriers to increasing mix in new and redeveloped areas may be the perceptions of those involved, and their views of others' perceptions, which may or may not reflect reality. There is some

evidence that developers, RSLs, local authorities and sales agents may be more conservative than buyers about what is viable on any particular site⁹⁷. In one study, developers and estate agents for new build schemes thought that a 50% social housing mix would be difficult to fund and the ownership element would be difficult to sell⁹⁸. While there is little experience of new-build mixed-tenure schemes with this level of social housing, of course, many estate redevelopment schemes include homes for sale alongside more than 50% social housing overall. Partners may also have fears about how difficult the development process will be or, after development, what life in the development will be like, how particular residents will behave and how the development will be managed. There is evidence that perceptions change over time with experience. Some concerns could also be forestalled by assurances and agreements about lettings and management.

Redevelopment schemes are able to draw on a wealth of evidence and good practice advice about informing and involving

⁹⁴ For example in New Deal for Communities partnerships, CRESR, 2005, and those in other area based regeneration schemes, Dabinett et al., 2001

⁹⁵ Studies of complex estate regeneration schemes show that lack of agreement at the start of projects can create delay, waste and bad feeling, for example Lee et al., 1999

⁹⁶ Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000

⁹⁷ Martin and Wilkinson, 2003; Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

⁹⁸ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

existing residents⁹⁹. However, there are even greater challenges where schemes aim to make significant changes to mix in terms of tenure, income, employment status or other sensitive issues and by attracting newcomers present greater challenges. Existing residents may feel that their needs are not being met or that they are even losing out to those of newcomers¹⁰⁰. There can be a danger of an ‘us and them’ divide developing, which obviously threatens goals of interaction and cohesion. Where the scheme is being delivered through stock transfer, residents have an effective veto through the ballot process. In practice, in these cases residents should be seen as members of the partnership.

Site location, size and type

Whatever its internal mix, the new or redeveloped housing area and residents in it will be affected by the mix on its surrounding neighbourhood. The surrounding neighbourhood will have more influence if the new or redeveloped site is to be linked by lines of sight, paths and roads to its surroundings, and will be more likely

to be seen as a neighbourhood in its own right or as part of an existing area rather than as a distinct neighbourhood. Many estate redevelopment schemes seek to use these links to create improvements. Some research has recommended the selection of sites adjacent to areas dominated by one ethnic group in cities where ethnic segregation is a concern, for developments of housing likely to be taken up by another ethnic group or a mix of ethnicities, to create ‘bridging’ communities¹⁰¹. The size of the site affects requirements for including affordable housing in a market-rate development¹⁰². Of course, as in any housing development, the site shape affects home type and layout options, but these will be more salient when there is concern to create mix within the site.

Design and layout

Studies of regeneration suggest that external design should not enable homes in different tenures to be distinguished, in order to limit the potential for stigmatisation of social housing and its residents, at least by the casual observer. This has become almost a

⁹⁹ Cole and Reeve, 2001 includes a summary

¹⁰⁰ Some recent regeneration schemes which used increased density and tenure mix to change social mix and to provide cross-subsidy have met with concern and sometimes outright opposition from existing residents; Tunstall, 2002

¹⁰¹ Ratcliffe et al., 2001

¹⁰² Crook et al., 2005

good practice orthodoxy within regeneration literature¹⁰³, and there is evidence that developers also support ‘tenure-blind’ design as identifiable social housing is thought more likely to affect saleability of private homes¹⁰⁴. However, in practice it may be difficult to disguise tenure differences, at least from the knowledgeable observer. Different tenures may tend to have different home sizes and types. Some home types, such as very large family homes or those built to full disabled access standards, are much more likely to be found in social tenure. Even within units of the same type and size in terms of number of bedrooms, social housing has higher design and space standards than private housing, while social housing funding does not often pay for garages, so uniform design may be impossible or may require additional subsidy¹⁰⁵.

As we have seen, evidence on the importance of mixing at small scale within the site depends of the goals, and there

are divergent views on whether it might create management problems or benefits, including between different developers and different RSLs¹⁰⁶. These partly reflect different goals, but also different levels of experience. However, even if all partners felt pepper-potting was important to their goals, there are practical difficulties, which could limit it. As noted, different space standards require different footprints and make for complicated tasks for architects, particularly for terraced houses and in flats. On larger sites, pepper-potting means that homes in different tenures may fall into different phases and be released in small numbers over a long and not necessarily predictable time period, which could add to funding, marketing and letting challenges for sellers and RSLs. On the other hand, processes for tenure diversification in existing social housing areas which are triggered by individual residents enable or even encourage a pepper-potting of tenure, and all the evidence is that this works well¹⁰⁷. High-density requirements, often applied on

103 For example, DETR, 2000; Cole and Reeve 2001; and from the US, Brophy and Smith, 1997.

104 Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

105 Allen et al., 2005

106 Studies have found that some developers feel dispersed social housing is less identifiable, while others feel social housing clustered in a discreet part of the site is more likely to protect saleability; some RSLs feel that clumped homes are easier to manage: Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

107 In addition to the Right to Buy, these include landlord’s own trickle sales schemes; one example is JRF’s own as described by Martin and Watkinson, 2003.

larger, London and South East sites where mixed communities are being developed, add to the design and layout challenges for architects¹⁰⁸.

Design and layout, in particular the amount and quality of public outdoor space, communal space and shared facilities, are crucially important. They will affect the popularity of the scheme, the demands on management and costs, which feed into service charges. As in any housing development, good practice advice recommends planning ahead to ensure that manageability and cost effectiveness are built in through design. Some research suggests that this is happening in mixed developments, but that divergent approaches to management costs and service charges from social landlords and developers create tensions or affect the potential for uniform and high-quality housing, urban design and landscaping across schemes. One study suggests identifying areas of public realm that local authority might adopt easily, as a means of reducing the demands on service charges¹⁰⁹.

Local planning policy and decision making

As the section 106 system has matured, planners have become more adept at using it to gain more benefit¹¹⁰. In high value markets, higher density requirements may be attractive to developers as they enable more profit – and they increase the potential for cross-subsidy between homes for sale and affordable housing or other section 106 elements. Planning policy clearly affects the possible housing type and layout. Tenure factors separate from the prejudices or preference of developers or future residents, such as the higher internal space standards and lack of garages in most social housing – can influence layout options and make one tenure look different to another¹¹¹.

Subsidy arrangements

The amount of subsidy available and the details of criteria can have a significant effect on the tenure mix, other features of the development such as design quality, and the subsequent population mix. This is a complex and evolving area, with a particular variety of schemes to support intermediate housing, and the emergence of new sources

¹⁰⁸ Reports offering practical advice on successful high density include Cope with Averbury International, 2002 and PRP, 2002

¹⁰⁹ HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004

¹¹⁰ Monk et al., 2005

¹¹¹ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

of subsidy, and different impacts according to the local housing market. As has been noted, section 106 and densification have become increasingly important as sources of support for mixed development and redevelopment to encourage mix.

The development process

The size, timing and mix within the phases of larger developments can affect how residents are distributed and how social relations develop across the whole site. A series of small phases can act like a series of separate developments and create distinct group identities amongst residents and non-residents, despite design and layout across the development. Some studies have found that the character of early phases may shape the reputation of the whole development¹¹². If early phases are mostly social housing, as can happen in estate redevelopment schemes where there is pressure to rehouse residents and developers of private homes want to wait to see how the market develops, this can lead to a perception of the whole new area as being more down-market than might happen otherwise.

Decisions taken in the development process affect how much schemes will cost to manage. Some US sources argue that mixed income developments cost more per home to manage than either all-high income schemes, of whatever tenure, or public housing¹¹³. There is no evidence that this is the case from the UK, but the characteristics of some mixed developments or the circumstances in which they are being created may add to costs. Schemes which aim to attract very high income residents may provide amenities that have both high upfront and ongoing costs. In addition, many mixed tenure or mixed income schemes in the South East, whether new build or redevelopment are also being built at relatively high densities¹¹⁴. There are many arguments in favour of high density, but there is a consensus that flatted building types, communal spaces and other features may lead to higher financial and other costs, if management is not successful¹¹⁵.

These management costs must ultimately be paid for by residents or by their agents. Some costs may be absorbed by RSLs or

¹¹² This was noted for large council housing developments, for example in Alison Ravetz's well-known study of Quarry Hill in Leeds 1974, as well as recent mixed tenure schemes, for example Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

¹¹³ Smith, 2002

¹¹⁴ For example, Tunstall, 2002

¹¹⁵ For example, HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004

local authorities, but to ensure social and affordable housing elements in the mix do not create poverty traps or become unaffordable, service charges need to be kept low. The combination of partners, funding sources and capital and revenue streams may make ongoing finance complicated and opaque. There is a risk that residents in one part of the mix may end up cross-subsidising residents in another, which risks tensions, dissatisfaction and challenge¹¹⁶.

Marketing, sales and lettings agreements

Developers, estate agents and potential buyers may not have much experience of mixed communities and may lack confidence in them. Understanding between partners on lettings, immediate service and ongoing management that are put in place before homes are occupied can forestall concerns and can enable developers and marketers to talk to buyers about the area with confidence¹¹⁷. There is growing experience with lettings plans for initial and ongoing occupancy, and agreements between partners to ensure an ongoing strategy and liaison¹¹⁸. Ongoing

management arrangements are discussed below. Developers and estate agents may also tend not to talk to potential residents about the mix of residents planned for an area or for particular streets, blocks of homes, as a means to forestall prejudice affecting sales¹¹⁹. However, as between partners, clarity is likely to be the best policy. Estate regeneration schemes have learnt the importance of working with the media and managing public perceptions of neighbourhoods, and community cohesion partnerships also employ these techniques¹²⁰.

The resulting mix

The actual mix achieved is likely to evolve from initial ideas, as new information emerges on costs of development, practicalities of design and layout, housing needs and demand in the area, and partners negotiate section 106 agreements¹²¹ and other arrangements.

¹¹⁶ HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004

¹¹⁷ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

¹¹⁸ For example, as recommended for successful high density development: Cope with Avebury International, 2002

¹¹⁹ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

¹²⁰ VantagePoint/Home Office, 2004

¹²¹ Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005.

The longer schemes take to develop, the likelier that actual mix will diverge from initial expectations. For example, the actual class, employment and tenure balance in new towns often differed from plans, as they developed over long periods and were subject to vagaries of housing demand, finance regimes and construction industry cycles. In general there was a tendency to reduce social housing elements and to raise social housing rents¹²². The same processes apply, albeit on a smaller scale, for contemporary mixed community projects. The initial number or proportion of affordable units of social housing units may reduce from original plans, and later phases of low cost home ownership and resale of early phases may sell for much higher prices, affecting the predicted income mix. Tenure mix may vary from what was predicted as developers and first buyers make decisions reflecting market and demand conditions at the point of completion or soon after. There are examples of low-cost home ownership schemes that failed as no buyers came forward or homes were soon switched into

the private rented sector¹²³, or affordable homes have not been purchased within time limits and have reverted to market prices¹²⁴. There have been cases where low-cost home owners could not sustain payments and homes were repossessed, perhaps also ending up being rented privately¹²⁵. There are also examples of very popular private developments that soon became dominated by large private landlords. In both cases original predictions of tenure mix, household type, income mix – and even whether homes would be occupied – were overturned by events¹²⁶. The size of homes, particularly those for sale, is often left to emerge through the process but it can be very influential in the population, character and outcomes of a development.

¹²² Bennett, 2005

¹²³ DETR, 2000; see also Minton, 2005, who describes a number of factors which lead to investment consortia leasing back market rate homes to local authorities to house homeless families.

¹²⁴ Crook et al., 2002

¹²⁵ Rosenberg, 1995 in a study of low cost home purchasers in Scotland.

¹²⁶ For example, Tunstall and Coulter, forthcoming

Each of these processes has knock-on consequences for the actual mix of people in the development. Lettings agreements should help to reduce surprises in terms of the characteristics of residents arriving in social housing, but of course the actual arrivals depend on current local demand. Even in estate redevelopment schemes, there can be significant changes. This is particularly true where residents have been decanted, and patterns of take-up of any right to return can be unpredictable. There are examples of original residents becoming more likely to take up new homes over time as they recognise the quality of construction, or, conversely, demand from former residents may fade away as they become settled in new areas and don't want to upheaval that taking up the right to return implies.

The management of mixed communities

Managing mix

All neighbourhoods, even the most homogeneous, are a mix of individuals. All have the potential for all kinds of management challenges. The first step for successfully managing mixed areas is to employ general good practice in housing and neighbourhood management. There are many good sources of evidence and advice on this¹²⁷.

However, mixed areas present specific challenges. Some of the issues that may occur in any residential area, such as neighbour disputes or conflict over children's play, might be more likely to occur where groups of people with different patterns of life, needs or interests are grouped together¹²⁸. The diversity in intentionally mixed areas may be particularly ambitious, and may be outside the previous experience of residents and housing managers. In addition, some potential neighbourhood issues may be perceived as more profound divisions, such as those between owners and

renters or people of different classes or ethnicities¹²⁹. In addition, management may be more complex where more than one agency is involved: this has been seen in developments that involve more than one social landlord but there may be additional issues where agencies have different goals and experiences¹³⁰. These are not arguments against mix, but are arguments for careful, thorough and preventative management.

Some less successful mixed communities we have come across could have been planned and managed differently. There can be problems if, for example, resident needs are mismatched with service provision, either because services have not been provided or because the actual population differs from that expected (as in any development), if facilities or space shared by different groups of residents are not maintained as residents had expected (as in any development), and different standards of management and maintenance apply between different parts of the site (as in multi-landlord estates within social housing). There have been cases where a sense of 'us and

¹²⁷ Cole and Reeve, 2001 provide a useful summary of recent research and good practice advice

¹²⁸ Page and Boughton, 1997

¹²⁹ Jupp, 1999; Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005

¹³⁰ Ramwell and Saltburn, 1998, provide a detailed description of mixed tenure development in Hulme, Manchester, involving tenants and multiple agencies. US studies on mixed income areas, such as Smith, 2002, argues particularly strongly for the importance of good management in their success

them' develops between different groups of residents, triggered by preconceptions, visible differences or actual experiences, and was not addressed through available forums. There have also been situations where although improving educational outcomes may have been one of the nominal rationales for developing a mixed community, lack of consultation with the local education authority has left children struggling for school places¹³¹.

While plans may have to evolve over the life of the development, partners need to communicate and co-operate on decisions that will affect the likely and actual resident mix. As in any new housing association development, agreements and liaison between the local authority and the landlord are advisable to ensure no surprises in the nature of nominations. However, there may be additional variables in a mixed development. In some cases, very rapid and unpredictable sales or lettings can completely unravel a very carefully planned and financed tenure or social mix, where market conditions change rapidly or where

one owner or manager gets control of a critical mass of homes. As noted above, some mixed-tenure schemes in London have large-scale buying by private landlords who then enter contracts with local authorities to house large numbers of homeless families; the goals of mix are put aside in order to meet housing need and avoid penalties for using bed and breakfast accommodation¹³². Covenants are one option to slow this process. However, they are unlikely to be developed or implemented successfully without a base of good relations between partners, and may have side effects of slowing or deterring schemes. At the very least, information sharing would allow all agencies to be aware of developing population changes.

Studies of new estates generally suggest that support to individual households and encouragement to meet neighbours and other residents can have lasting benefits¹³³. Welcome visits from managers, residents' representatives, information about local services and 'get to know your neighbour' events help set up relationships and smooth

¹³¹ This was noted by Page in his 1993 study of large RSL developments of the 1990s

¹³² Minton, 2005

¹³³ Silverman et al. 2005 note the impact of community-building on the success of one of the Millennium Village mixed tenure demonstration projects.

channels of communication. Governance and resident involvement arrangements can play two roles: managing space and facilities that residents share, even if ownership or responsibility may be divided; and managing relationships, tackling tensions and developing community. These arrangements have to be based on good, ongoing relationships between the agencies involved in developing and managing the housing.

Decision making

As noted, thought needs to be given to how decisions on management will be made, how costs will be apportioned amongst the mix and how service charges will be collected and spent.

In mixed-tenure and multi-landlord social housing schemes built at relatively low densities, where the built form is houses and roads are adopted, the issue of service charges does not arise, and the tendency has been for each RSL and for owners and private landlords to work independently. Even in these cases, however, there have

been problems where it is not clear what organisation is responsible for a particular area or task, or where people in similar homes are paying different amounts for similar services. A central organisation might provide better information to residents, a means for partners to exchange information, more efficient services and, if desired, uniformity across the mix. These are among the main arguments for neighbourhood management, which has been promoted across neighbourhoods of varying origin and mix. Evidence suggests that neighbourhood management approaches can provide good service, forestall problems and ensure sustainable communities¹³⁴.

However, many mixed community schemes will need services that have to be charged for. There is a range of potential models for managing mixed-tenure schemes through special organisations. One of the development partners could take a lead role, taking on formal contractual responsibility for providing services to the whole of the development and perhaps establishing a

¹³⁴ Neighbourhood management has been promoted through pathfinder schemes and its value has been assessed in several reports. See for example Power and Bergin, 1999; SEU, 2001 and Brown, 2002.

subsidiary for the task. Alternatively, a new dedicated organisation can be established, with various constitutions: as charitable trusts, companies limited by guarantee, co-operatives or commercial organisations¹³⁵. They could concentrate solely on management or also play a wider role on community development or regeneration. While there is experience of each of these structures in other contexts, such as providing neighbourhood management, or as successor organisations at the end of regeneration schemes, there is not as yet much experience of how they operate in mixed communities. Resident involvement is seen as the orthodoxy in social housing and estate regeneration, and may help to iron out problems associated with in complex developments and to pre-empt potential tensions between residents in mixed communities¹³⁶.

The evolution of mix over time

Social and tenure mixes do not remain static from the point of completion and occupation. Gradual tenure and social

change has happened over time at a national and neighbourhood level and continues in most neighbourhoods¹³⁷. Perhaps the freezing of tenure change in many neighbourhoods between their first development as council housing and the introduction of voluntary or compulsory sales policies was the only exception. Even in these cases, social mix changed as residents came and went¹³⁸.

Household transitions that are particularly likely to result in moves include the birth of children, alterations in perceptions of crime and safety and changes in economic circumstances. Some household transitions may be partly predictable from information about age and household profiled at the time residents moved in, for example those relating to children reaching the ages for entry to primary school or transitions to secondary school. The emergence of management issues may also be partly predictable. A development with large numbers of primary school children now, for example, will have large numbers of teenagers in ten years' time. Similarly, a

¹³⁵ HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004. In one oft-quoted US example, a single purpose-built non-profit was established to provide litter clearance, ground maintenance and similar services to owners and renters, and both categories of residents had places on its board: Smith, 2002.

¹³⁶ Knox and Alcock, 2002

¹³⁷ For example Tunstall, 2005

¹³⁸ For example Groves et al., 2003

population with a preponderance of elderly people is more usually found in established areas decades after people first move in and may have special needs and, as ageing reaches its natural conclusion, see a rapid turnover to a new population as lots of sales or lettings are made. Significant sections of social housing, particularly in some northern cities, are going through this process at present.

The private rented sector is associated with rapid turnover of households, and can house very varied populations. In high-rent areas, the market for private rented housing may be polarised between young singles and couples on high incomes and family households who can pay the rent through housing benefit. Mix can evolve as homes transfer between different tenures. Social tenants may buy their homes, and then sell them or rent them to new residents; social or private landlords may take on properties and may change allocation policies; private owners may rent their homes out too. The development of more 'fuzzy' tenure with options for tenants to take on equity stakes

might even add to these processes. Mix can evolve through housing development or demolition. Deliberately mixed tenure or socially mixed areas have followed national tenure patterns with shift to ownership dominance¹³⁹.

High and rising prices for homes for sale in mixed areas can be seen as a sign of success. On the other hand, they could trace shifts in income mix – removing the middle groups or increasing the gap across the area, or the disappearance of lower income residents, and associated population changes. They could also be associated with speculative purchase of homes and the 'buy to mothball' rather than 'buy to let' phenomenon, which could be problematic. These processes of change may add to social mix but may also act to erode mix along one or more dimensions. The rapid erosion of mix in initially mixed neighbourhoods is likely to raise concern if vulnerable residents are displaced or do not gain from the process, or if there is no nearby mixed area to substitute for the role played by the one lost.

¹³⁹ Allen et al., 2005

Gaps in the evidence and directions for future research

There is a wealth of research, policy and advocacy on social mix, as demonstrated by our reference list. Nevertheless, there are still some areas where findings are tentative and still some gaps in knowledge. Ian Cole and colleagues argued that in the housing and regeneration field generally, we often know what works but not why it works¹⁴⁰. There are gaps on the details of case studies, how mixes were produced, how much mix is needed to produce effects and how different dimensions of mix interact, how much of the effects can be attributed to mix, and the effects of the local, market or policy context. Some topics and some types of area are less studied than others. We now point out some gaps in the existing evidence base, which we hope may provide ideas for future research.

Processes versus outcomes

The literature on tenure mix, in particular, has quite good coverage of different regions, mixes and types of development. These studies have frequently addressed themselves to similar questions, aiding comparability. However, almost all

the published research in the area has emphasised the measurement of outcomes, primarily through surveys of residents' attitudes and the analysis of administrative data. Whilst such quantitative measures are clearly a useful way of evaluating policy interventions against their proclaimed objectives, there is a danger in concentrating only on 'what works' in research designs. As discussed above, there are often several different theories about the way in which the claimed benefits of mixed communities arise. Whilst studies are generally well able to conclude whether or not a particular outcome has been achieved, few are able to be so decisive as to exactly how that outcome has happened. These mean that we need to be cautious about making strong claims, and assuming that we will get the same results from applying a policy in different areas.

We recommend that using detailed observational methods and more in-depth resident interviews in research design would assist here. Given the current predominance of snapshot surveys, studies

¹⁴⁰ Cole and Reeve 2001; see also DETR, 2000

that tracked the experiences of individual households over time could contribute to our understanding of how different types of household fare in different areas. Residents' evolving experience of new private and mixed developments is particularly under-researched.

Compositional effects in existing areas
New developments, distressed or 'dysfunctional' areas, and regeneration sites have much more often been studied than existing neighbourhoods. This is despite the fact that most people in the UK do not live in such recently transformed areas, though many or most do live in areas that are 'mixed' in at least some of the senses we have outlined. More case study evidence from existing housing areas in urban, suburban and rural settings could supply a clearer picture of the effects of different compositions, and the longer-term trajectories of mixed communities. On a related note, there are only a small number of studies of mix initiatives which have looked at outcomes over a longer period after the intervention is complete. As we

have seen, one argument for changing the social mix on distressed social housing estates is that it removes the need for repeated cycles of renewal. In the short term, as several authors note, it is hard to distinguish independent effects of the social mix from those of new or substantially refurbished neighbourhood environments. With regard to new developments and the remodelling of existing estates, we recommend further research on areas that are five, ten or more years from the date when buildings were completed and occupied.

Conclusion

We have argued that social mix is a central plank of current Government policy towards neighbourhoods. Though the idea of ‘mixed’ and ‘balanced’ neighbourhoods is not a new one, they are currently being created across the UK, both deliberately by tenure change as a means to fulfil social policy goals and as a side effect of funding regimes for the construction and refurbishment of social housing. Whilst house type and tenure is the level of mix which policy can most directly affect, the benefits of mixed communities are more often thought to be achieved through the mix of people and households with different social characteristics.

Tenure serves as a proxy for these social characteristics. The most commonly cited of these is income, and alleviating and avoiding problems associated with spatial concentrations of poor households has been a prime reason for seeking to create mixed communities. The planning, implementation and longer-term maintenance of these places may be more complex, but realistic goals, high-quality design and assiduous neighbourhood management remain of

paramount importance. Social mix does not obviate conventional wisdom and best practice in housing.

Our review of the research evidence suggests similar measured optimism about the benefits of socially mixed communities. The large majority of the mixed neighbourhoods reported in the literature have become broadly successful places where people want to live. Benefits that rely on there being increased income mix, such as more and more varied commercial services, are well evidenced. Where the benefits of mix rely on less measurable attitudes and behaviours and on interaction among residents, there is evidence, but it is at present less decisive. Achieving these aims may require getting the mix right along several dimensions at once, such as ensuring that there are households with children across different tenures and social groups. This requires careful planning, and when, as in major remodelling of housing estates, altering the social mix involves substantial disturbance to existing residents’ lives, planners and policy makers will want to be all the

more certain that the preconditions for success are there, and that success cannot easily be achieved by more conventional mechanisms. Rationales for ensuring that new communities are socially mixed are clear cut, though attention is nonetheless required to local conditions and markets.

This is a rapidly developing area. It remains immature in some aspects, notably the breadth of longitudinal research and the understanding of exactly why different socially mixed places may better meet the needs and aspirations of their residents. We hope that the coming years will see a continued interest in empirical and theoretical research on mixed communities and in innovative policy and practice in building them.

Glossary

Affordable housing: homes rented or owned with public subsidy at lower cost to the resident than prevailing market prices. Includes social housing and intermediate housing.

Intermediate housing: homes that are partially subsidised for sale or rental below market prices, including shared and low-cost ownership schemes.

IPPR: Institute for Public Policy Research

JRF: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

ODPM: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Pepper-potted: Used to refer to mixed-tenure developments where many adjacent dwellings are in different tenures.

Private housing: homes owned or rented privately without public subsidy

RSL: Registered Social Landlord

Section 106: a mechanism under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act whereby planning authorities require developers to make a contribution towards affordable housing or other public facilities such as schools or parks, reflecting the wider impact of the new private housing development.

Social housing: homes rented with public subsidy from local authorities or Registered Social Landlords (RSLs); tenancies are allocated to those unable to rent or buy on the open market on the basis of housing need.

Bibliography and further reading

Case studies of mixed-tenure, mixed-income neighbourhoods

Allen, C, Camina, M, Casey, R, Coward, C and Wood, M (2005) **Mixed Tenure, Twenty Years On: Nothing Out of the Ordinary**. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Andrews, C L, and Reardon-Smith, W (2005) **Challenging Perceptions: Case Studies of Dispersed and Mixed Tenure Developments**. Newbury: Sovereign Housing Association

Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K (1998) **Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood Impacts of Owner Occupation**. Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.

Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K (2000) 'Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts' **Policy and Politics** 28(1) 93-108

Beekman, T, Lyons, F and Scott, J (2001) **Improving the Understanding of the Influence of Owner Occupiers in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods**. Edinburgh: Scottish Homes

Butler, T and Robson, G (2001) 'Social Capital, Gentrification and Neighbourhood Change in London: a comparison of three South London neighbourhoods' **Urban Studies** 38 2145-62

Butler, T with Robson, G (2003) **London Calling: The Middle Classes and the Remaking of Inner London**. Oxford: Berg

Cameron, S (2003) 'Gentrification, housing redifferentiation and urban regeneration: "Going for Growth" in Newcastle upon Tyne' **Urban Studies** 40(12) 2367-2382

Cole, I, Gidley, G, Ritchie, C, Simpson, D and Wishart, B (1996). **Creating Communities or Welfare housing? A study of New Housing Association Developments in Yorkshire/Humberside**. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.

Craigforth (2002) **Engaging Home Owners in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods**. Edinburgh: Chartered Institute of Housing in Scotland.

Grove, R, Middleton, A, Murie, A and Broughton, K (2003) **Neighbourhoods that work: A Study of the Bournville Estate, Birmingham.** York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Harding, A (1998) **Hulme City Challenge: Did it Work?** Manchester: Manchester City Council.

Hiscock, R (2001) **Are Mixed Tenure Estates Likely To Enhance The Social Capital Of Their Residents?** Conference paper, Housing Studies Association Conference, Cardiff University

Jupp, B (1999) **Living Together: Community Life On Mixed Tenure Estates.** London: Demos

Manzi, T and Smith-Bowers, W (2005) **Gated Communities as Club Goods: Segregation or Social Cohesion?** Housing Studies 20(2) 347-361

Martin, G and Watkinson, J (2003) **Rebalancing Communities: Introducing Mixed Incomes Into Existing Rented Housing Estates.** York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Minton, A (2005) 'At the Mercy of the Market'. New Start 26/10/2005.
ODPM (nd) **Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour In Mixed Tenure Areas.** Research report.

Page, D and Broughton, R (1997) **Mixed Tenure Estates.** London: Notting Hill Home Group/Housing Corporation

Ramwell, R and Saltburn, H (1998) **Trick or Treat? City Challenge and the Regeneration of Hulme.** Darlington: North British Housing Association / Guinness Trust

Rosenberg, L (1995) 'Monitoring low cost home ownership initiatives: A longitudinal analysis of housing market trends within the privatised areas of four council housing estates in Scotland' **Housing Studies** 10(3) 285-303

Silverman, E, Lupton, R and Fenton, A (2005) **A Good Place for Children? Attracting and Retaining Families in Inner Urban Mixed Income Communities.** York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Neighbourhood effects, regeneration and social policy

Capita (1996) **An Evaluation Of Six Early Estate Action Schemes**. London: HMSO

Clark, J, Dyson, A and Millward, A (1999) **Housing And Schooling: A Case Study In Joined-Up Problems**. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Cole, I. and Shayer, S (1998) **Beyond Housing Investment: Regeneration, Sustainability and the Role of Housing Associations**. Sheffield: CRESR

Cole, I and Reeve, K (2001) **New Deal for Communities: National Evaluation Scoping phase: Housing And Physical Environment Domain**. London: ODPM

CRESR (2005) **New Deal for Communities 2001-2005: An Interim Evaluation**. London: ODPM.

Crowther, D, Cummings, D, Dyson, A and Millward, A (2004) **Schools and Area**

Regeneration. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Dabinett, G; Lawless, P; Tyler, P and Rhodes, J (2001) **A Review of the Evidence Base for Regeneration Policy and Practice**. London: ODPM.

DETR (2000) **Regeneration That Lasts: A Guide To Good Practice On Social Housing Estates**. London: DETR

Galster, G; Quercia, RG and Cortes, A (2000) 'Identifying neighborhood thresholds: An empirical exploration' **Housing Policy Debate** 11(3) 701-732

Lee, P and Murie, A (1997) **Poverty, Housing Tenure and Social Exclusion**. Bristol: Policy Press/JRF

Lupton, R (2003) **'Neighbourhood Effects': Can We Measure Them And Does It Matter?** CASEpaper 73. London: CASE

Lupton, R (2004) **Schools in Disadvantaged Areas: Recognising Context and Raising Quality (CASEpaper 76)**. London: CASE

Lupton, R (2005) 'Social justice and school improvement: improving the quality of schooling in the poorest neighbourhoods' **British Educational Research Journal** 31(5) 589-604

Maxwell, D (2005) **Shifting Foundations: Home Ownership And Government Objectives**. Working paper. London: IPPR

Murdoch, J and Day, G (1998) 'Middle class mobility, rural communities and the politics of exclusion' in Boyle, P J and Halfacree, J H (eds) **Migration into Rural Areas: Theories and Issues**. Chichester: Wiley

ODPM, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2005) **Planning For Mixed Communities: A Consultation Paper On A Proposed Change To Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing**. London: ODPM

Tunstall, R and Coulter, A (forthcoming 2006) **Turning the tide? 25 years on 20 estates**. York: YPS

SEU, Social Exclusion Unit (2001) **A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan**. London: Cabinet Office

Thrupp, M (1999) **Schools Making A Difference, Let's Be Realistic!** Buckingham: Open University Press

BME housing and 'community cohesion'

Amin, A (2002) 'Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity'. **Environment and Planning A** 34 959-980

Chahal, K (2000) **Ethnic Diversity, Neighbourhoods And Housing** (JRF Foundations series). York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

FEANTSA (2001) **Housing Policy As A Way Of Reinforcing Social Cohesion: 13th European Meeting Of Housing Ministers; Final Communique, Edited Summary**. Brussels: FEANTSA

Harrison, M and Philips, D (2003) **Housing And Black And Minority Ethnic Communities**. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Home Office/ODPM (2005) **Community Cohesion: Seven Steps, a Practitioner's Toolkit**. London: ODPM

Johnston, R, Forrest, J and Poulsen, M 'Are there Ethnic Enclaves/Ghettos in English Cities?' **Urban Studies** 39(4) 591-618

LGA, Local Government Association (2004) **Community Cohesion: An Action Guide: Guidance For Local Authorities**. London: LGA.

Robinson, D (2005) 'The Search for Community Cohesion: Key Themes and Dominant Concepts of the Public Policy Agenda'. **Urban Studies** 42(8) 1311-1427

Robinson, D, Coward, S, Fordham, T, Green, S and Reeve, K (2004) **How Housing Management Can Contribute to Community Cohesion**. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing

Robinson, D, Iqbal, B and Harrison, M (2002) **A Question of Investment: From Funding Bids to BME Housing Opportunities**. London: The Housing Corporation

Ratcliffe, P with Harrison, H, Hogg, R, Line, B, Phillips, D and Tomlins, R (2001) **Breaking Down The Barriers: Improving Asian Access To Social Rented Housing** Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing

Scottish Homes (2001) **Assessing the Market for New Owner-occupied Housing among Glasgow's Black and Minority Ethnic Communities** (Précis Series no 137). Glasgow: Scottish Homes

Silburn, R, Lucas, D, Page, R and Hanna, L (1999) **Neighbourhood Images In Nottingham: Social Cohesion And Neighbourhood Change**. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Housing demand and housing markets

Bramley, G et al (2001) **The Future of Owner Occupation in Scotland**. Edinburgh: Communities Scotland

Blenkinsop, J and Gibbons, J (2004) **Housing Markets: Preparing For Change**. London: Impact/Housing Corporation

Craigforth Consultancy and Newhaven Research (2004) **Understanding The Dynamics Of Low Demand In Owner Occupation In East Ayrshire And North Lanarkshire**. Edinburgh: Communities Scotland

Freeman, L (2004) **Siting Affordable Housing: Location and Neighbourhood Trends of Low Income Housing Tax Credit Development in the 1990s**. Washington DC: Brookings Institution

Lupton, R (2003) **Poverty Street: The Dynamics Of Neighbourhood Decline And Renewal**. Bristol: Policy Press

Newidiem with Menter a Busnes (2003)
Age-Balanced Communities In Rural Wales.
Cardiff: Newidiem

Power, A and Mumford, K (1999) **The Slow Death of Great Cities: Urban abandonment or Urban Renaissance?** York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Tribal HCH (2005) **Low Demand For Owner Occupation In Scotland.** Edinburgh: Communities Scotland

Wilcox, S (2005) **Affordability And The Intermediate Housing Market: Local Measures For All Local Authority Areas In Great Britain.** York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Housing design and neighbourhood management

Bennett, J (2005) **From New Towns To Growth Areas: Learning From The Past.** London: IPPR

Brown, A (2002) **Neighbourhood Management: Lessons From Working For Communities Pathfinders And Related Initiatives In Scotland.** Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Central Research Unit

CABE, Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (2004) **What Home Buyers Want: Attitudes And Decision Making Among Consumers.** London: CABE

Cole, I, McCoulough, E and Southworth, J (2000) **Neighbourhood Agreements In Action: A Case Study In York.** York: York Publishing Services

Cope, H and Avebury International (2002) **Capital Gains: Making High Density Housing Work In London.** London: London Housing Federation

Ekins, P and Newby, L (2000) **The Big Picture: Sustainable Communities**. London: Housing Corporation

HACAS Chapman Hendy (2004) **What Price Sustainability? Keeping Service Charges Affordable in High-Density Mixed Tenure Development**. London: Moat/Ujima/L&Q/LHF/Greenwich Peninsula

Kearns, A and Turok, I (2004) **Sustainable Communities: Dimensions and Challenges**. London: ODPM

Lee, A; Tunstall, R and Power, A (1999) **Partnership As Never Before: Establishing A Local Housing Company In LB Brent**. London: Housing Corporation/Ealing Family Housing Association

Mean, M and Tims, C (2005) **People Make Places: Growing The Public Life Of Cities**. London: Demos

PRP Architects (2002) **High Density Housing In Europe: Lessons For London**. London: East Thames Housing Group

Page, D (1993) **Building for Communities: A Study of New Housing Association Estates**. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Page, D (1994) **Developing Communities**. Teddington: Sutton Hastoe Housing Association

Power, A and Bergin, E (1999) **Neighbourhood Management** (CASE Paper 31). London: CASE

SEU, Social Exclusion Unit (2000) **Policy Action Team 4: Neighbourhood Management**. London: DETR

Tunstall, R (2002) **Housing Density: What Do Residents Think?** London: East Thames Housing Group

Reviews and international perspectives

Berube, A (2005) **Mixed Communities In England: A US Perspective On Evidence And Policy Prospects**. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Brophy, P C and Smith, R N (1997) 'Mixed income housing: Factors for success' **Cityscape 3** 3-32

Fainstein, S (2004) **Cities And Diversity: Should We Want It? Can We Plan For It?** Conference Paper, The Resurgent City, London School of Economics

Katz, B (2004) **Neighborhoods of Choice and Connection: The Evolution of American Neighborhood Policy and What It Means for the United Kingdom**. New York: The Brookings Institution

Minton, A (2002) **Building Balanced Communities: The US And UK Compared**. London: RICS

Norris, M (2002) **Developing, Designing and Managing Mixed Tenure Estates: Implementing Planning Gain Legislation in the Republic of Ireland**. Conference paper, Housing Studies Association Conference, York University

Smith, A (2002) **Mixed-income Housing Developments: Promise and Reality**. Cambridge: Harvard Joint Center on Housing Studies

Tunstall, R (2003), 'Mixed Tenure Policy in the UK: Privatisation, Pluralism, or Euphemism?' **Housing Theory and Society 20**(3) 153-259

Varady, D P, Raffel, J A, Sweeney, S and Denson, L (2005) 'Attracting middle-income families in the Hope VI public housing revitalization program' **Journal of Urban Affairs 27**(2) 149-164

Wilson, W J (1987) **The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Wood, W (2003) 'A Balancing Act: Tenure Diversification in Australia and the UK'. **Urban Policy and Research 21**(1) 45-56

Housing Corporation offices

Maple House
149 Tottenham Court Road
London W1T 7BN

www.housingcorp.gov.uk

CENTRAL:

Attenborough House
109/119 Charles Street
Leicester LE1 1FQ
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 0116 242 4801

31 Waterloo Road
Wolverhampton
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 1902 795001

Trinity House
Cambridge Business Place
Cowley Road
Cambridge CB4 0WZ
Tel: 01223 393 516

LONDON:

Waverley House
7-12 Noel Street
London W1F 8BA
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 020 7292 4401

NORTH:

4th Floor
One Piccadilly Gardens
Manchester M1 1RG
Tel: 0845 230 7000

1 Park Lane
Leeds LS3 1EP
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 0161 242 2001

St. George's House
Team Valley
Kingsway Trading Estate
Gateshead NE11 0NA

SOUTH EAST:

Leon House
High Street
Croydon
Surrey CR9 1UH
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 020 8253 1444

SOUTH WEST:

Beaufort House
51 New North Road
Exeter EX4 4EP
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 01392 428201

For further copies of the publication please call 0845 230 7000 or e-mail enquiries@housingcorp.gsx.gov.uk

We can also provide copies in large print, Braille and audio cassette, on request. Other language versions may also be available.

In the mix

A review of mixed income, mixed tenure and mixed communities.

Communities should contain a greater mix of housing types and residents, according to the Government. This aim is reflected in its current policies on housing and neighbourhoods.

In the last ten years, a great deal of research has been carried out on communities with mixes of incomes and tenures, how mix is being achieved and what effects it can have. This publication provides a review of that research. Importantly, it also offers lessons for the practical implementation of planned changes to mix and for the management of new and existing mixed areas.