

THE PROMOTION OF 'MIXED TENURE': IN SEARCH OF THE EVIDENCE BASE

Dr Rebecca Tunstall
H613, Dept of Social Policy, LSE
Houghton St, London WC2A 2AE
Tel 020 7955 6867
R.Tunstall@lse.ac.uk

DRAFT: NOT FOR QUOTATION

Summary

Provoked by concerns that mono-tenure areas were increasingly associated with mono-social group areas, social problems, and lack of choice in the housing market, the promotion of 'tenure diversification' and 'mixed tenure' within local areas (of indeterminate size) has been an important element of housing policy since the 1980s.

Policy instruments at least partly intended to promote mixed tenure include the Right to Buy, other low-cost home ownership schemes, aspects of estate and urban regeneration policy and the use of the planning system. While it might seem that 'tenure diversification' and 'mixed tenure' are euphemisms for breaking up social housing estates and reducing the total stock of social housing, the operation of the Right to Buy protected council housing in villages and planning policy has sought to create 'mix' by inserting social housing into larger new private housing developments.

Mixed tenure is still very topical, and now typifies 'third way' approaches in current housing policy. It is widely argued that the promotion of mixed tenure may help reduce concentrations of social exclusion in neighbourhoods, either through population movement or social and economic shifts caused by mechanisms including the effect of role models, changes to social networks, and changes to buying and lobbying patterns.

However, there has been surprisingly little research on how mixed tenure patterns actually are, how they have changed over time, what effect policies have had on mixes, whether the mechanisms exist through which hypothesised benefits of mixed tenure can be achieved, what the outcomes of mixed tenure are, what mixes are important and at what spatial scales they might operate.

This paper synthesises available published evidence on each of these issues, mainly from the UK, with some from the US and other countries. It predates a major study of mixed tenure in the UK, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and carried out by Joe Doherty, Elspeth Graham, Paul Boyle and Rosemary Hiscock, which is due to be completed shortly.

The existing evidence shows major regional, area and neighbourhood differences in tenure mix. There have been trends away from mixed tenure at regional and local authority levels, and possibly ward and ED levels since the 1970s, despite policy to promote mixed tenure.

The evidence base for the effects of mixed tenure and tenure mixing is weak. Available evidence suggests effects are not strong, and there are some negative effects. In some cases, effects are at least partly due to regeneration or social mix rather than tenure mix. The evidence does not justify promotion of mixed tenure and tenure mixing.

1. THE PROMOTION OF MIXED TENURE

Who supports mixed tenure?

Tenure diversification in local authority estates has been pursued by central government since the 1980s, when it was more politically contentious than now, and seen as a euphemism for privatising council housing (eg. Pinto, 1993). ‘Mixed tenure’ more broadly has been an explicit policy goal of UK central government, both Conservative and Labour, since the 1990s, when concern about new RSL estates and about the supply of affordable housing added to concern about council estates. The DoE stated that tenure diversification in council estates was *"central to the regeneration of run-down estates"* (1991 p.2) and *"can contribute significantly to the upgrading of an estate and the surrounding area"*(1989 p.2). Promoted by the Urban Task Force, established by the new Labour government in 1997 (1999). The 1995 housing white paper stated *"we want to ... help construct sustainable communities where... home owners and renters live alongside each other"* (1995 p35). By the end of the 1990s, a DETR report noted that mixed tenure was part of the 'professional orthodoxy', alongside mixed use urban development, higher densities, and 'brownfield' reuse (DETR, 2000b). Mixed tenure has been referred to by the Urban Task Force (1999), the Social Exclusion Units' Policy Action Teams, and the housing Green Paper. It has been built into neighbourhood renewal policy and the HIP assessment criteria, and is expected to be demonstrated in pathfinders for Housing Revenue Account PFIs, ‘starter home’ projects and other contemporary initiatives.

Mixed tenure has also been supported by think tanks and commentators (Perri 6, 1997, Young and Lemos, 1997, Jupp, 1999). Outside the UK, mixed tenure has also been supported in the Netherlands (Parkinson, 1998; Ostendorf *et al.*, 2001), and collectively by housing ministers across the European Union (FEANTSA, 2001).

It is notable that there is little explicit evidence of the views of housing consumers, whether housebuyers, potential buyers or tenants, on mixed tenure.

Tenure mix and the extent and number of ‘mixed tenure’ areas are affected by gross changes in size of different tenures at national and regional level, through new building and demolition that does not create or destroy all tenure groups proportionately, and transfer of existing home between tenures. These changes will be partly attributable to general housing policy, and partly to wider social and economic forces.

Table 1: Mechanisms that can lead to mixed or more mixed tenure in particular areas

Building homes for tenures other than the dominant tenure group for the area; for example by building homes for sale or shared ownership in or adjacent to council estates ¹
Demolishing homes in the dominant tenure for the area
Changing the tenure of homes in the dominant tenure group for the area, for example selling homes in council estates to sitting tenants ¹ ; improving homes in council estates for sale or shared ownership ¹ ; or selling unimproved homes in council estates to individual or group purchasers to improve them ¹

Note 1: In each case purchasers may subsequently rent out their homes privately

Successive UK governments have actively promoted tenure diversification in areas dominated by council housing through a range of policies for over twenty years. These include the low cost home ownership initiatives, principally the Right to Buy for council tenants, but also a range of alternative low cost home ownership (LCHO) initiatives (Bramley and Jordan, 1998; SPARK, 2001). SPARK pointed out that the development of mixed tenure was only one of the aim of LCHO schemes, which also included the expansion of home ownership and freeing up social rented units (2001). Bramley and Jordan argued that the only LCHO schemes to include tenure mixing as a major aim apart from the RTB were those in Scotland (1998). Only LCHO schemes that

transfer the tenure of existing homes, such as RTB, Voluntary Purchase Grant, improvement for sale, and mortgage to rent schemes, and, potentially, those that involve new build such as shared ownership which is often introduced as part of estate redevelopment projects, and GRO grants in Scotland, some of which are targeted at 'mono-tenure' social housing estates. LCHO schemes such as the Cash Incentive Scheme, Tenants' Incentive Scheme, Do-it-Yourself Shared Ownership, and Homebuy that involve moving households into new homes and new tenures, and presumably new areas, may affect neighbourhood social mix but not tenure mix.

LCHO schemes were often introduced as part of council estate regeneration projects such as those funded by Estate Action (1985-94) and SRB (1994-). The Estate Action programme was the biggest capital funding programme directed at council estates in England from 1985-94. By 1994/95 it accounted for spending of nearly £2bn on half a million homes in 170 local authorities (Capita, 1996). Funding was primarily used for large-scale physical renovations and improvements, but tenure diversification was intended to be "a central plank" (*ibid.* p41). Other urban regeneration programmes have also promoted the insertion of home ownership and RSL housing into areas dominated by council renting. Robson *et al.* identified increasing the quantity of private sector housing as one of the hundred objectives of thirty-three 1980s urban policy programmes they investigated (1994).

Planning mechanisms have also been used to encourage mixed tenure development and to insert social housing into new developments intended mainly for home ownership. PPG1 explicitly promoted the adoption of 'urban village' principles, including mixed tenure or mixed cost housing, in the design of new residential developments (DoE, 1997). The draft revisions to PPG 3 emphasised the benefits of social mix and stated, "the Government does not accept that different types of housing and tenures make for bad neighbours" (DETR, 1999). The final version said that development plan policies should explicitly spell out the level of social housing required in the plan area and the amounts to be provided on individual sites (DETR, 2000c).

2. THE IMPLICIT HYPOTHESES ABOUT MIXED TENURE AND TENURE MIXING

Implicit hypotheses and explicit claims

Why is there such support for mixed tenure? What are its supposed benefits?

Support for mixed tenure has become so widespread and unquestioning, that some statements in support of it have no explanation for why it might be beneficial or how it could achieve beneficial effects. They can be circular: *'the local population will benefit from being mixed... as an antidote to the encroachment of ever-more marked tenure divisions'* (Cole *et al.*, 1998 p5). Some use intangible terms with little indication of potential indicators or mechanisms for achieving outcomes. The 1995 white paper suggested that mixed tenure areas were more 'sustainable' (DoE 1995 p35), and the DETR later claimed that tenure mixing could lead to a 'new atmosphere and attitude' (2000a). Claims also include lower turnover, more popularity, reduced management and maintenance costs, increased employment, reduced social exclusion, more social cohesion, increased social capital or community activity, better public/private services and other 'regeneration' effects.

There appear to be different reasons for the support of mixed tenure and tenure mixing, and different ideal mixes for different policy areas. However, 'mixed tenure' appears to be widely used as a euphemism for other ends or as a short-hand to refer to mechanisms to achieve other, unstated, ends, across policy areas.

In discussion of social housing and regeneration, 'mixed tenure' appears to be widely used as a euphemism for social mix, /or for avoiding social rented mono-tenure. Given the correlation between housing tenure and a wide range of socio-economic characteristics, 'mixed tenure' is very widely used as a partial synonym for or as mechanisms to achieve social mix and heterogeneity at local level. Some arguments for mixed tenure are clearly more directly about social mix. 'Social mix' may itself be a euphemism for avoiding concentrations of people on low incomes or who are not in employment. For example, the DETR recommended mixed tenure because "the sustainability of estates is likely to be undermined if they house concentrations of benefit-dependent people" (2000a). Ostendorf *et al.*, commented, "unsurprisingly, the rise of urban areas characterised by the concentration of low incomes is attracting far more attention than those of high incomes" (2001 p.372).

Mixed tenure is also used at least partly as a synonym or euphemism for the alternative to areas dominated by social housing. Murie and Nevin state, "the problem, as it is presented, is equated with council housing estates... deprivation and lack of social mix in other communities and housing tenures are not identified as meriting action" (1997 p6). Cautions against homogenous social rented tenure, form an important variation on support for mixed tenure (see eg. Page, 1993, 1994; Jupp, 1999). There is little concern about areas of concentrated home ownership. Should they be of concern? They do make it more likely, for any given national tenure structure, that other areas will be low-income dominated, but are there any other, direct problems?

In contrast, in discussion of planning and new house building, 'mixed tenure' appears to be widely used as a euphemism for avoiding owner-occupation mono-tenure. Tenure mix is often used as a "proxy" for developing new social housing (DETR, 2000c).

The implicit hypotheses are in conflict over the relative value of mixed tenure. Is mixed tenure a second best to home ownership dominated tenure patterns? Is the main aim of policy to avoid social renting dominated areas, with either mixed tenure or home ownership domination satisfactory? Or is mixed tenure the best tenure pattern of all?

Testable hypotheses about mixed tenure and tenure mixing

Three alternative testable hypotheses about mixed tenure and tenure mixing can be established from consideration of the reasons for support for mixed tenure and the claims made for it:

- i) Local social mix has compositional effects on areas outcomes but not on individuals
- ii) Local social mix has cumulative or threshold effects constituting 'neighbourhood effects' (mixed tenure is important as a means to or proxy for social mix)
- iii) Tenure mix has cumulative or threshold effects constituting 'neighbourhood effects', independent of social mix.

Without knock-on neighbourhood effects from mixed tenure, living next to households in different tenures may be "more of a statistical artefact than a daily reality for its residents" (Perri 6, 1997 p5). In a rare explicit claim, Hiscock stated, "mixed tenure appears to have more than just diluting effects" (2001, p15).

Some support for tenure mix goes beyond this and does not rely either on the compositional or neighbourhood effects of social mix, but assumes that tenure mix itself can exert 'neighbourhood effects'.

There is a large literature that argues that housing tenure, particularly home ownership, can have a wide range of effects on individual and household attitudes, behaviour and outcomes. Similarly, 'neighbourhood effects' have been widely proposed as at least a partial explanation for differences between neighbourhoods in individuals' attitude, behaviour or other outcomes, which remain after identifiable explanatory variables relating to individuals – and in some case, families - have been controlled for. It has been heavily researched, particularly in the USA and in Australia, and it has been used to explain differences in voting patterns (eg. Johnston *et al.*, 2001), educational participation and achievement (eg. Overman, 1999), health and mortality, early fertility, drug use, crime, land use, business development, attitudes to the community and the level of community participation, public service quality, employment and deprivation (eg. Galster *et al.*, 2000). The existence and significance of neighbourhood effects is the subject of heated and ongoing debate. It is not clear how much of the 'neighbourhood effect' in different cases could be attributed through further research or if data were available for either the characteristics of the individuals making up the neighbourhoods population, or specific characteristics of the neighbourhood such as its tenure structure, or its topography, the presence of infrastructure, public and private services, labour markets, and area reputation. The distinction between these two may be contestable. It is not clear whether these differ from 'threshold effects' in individual variables or and cumulative effects of combinations of different variables, and whether this might threaten the concept of neighbourhood effect. In addition, investigation of putative 'neighbourhood effects' are associated with notorious data and methodological problems including difficulty distinguishing and attributing effects (eg. Johnston *et al.*, 2001).

As in the case of other neighbourhood effects, there has been some discussion of the mechanisms through which 'tenure mix neighbourhood effects' could be produced. Firstly, tenure mix could affect resident attitudes or behaviour, via the provision of new tenure options (allowing existing residents to shift tenure without moving area), via the observation of residents of other tenure (tenure 'role model' effects) or via the interaction between residents of different tenures, including through social control, collective action or the development of social capital. Secondly, tenure mix could affect non-resident attitudes or behaviour via observation or interaction. These are the main mechanisms to be discussed more or less explicitly, in literature on mixed tenure. There may also be other mechanisms as yet unconsidered.

This paper focuses on the evidence base for the 'neighbourhood effects' of mixed tenure, and the mechanisms through which they might operate.

The next section expands on the claims made for mixed tenure. It attempts to distinguish claims made for mixed tenure and tenure mixing *per se* from those which appear to be using mixed tenure only as a euphemism for, or as an indicator of, or means to social mix. It attempts to distinguish between the mechanisms believed to produce the effects. It attempts to distinguish between claims made for *mixed tenure* in comparison to non-mixed tenure (comparisons between areas), and those made for processes to encourage *tenure mixing* in particular areas (change over time).

Notably, most of the claims either explicitly or implicitly compare mixed tenure to tenure dominated by social renting or even local authority renting specifically. Some of them are the reverse of hypotheses about why problems can occur in these areas (eg. Jupp, 1999). Most of them concentrate on the potential benefits of changing non-mixed tenure patterns. These form the hypotheses that this research will test through reviewing available evidence.

Changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation of other residents or 'role model' effects

Political geographers have hypothesised a process of 'conversion by observation' to explain neighbourhood effects on electoral behaviour, where the local context affects perceptions of social policies and problems, their salience and effectiveness, affects the individual response (eg. Johnston *et al.*, 2001). The effect of observing others' behaviour, a 'role model' effect has also been suggested by those investigating neighbourhood effects on behaviour including job search, child rearing and crime (eg. Wilson, 1987).

Those promoting mixed tenure have suggested that owner occupiers may act as 'role models' for or important influences on social and possibly private renters in a neighbourhood, in terms of their attitude and behaviour towards their homes and the area, collective action, and their employment or educational status. A proportion of owners may also enable or enforce collective control on all residents' behaviour.

The idea that social housing and its residents in any concentration may have adverse effects on resident attitudes and behaviour has been a strong theme in analysis of the problems of some social housing estates. Enoch Powell stated that "the council housing system today is morally and socially damaging" (quoted in Forrest and Murie, 1991 p27). A resident of a council estate in London argued "'Jones' to keep up with are useful, but there are so many irresponsible people here" (Power and Tunstall, 1995). Page has hypothesised an 'estate effect' from concentrations of social tenure (2000). There are strong connections to culturally-based or related theories of poverty (eg. Wilson, 1987).

Mixed tenure and/or tenure mixing may be associated with other changes in attitudes, such as higher resident self-confidence, and personal efficacy. The DoE stated that tenure diversification in council estates "helps create a new atmosphere and attitude for the estate" (1989 p.2), although this statement is very unclear about who it is that has the attitude.

The boundary between tenure effects and social mix effects here is not clear, but some theories assume that owners have different motivation, attitudes and behaviour to renters, independently of socio-economic or demographic characteristics. Mixed tenure and/or tenure mixing may be associated with differences in behaviour such as more individual and collective action to demand, and protect better public or private sector services. For example, DETR argued that raising levels of owner-occupation in social housing estates is a way of increasing the numbers with a financial stake in and therefore more commitment to the estate (DETR, 2000a).

Changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via interaction between residents of different tenures

Mixed tenure and/or tenure mixing may be associated with changes in resident attitudes and behaviour through increased social interaction between residents of different tenures.

Political geographers have hypothesised a process of 'conversion by conversation' to explain neighbourhood effects on electoral behaviour, by which that the local, sub-constituency level context affects social interaction and political information and attitudes received, and thus individual response (Huckfeller and Sprague 1990, quoted in Johnston *et al.*, 2001).

Claims made for tenure diversification within social housing have emphasised potential impact on employment opportunities through interaction between tenures. Some research on deprived and unpopular council estates has shown strong networks and 'social cohesion' without or prior to tenure diversification (eg. Forrest and Kearns, 1999; Page, 2000). However, these may be concentrated on the estate itself and involve a fairly homogenous social group, alike in socio-economic status and also ethnicity, and thus the 'wrong sort' of social interaction might contribute to social exclusion rather than inclusion (eg. Page, 2000)

Many theories about 'conversion by conversation' appear to use tenure mix as a proxy for social mix, and assume that residents in different tenures will have different patterns of employment and income. Mixed tenure in a neighbourhood may lead to interaction between those in work and those without. Those not seeking work may be encouraged to do so and those seeking work may hear about more opportunities, resulting in a neighbourhood effect on non-employment.

Specific ideas such as these plus a general concern about the existence of social segregation and its effects on social exclusion have led to some broad claims. The Urban Task Force argued that areas of mixed tenure and income groups with indistinguishable social and market housing can help create 'social integration' (Urban Task Force, 1999, pp45-46; see also Jupp, 1999). European Union housing ministers declared that housing policy could "combat social exclusion" through a mix of different forms of housing ownership, as well as social mixes of residents and a variety of building types (FEANTSA, 2001 p2).

However, fears about the potential negative effects of mixed tenure on social interaction and at least compared to those of areas dominated by owner-occupation have been the major barriers to the development of more mixed tenure (Jupp, 1999).

Changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation and/or interaction processes

There are a number of agreements made for mixed tenure which could relate to either or both of the 'observational' or 'conversational' processes.

For example, it has been argued that mixed tenure and/or tenure mixing may be associated with more or better, or even cheaper local public and private sector services. The DoE stated that tenure diversification in council estates may reduce management and financial costs for local authorities, presumably through effects on behaviour and reduced maintenance and monitoring costs (1989 p.2). The Urban Task Force argued that areas of mixed tenure and income groups with indistinguishable social and market housing can help sustain neighbourhood services (Urban Task Force, 1999, pp45-46).

It has been argued that mixed tenure may lead to more collective action or to increased social capital, with greater potential for effective collective action (Jupp, 1999, Hiscock, 2001).

There are widespread suggestions that housing tenure may affect political behaviour at an individual level, with potential cumulative effects. Margaret Thatcher argued that local authority housing was "a means through which socialism was still built into the institutions and mentality of Britain" (1993 p.306), and a "perceived electoral advantage of promoting council house sales" (Forrest and Murie, 1991 p101) has been widely identified. Given the area-based electoral system used at local and national level, this could create party-political motive for creating particular tenure mixes at ward and constituency level. However, literature on tenure mix has not addressed these issues directly.

Changes to non-resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation of the neighbourhood or residents and/or interaction with residents

In a variant of the conversion by observation idea, it has been argued that tenure mix may affect the attitude and behaviour of non-residents towards residents of the neighbourhood concerned. 'Labelling theory' has been widely applied in analysis of the problems of some social housing estates (eg. Taylor, 1995), and it is argued that poor reputation can affect existing residents through worsened services and job opportunities, and may deter potential applicants from the areas, affecting social mix. Mixed tenure and/or tenure mixing may be associated with improved reputation of an area.

Again, it is not clear how much tenure effects or social mix effects might be responsible. Pawson *et al.* were equivocal when they stated that one of the main arguments for the replacement of council homes by owner occupied ones in run-down, stigmatised areas is that "an influx of largely employed home owners can recast the image of an area, to the benefit of long-established residents and newcomers alike" (2000 p.57, emphasis added). It is important to note that outdoors observation can only create tenure mix effects if the outsiders have some information on the tenure of homes in the area concerned. While marketing by private developers will provide some information, some mixed tenure developments explicitly try to avoid giving tenure clues through design or layout.

Finally, fears about the potential negative effects of mixed tenure on the perceived reputation of an area at least compared to those of areas dominated by owner-occupation have been the major barriers to the development of more mixed tenure (eg Jupp, 1999).

Changes to resident housing behaviour via provision of additional tenure options

It has been argued that tenure mixing may reduce turnover of population by providing a greater range of tenure options for residents, particularly by providing social housing residents the opportunity to move into home ownership without leaving the area

Wilson said, "proponents of the Right to Buy thought that mixed tenure estates would contribute to stability on council estates" (Wilson, 1999 p.15). The DETR claimed that diversifying tenure and the tenant population will increase the stability of the population within an estate (DETR, 2000a), and that in areas where demand for social housing is low, diversification of tenure can provide some protection against the consequences of low demand, including high levels of voids and turnover; (DETR, 2000a). It was also argued that diversification could allow an estate to adapt to changes in residential preferences over time (DETR, 2000a).

Some sources have claimed that turnover of more particular parts of the population, such as economically active residents, may be reduced by tenure mixing processes in socially rented areas. The DoE stated that tenure diversification in council estates was may help current resident renters to buy (1989 p.2), and its successor department said that tenure diversification increases the scope for housing career moves by better-off social renting tenants within the locality – again helping to maintain the stability of the population. (DETR, 2000a). Stabilising population was one of two major aims of the Craigmillar Housing Development Project that led to tenure diversification in parts of Edinburgh, (Pawson *et al.*, 2000).

There has been little direct arguments made about how tenure mixing in areas dominated by home ownership might affect mobility. However, extrapolating above arguments could imply that the (enforced) mobility of residents such as new households could be reduced by providing options for renting without leaving the area. These ideas are reflected in concerns about the ability of new households and younger people in rural areas to find housing in their villages and towns of origin, and associated promotion of increased social housing provision.

3. THE EVIDENCE BASE ON MIXED TENURE AND TENURE MIXING

The extent of mixed tenure, changes overtime and the impact have policies to encourage tenure mixing has

Despite the academic and policy interest in mixed tenure, there has been very little consideration of how it can be identified and measured, partly because commentators feel that identifying 'non-mixed' tenure areas is fairly easy and incontestable. Despite the emphasis placed on policies to encourage tenure mixing, evaluations of these policies have not all even assessed the impact on neighbourhood tenure mix, and the area effects on wider housing policy and tenure changes, particular the ongoing growth of home ownership, has not been assessed. There is little information on whether tenure patterns are becoming more or less mixed over time.

The effects of mixed tenure and tenure mixing

The DETR stated in a review of evidence on estate regeneration, "*there is widespread belief in the importance of tenure diversification, but relatively little empirical evidence about its impact.*" (2000a). Other commentators have made the same observation (eg. Rosenberg, 1995; Jupp, 1999). Forrest and Murie noted that more research effort had gone into investigating why eligible tenants did not take up the Right to Buy than in assessing the wider consequence of the policy (1991). Particular lack of longitudinal data (Rosenburg, 1995).

There are four main completed studies of tenure mixing in the UK (see Table 2).

Table 2: Major studies of the effects of mixed tenure and tenure mixing in the UK

Study	Number of neighbourhoods	Households per neighbourhood	Tenure mix	Tenure mixing process	Research methods	Variables
Atkinson and Kintrea, 1998	Niddrie, Edinburgh	c.1,000	RSL renting dominated	New build, demolition and transfer	Resident survey, staff interviews	Social interaction, facilities, employment, estate features
Page and Boughton, 1997	4, London	c.100	RSL renting dominated	New build	Staff and resident interviews	Socio-economic
Pawson <i>et al.</i> , 2000	<i>As Atkinson and Kintrea</i>	<i>As Atkinson and Kintrea</i>	<i>As Atkinson and Kintrea</i>	<i>As Atkinson and Kintrea</i>	<i>As Atkinson and Kintrea</i>	
Jupp, 1999	10, London, South West, South East, East, West Midlands, North East, Yorkshire and Humberside	150-2,300	Ownership dominated, LA dominated, RSL dominated and mixed	New build and demolition/new build	Staff interviews, resident sample survey	Social interaction, facilities, employment

Sources: Studies quoted

The first major empirical study of mixed tenure across the UK, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and carried out by Joe Doherty, Elspeth Graham, Paul Boyle and Rosemary Hiscock, which is due to be completed soon. This uses the 1991 Census to assess patterns of tenure mix in the UK, and the relationship between mix and mortality, health, car-ownership, employment and population stability at ward and enumeration district level, with testing for the ecological fallacy. Further work on the 2001 census is planned to investigate change in tenure mix over time and potential longer-range effects of tenure mix.

There are a large number of qualitative studies that focus on social housing estates, with some comparison to local or national situations (eg. Power and Tunstall, 1995; Taylor, 1995), which have probably played a role in generating hypotheses about potential benefits of non-homogenous tenure, but are not of great use in developing the evidence base. There are a small number of studies explicitly comparing between areas with different tenure mix. For example, one study compares the characteristics of mixed tenure post-code areas, the ACORN category of 'better-off council estates, homes often bought' with two types of local authority dominated areas, 'council estates, less well-off families' and 'council estates, older residents', using data from the Strathclyde area (Hiscock, 2001). The very large US literature on poor urban neighbourhoods, the neighbourhood effect, which often uses extensive quantitative data and comparison across the whole country, provides some useful material and certainly useful methodological model, but the big differences in housing tenures and policy make direct transferability difficult.

While the idea of 'tipping points' and threshold effects, derived from US research on the phenomenon of 'white flight,' has become part of the colloquial terminology on area problems (eg. Power and Rogers, 1999), there has been has been limited consideration in literature on neighbourhood effects on where threshold effects or 'critical masses' in tenure mix are found (Galster *et al.*, 2000; SPARK, 2001), and little discussion of what kinds of mix of tenure might be important. There has been little long-term evaluation of impact of mixing processes.

There are also inherent methodological problems, due to the lack of data on tenure mix and challenges of investigating neighbourhood effects. It is difficult to disaggregate effects from other contemporary and related changes (DETR, 2000a). In addition, some authors have suggested that the effects of tenure mixing processes may be too long term to be assessed yet, despite the fact that some policies and specific projects have been established for several years (eg. or, 1995; DETR 2000a).

To summarise, gaps in the evidence base for policy and debate include:

Definition/s of mixed tenure

- Data on existing tenure patterns
- Data on trends in tenure patterns and the impact of policy to encourage mixed tenure
- Scale on which neighbourhood effects might operate (Overman, 1999)
- Evidence on what mixes have effects
- Evidence on the mechanism through which mixed tenure has effects
- Evidence on the cost-benefit of policies intended to promote mixed tenure (Galster *et al.*, 2000)
- Quantitative data (Hiscock, 2001)
- National, regional and area-comparative data in addition to local studies (Hiscock, 2001).

The next two sections attempt to address these major gaps in the existing evidence base, through synthesis of existing information from the UK and also from some other countries.

4. HOW MUCH MIXED TENURE IS THERE?

What is 'mixed tenure'? How do you measure it?

As noted above, there has been very little consideration of how mixed tenure can be identified and measured. This must be partly because commentators feel that identifying 'non-mixed' tenure areas is fairly easy and incontestable. However, there are important questions.

Which tenures are under discussion? For example, does inserting RSL housing into a council estate contribute towards mixing? Is shared ownership a separate tenure from renting and owning? Ford uses the term 'tenure diversification' to refer to the growth of the PRS (2000). DoE performance indicators for monitoring the impact of its Estate Action scheme on tenure diversity included a fourth tenure after home ownership, private renting and housing association renting: homes owned by tenants' groups (Capita, 1996). Data and analysis widely distinguish between homes being purchased with a mortgage and homes owned outright. Forrest *et al.* suggested "*it can be argued that the true privatisation... [of homes sold under the Right to Buy] does not occur until they are resold... [then] they become divorced from the effect of bureaucratic allocation*" (1995 p.9). Some analysis of tenure has used dual categories, including both public/private and owned/rented. Analyses that consider three or more categories imply a multi-dimensional set of mixes, with for example 50%-40%-10% tenure breakdown producing a different mix to 50%-30%-20%.

What scale of areas are being discussed? The smaller the area – the smaller the sample from the total population – the greater the potential for variation and deviation from average patterns.

While tenure might be mixed within any one unit of spatial scale, there could be very different smaller-scale patterns within this, from an even mix to two segregated areas. The study of patterns of the spatial patterning of different ethnic groups has developed a range of complex measures of degrees of concentration and segregation (eg. Peach, 1996), which could be used. Figure 1 sets out some ways to conceptualise local mixes in three tenure systems.

Figure 1: Ways to conceptualise local 'mix' in three-tenure systems

Mixed tenure system	
a)	close to equal division between three tenures; or
b)	two larger and one smaller; or
c)	one larger and two smaller
Dominated system = one tenure over 50%	
a)	plus two small extra tenures; or
b)	plus one small and one tiny extra tenure
Heavily dominated system = one tenure over eg. 70%	
a)	plus two small extra tenures; or
b)	plus with one small and one tiny extra tenure

Harvey *et al.* defined mixed tenure enumeration districts as those in which no single tenure exceeded 50% of households (1997). Given that home ownership nation-wide forms more than 50% of households, Harvey *et al.* also considered 70% as a cut off point, just above the figure for home ownership nation-wide. These are simple and attractive measures, and are used later in this study. It is important to note that many studies of mixed tenure areas have examined areas where one tenure is dominant, or where the domination of one tenure has been reduced but not removed, or in some cases replaced by the domination of another (eg. Page and Boughton, 1997; Jupp, 1999).

How much 'mixed tenure' is there in the UK?

The UK, England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland are all home ownership dominated tenure systems. Scotland is closest to being 'mixed', with the lowest level of home ownership of the counties at 62% in 2000 (National Statistics, 2001). While links between tenure and socio-economic position are so strong for most of the UK than tenure is a regular component of indexes of deprivation, the Scottish tenure system is so different that Scotland-specific indexes have avoided tenure. Northern Ireland is most dominated by home-ownership, at 73% of house holds in 1999 (National Statistics, 2001).

Most counties in the European Union are also owner-occupation dominated, although there is considerable variety in tenure mixes (Bramley and Morgan, 1998). However, Germany and the Netherlands (Whitehead, 1998) and Switzerland (Bramley and Morgan, 1998) are renting-dominated systems. France only became owner-occupied dominated in the 1980s, and, unusually, the narrow domination of owner-occupation in Sweden was under threat from rises in rental tenures in the 1990s.

Within the countries of the UK, Harvey *et al.* noted, "there are marked regional variations in housing tenure" (1997 p.13). Forrest and Murie noted that "council housing is particularly important in the industrial conurbations of the North and West Midlands, with a few additional places - Hull, Nottingham, and Norwich, having unusually large public sectors... council housing tends to be more important in Inner London boroughs" (1991 p37). No English region has a 'mixed tenure' system. London is the English region closest to being 'mixed', with the lowest level of home ownership at 58% in 2000 (National Statistics, 2001).

Only a handful of local authorities in inner London and in Scotland have 'mixed' tenure systems. Apart from a very small number of local-authority renting dominated systems, the vast majority are dominated by home ownership.

At sub-local authority level, another study produced survey data that enables a comparison of degrees of local authority domination at different spatial scales (Table 3).

Table 3: Proportion of households in local areas with different tenure mixes for a range of local areas sizes in England and Wales in 1997

% Local authority tenure	'Local area' size							
	ED	500 households	1,000 households	2,500 households	5,000 households	10,000 households	Ward	Constituency
0-19.9%	68%	68%	65%	65%	68%	69%	68%	70%
20-39.9%	12%	14%	18%	24%	22%	24%	24%	20%
40-59.9%	11%	11%	11%	5%	7%	6%	8%	2%
60-79.9%	6%	6%	5%	3%	2%	1%	1%	0
80-100%	1%	1%	1%	*	*	*	0	0
Local authority dominated	7.18%	7.18%	6.17%	3.8%	2.9%	1.7%	1.9%	0

Note* = less than 1%
 Source: Data derived from 2643 respondents to 1997 British Election Survey in England and Wales. Table derived from analysis by Johnston *et al.*, 2001.

These data clearly show how it gets more unusual for local authority tenure to dominate successively large areas. In 1997, 18% of households in England and Wales lived in council housing. This table shows that the vast majority of households in the British Election Survey lived in local areas that were not dominated by council housing, and this was true for a range of area sizes from enumeration districts to constituencies. Over 80% of local areas, at all scales, are mixed if this is defined as having less than 40% council tenure. Over 65% are mixed at all scales if this is defined as having less than 20% council tenure. However these areas could be seen as 'unmixed', possibly having disproportionately low levels of council housing and varied levels of home ownership and housing association and private renting. While the areas with more than 40% council housing are atypical, the majority of council tenants live in enumeration districts, 500 households and 1,000 household areas where council tenure is over 40% (Johnston *et al.*, 2001). This size of population matches the size of many council estates. After the 1,000 households level, there is a drop in the percentage of people living in areas with 40% or more council housing. Areas of 2,500 households or more would constitute very large council estates or two adjacent estates.

The areas with local authority tenure of 20-39% are the most likely to be mixed tenure, and this suggests that at ward level, mixed tenure areas are in a small minority. Newcastle, located in a region with double the average proportion of mixed tenure enumeration districts, and almost a mixed tenure local authority, with only 53% of households in owner-occupation, is used here as a case study for tenure mix at ward level (Table 4).

Table 4: Tenure type of wards in Newcastle 1996

Dominant tenure	Proportion of total (50% cut off)	Proportion of total (70% cut-off)
Owner occupied	16 (62%)	4 (15%)
LA rented	5 (19%)	1 (4%)
PRS	0	0
RSL	0	0
'Mixed'	5 (19%)	21 (81%)

Source: 1996 Inter-censal survey, on www.newcastle.gov.uk

The sharp difference in results for the two definitions of mixed tenure is very notable, with a small minority of wards not dominated by any one tenure but a large majority not heavily dominated by one tenure. 'Mixed' wards included those where ownership and local authority renting were the largest tenures, those where the two largest tenures were very close in size and those with a considerable gaps between the first, second and third largest tenures.

Harvey *et al.* examined tenure patterns at enumeration district level in England in 1991, and found that 8% of enumeration districts were 'mixed tenure', defined as where no tenure group amounted to more than 50% of households, and 38% were 'mixed' if a 70% cut-off point was used (Table 5).

Table 5: Tenure type of enumeration districts in England in 1991

Dominant tenure	Proportion of total (50% cut off)	Proportion of total (70% cut off)
Owner occupied	75%	55%
LA rented	14%	6%
PRS	2%	1%
RSL	1%	0
'Mixed'	8%	38%

Source: Adapted from Harvey *et al.* 1997 p.12.

Note: In 1991, 67% of households were in owner occupation, 20% in local authority renting, 9% in private renting and 4% in housing association renting in England (EHCS, *ibid.* 1997).

The similarities between results for the single enumeration districts and the 500 and 1,000 household measures in Table 3, which are likely to include two and four enumeration districts respectively, suggests that adjacent enumeration districts are usually very similar in tenure composition. Areas of mixed or homogenous tenure may not coincide with any of the spatial scales and categories used above, in practice. For example, Harvey *et al.* noted that some council estates covered part of one enumeration district while others covered all of or part of several (1997).

Harvey *et al.* showed that London is also the national capital of mixed tenure at small scale, with 16% of enumeration districts without any majority tenure, followed by Merseyside at 10%, compared to a national average of 8% (1997). The South East is the most heavily home-ownership dominated region, at 75% of households in 2000 (National Statistics, 2001). The South East, South West, East and East Midlands all have above the national average proportion of enumeration districts dominated by home ownership (Harvey *et al.*, 1997). The North East has 29% of enumeration districts dominated by local authority renting, over twice that national average of 14%, and is followed by the Merseyside at 23% and Yorkshire and Humberside and London at 19%, with the West Midlands and the North West also above average (*ibid.*). The South East, and to a lesser extent the East, London and South West have the highest proportion of owner-occupation dominated enumeration districts. London has the highest proportion of local authority-, PRS-, and RSL-dominated enumeration districts. London, and to a lesser extent the South East, have the highest proportion of 'mixed' tenure enumeration districts not dominated by any one tenure (1997)..

At sub-enumeration district level, Jupp found that even in ten 'mixed tenure' housing estates, only three had considerable number of streets with more than one tenure with a further three having some mixed tenure roads (1999).

Has the number of 'mixed tenure' areas in the UK grown or reduced over time?

Using the 50% cut-off point, the UK has been dominated by home ownership since 1971 (CSO, 1981). Until the late 1960s, England and Wales were mixed tenure. Scotland was mixed tenure from 1985 when local authority renting dropped under 51% (CSO, 1986), to as recently as 1989, when home ownership was about to go over this figure (Table 6).

Table 6: Dominant tenure of households in the countries of the UK 1971-2001

Dominant tenure	1971	1981	1991	2001
Owner occupation	England Wales	England Wales Northern Ireland	England Wales Northern Ireland Scotland	England Wales Northern Ireland Scotland
LA renting	Scotland??	Scotland	0	0
Private renting	0	0	0	0
None (mixed)	Northern Ireland	0	0	0

Source: CSO 1986, 1987 (derived from DoE Housing and Construction Statistics)

The number of 'mixed tenure' regions has also declined since the 1970s. Yorkshire and Humberside changed from mixed to owner-occupied dominated in 1971. Greater London (Kleinman, 1999) and the 'north' were 'mixed' until 1981, but by 1991 all regions were owner occupied dominated (CSO, 1981; 1987).

The number of mixed tenure local authorities has declined over time. For example, Manchester, Harlow and Hull were among the remaining handful of mixed tenure local authorities at the start of the 1990s but were home ownership dominated by the end of the decade. The table below examines trends in the tenure structure of London, where tenure mixing is currently concentrated at local authority and enumeration district level, and possibly at ward levels too. Inner London was private rented dominated until 1961, but while the geography of housing tenure in London has been "*transformed*" since the 1960s (Forrest and Murie, 1991 p139), inner London as a whole remained mixed until at least 1991 (Census 1991). Table 7 shows trends in London since 1971.

Table 7: Dominant tenure of households in London boroughs 1981-1998

Dominant tenure	1981	1991	1998
Owner occupation	Barney Bexley Brent Bromley Croydon Ealing Enfield Harrow Havering Hillingdon Hounslow Kingston Merton Redbridge Richmond Sutton Waltham Forest	Barney Bexley Brent Bromley Croydon Ealing Enfield Harrow Havering Hillingdon Hounslow Kingston Merton Redbridge Richmond Sutton Waltham Forest Wandsworth	Barney Bexley Brent Bromley Croydon Ealing Enfield Harrow Havering Hillingdon Hounslow Kingston Merton Redbridge Richmond Sutton Waltham Forest Barking and Dagenham City Camden Hammersmith and Fulham Kensington and Chelsea Newham Wandsworth Westminster
None/mixed	Camden Hammersmith and Fulham Greenwich Haringey Kensington and Chelsea Lambeth Lewisham Newham Wandsworth Westminster	Camden Hammersmith and Fulham Haringey Islington Kensington and Chelsea Lambeth Lewisham Newham Westminster Barking and Dagenham City Hackney Southwark	Islington Southwark Tower Hamlets Greenwich Lambeth Hackney Lewisham
LA renting	Barking and Dagenham City Hackney Islington Southwark Tower Hamlets	Tower Hamlets	0

Source: Census, London Research Centre (for 1998)

No information is currently available on changes in tenure mix over time at ward, enumeration district or other local scale, although this could be extracted from successive Censuses.

What effect has policy to promote tenure mix had on tenure mix in the UK?

The Right to Buy (RTB) had much the biggest impact of all LCHO initiatives (Rosenburg, 1995; Bramley and Jordan, 1998), with two million homes sold against less than 100,000 for all the other initiatives combined. If tenure transitions vary by area, some areas might become more mixed while others become less so. In summary, Forrest and Murie argued that the effect of the RTB was that *"the housing markets and tenure structures of different regions are diverging with a tendency for a privatised Southern and Eastern market and with the North remaining municipalised"* (1991 p111). The RTB has had the lowest impact in the very regions that were not already owner-occupation dominated when it was introduced: London and the North (DTLR, 2001). At local authority level, Forrest and Murie also found *"enormous variation in the rate of sale... tending to accentuate local variations"* (1991 p120). While 51% of 1979 homes were sold in Crawley by 2001, in Manchester, Oldham and High Peak only 14% had been sold (DTLR figures from HIP returns, 2001). Jones and Murie predicted in 1996 that by 2010, local authorities would still own at least 70% of their 1980 stock in Yorkshire and Humberside, the North West and Greater London (1996) (although these predictions have now been overtaken by accelerating stock transfer within the social rented sector). Forrest and Murie summarised the impact of the Right to Buy on tenure mix at regional and local level by stating *"the consequence of the policy is a major revision of the geography of housing tenure. But it is a revision resulting in increased tenure polarisation between localities"* (1991 p135).

However, at neighbourhood level, the RTB has meant that some council estates have become 'mixed tenure' areas. For example, 67% of people who bought homes from RTB purchasers described their new neighbourhood as 'mixed tenure', while 14% thought it was mainly owner occupied (Forrest *et al.*, 1995). This is reflected in the tailor-made ACORN category of 'better-off council estates, homes often bought'. However, in the North, Forrest *et al.* found that 27% of buyers felt the neighbourhood was mainly council housing, reflecting lower rates of RTB sales, and a lesser contribution to creating mixed tenure neighbourhoods (*ibid.*). The RTB also opened up another mechanisms for tenure diversification within council estates. Forrest *et al.* found that 8% of homes sold, particularly flats and those in areas badly affected by the housing market collapse, were in the private rented sector by 1991, making up 1% of the total private rented sector at the time (1995). Despite the potential for improvement in the housing market, they expected more ex-RTB homes to flow into private renting in future.

There were also regional and local variations in availability and take-up of other LCHO initiatives by local authorities, RSLs and buyers (Rosenburg, 1995). Most research into LCHO focuses on cost, take-up and characteristics of purchasers, with little evaluation of outcomes for the tenure mixing aim. However, between 1995/96 and 1990/00, LCHO became increasingly concentrated in London, in contrast to the Right to Buy, and the South East, because of the particular affordability problems faced by would-be-buyers in these regions and the problems selling low cost homes in some others (SPARK, 2001). Although overall numbers are small, concentrating LCHO sales in the South East would only add to the domination of home ownership at regional and local authority levels in this area.

Council housing estate regeneration schemes have affected tenure mix by using demolition, new build and tenure transfer, almost entirely in local authority tenure-dominated estates of up to a few thousand homes in size. They have been concentrated in housing estates where national tenure transfer schemes, particularly the RTB, have had little effect. All the estates investigated in a DETR review of estate regeneration schemes included some tenure diversification (2000a), mainly involving transferring homes to RSLs or RSL development rather than private developers or ownership. However, estate regeneration schemes have generally lead to 'more mixed' but still local authority or dominated areas rather than 'mixed tenure' areas with no majority tenure. For example, two of the six Estate Action schemes in the main evaluation of the programme explicitly did not even aim to change tenure patterns, despite guidance, *"primarily because of the lack of private sector involvement"*, and the DoE was said to acknowledge that tenure change in these estates, in Newcastle and Merseyside, was *"not realistic given the nature of the problems on the estates and local market conditions"* (Capita 1996 p.7). In interviews with local authority and DoE regional officers involved in Estate Action, there was scepticism about whether tenure mixing could be achieved in unpopular

council estates in areas with low demand for housing. The greatest mixing effect in the case studies was in Tower Hamlets, where a tenure change of 12% was achieved through self-build for home ownership and increases in RTB (Capita 1996 pp.41-42). All the six estates remained local authority -renting dominated, despite total expenditure of millions of pounds. A study of twenty unpopular council estates 1980-95 found that while in four out of the twenty land was sold to RSLs or developers for the development of new homes, the Right to Buy was the main mechanism for tenure diversification, and the average proportion of homes sold in the estates was only 5%, far below local authority and national averages (Power and Tunstall, 1995). Dave Cowans, Chief Executive of Places for People, the largest UK RSL, said in evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport, Local Government and the Regions in 2001 that "*radical*" shifts in tenure mix "*tends to suggest demolition*" (Stationery Office, 2001). Table 8 below demonstrates this.

Table 8: Selected examples of tenure diversification of council estates through estate regeneration schemes

Name of estate/area	Mechanisms			Change in total number of homes	Resulting tenure mix		
	Transfer	New build	Demolition		LA	RSL	OO
Twenty unpopular council estates 1981-1995 (Power and Tunstall, 1995)	✓	✓	✓	0	95%	5%	
Tower Hamlets Estate Action case	✓	✓		12	88%	0	12%
Town End Farm (Jupp, 1999; DETR, 2000a)	✓		✓	NA	NA	NA	NA
Broomhall, Sheffield (Jupp, 1999)		✓	✓	(all demolished)	0	63%	37%
Bonamy, Southwark (Jupp, 1999)		✓	✓	18%	38%	38%	23%
Niddrie, Edinburgh 1981-1998 (Pawson <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	✓	✓	✓	23%	35%	43%	21%
Manor, Sheffield (NHF, ud)	✓	✓	✓	64%	3%	59%	37%
Ferguslie Park, Glasgow 1988-94 (NHF, ud)	✓	✓		6%	70%	21%	8%

Source: Sources quoted

✓ ✓

= The most important mechanisms

One other exception is large scale new building. More radical tenure change was achieved across a wider area in London Docklands. Largely through house building and a doubling of the number of households in the area, through the Unitary Development Corporation established there. While in 1981 83% of households in the LDDC area rented from the local authority, by 1991, the tenure structure had become 'mixed' with 39% local authority renting, 38% home ownership, 13% private rented and 10% RSL rented. Six years later home ownership was, at 43%, on the way to becoming dominant. Kleinman argued that the effect was to turn the housing market from one abnormal by national, London and even inner-London standards into a "more normal" one in the area, which by 1997 had 36,000 households London Docklands (1999). He noted that "few issues have proved as contentious as this in the Docklands" (1999 p.9).

Regeneration efforts have led to a substantial amount of intra-social tenure mixing, but it is not clear whether this can produce any of the effects attributed to other forms of tenure mix, whether through social compositional, social mix neighbourhood effects or tenure mix neighbourhood effects. Research by Crook *et al.* showed that between 1991/92 and 1993/94 new building inserted 26,000 RSL homes into council estates, of which over 23,000 were replacing demolished council homes and thus having a double effect on the intra-social tenure mix (1996). These intra-estate mixing developments made up one third of the national RSL development total for these years. The process was encouraged by the tenure diversification aims of Estate Action, declining condition of council homes, and Housing Corporation emphasis on council priorities (*ibid.*). This mixing mechanism was concentrated in the North East, the North West and Merseyside, and in metropolitan districts, where local authority stocks were among the largest and RTB sales among the lowest. The authors commented that the mixing did not achieve significant changes in social profile, and new tenants had similar levels of deprivation to contemporary new RSL tenants. A DETR study on estate regeneration noted that RSL involvement in local authority estates did little for 'tenant diversification' (DETR, 2000a).

Tenure diversification usually happened alongside other initiatives such as improvement of housing, changes to housing management, environmental improvements, encouragement of resident involvement, economic development and training initiatives (Pawson *et al.*, 2000; DETR, 2000a; Crook *et al.*, 1996).

In summary, there are limits to the impact of policy to promote tenure mix. Regional, local and neighbourhood housing markets limit the saleability of homes developed for or available for transfer into home ownership, particularly in neighbourhoods dominated by social housing Forrest and Murie, 1991; Pawson *et al.*, 2000). Funding available from local authorities, RSLs and central government to subsidise LCHO is limited (SPARK, 2000). Lenders may be more reluctant to assist purchasers in marginal areas.

Summary

If a mixed tenure area is one in which no tenure accounts for more than 50% of households, there are no mixed tenure regions and only a handful of mixed tenure local authorities in the UK. Mixed tenure enumeration districts make up 8% of the total. Tenure patterns have become less mixed over the last twenty years at regional and local authority level. This may be true at wards and enumeration district level too. Policies to encourage mixed tenure have not reduced inter-regional and inter-local authority differences in tenure patterns, and may not have prevented reductions in tenure mixing at all scales, although they have created some new mixed tenure areas in a proportion of formerly local authority renting dominated areas.

3. EVIDENCE ON THE EFFECTS OF TENURE MIX AND TENURE MIXING

What effects do mixed tenure and tenure have?

This section considers the evidence to support or contradict the claims made for neighbourhood tenure effects, mixed tenure and mechanisms associated with it (see above). It examines evidence both that uses a static comparison between more and less mixed tenure areas, and dynamic comparisons in fixed areas before and after tenure mixing processes have operated.

Because of the limits of available research and inherent methodological problems, this section assesses evidence for neighbourhood tenure mix effects and tries to distinguish them from social compositional effects through checking whether tenure mix and tenure mixing result have effects on those in all tenures.

Is there evidence for changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation of other residents or 'role model' effects?

Jupp found that some of the residents who thought mixed tenure offered a better physical environment than social housing dominated areas thought this was because "owners are perceived to keep their houses smarter" (1999 p70), but this does not provide evidence of a knock-on effect beyond the compositional one. 5% of all residents, particularly in a small minority of estates, liked the ideas of different types of people living in the same areas as they hoped "it would break down class barriers, create tolerance" (Jupp, 1999 p70).

Is the opportunity to observe people in different tenures positive? Jupp found that some housing managers and developers were concerned that mixed tenure, particular at small scale, could create negative perceptions and antagonism between those in different tenures (1999). These concerns were felt to feed into lower prices for the owner-occupied homes.

Is there evidence for changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via interaction between residents?

Firstly, do people from different tenures mix? Jupp found that while 94% of residents in ten 'mixed tenure' estates knew another resident by name, and 64% knew more than five, only an average of 37% knew someone from another tenure by name and only 17% knew more than five people from another tenure (1999). For some of the ten estates and some parts of them, interaction was "almost non-existent" (1999, p40). Notably, further analysis shows that figures for knowing residents of another tenure are higher for the social renting dominated estates than for owner-occupied dominated ones, and lowest of all for the estates where no one tenure dominated. While 69% of residents said they could rely on another resident for help or advice, only 17% said this included someone from another tenure. Hiscock stated that "those who live in areas with more social renters do have less social capital but this is not just because they are more likely to be social renters" (2001, p15). Hiscock found that residents in Strathclyde postcode sectors with an average of 62% social housing were about twice as likely to say that they exchanged favours with other residents and felt part of the community than those in areas with an average of 82% social housing, but there was no significant difference between mixed tenure areas and those with 62% social housing (2001).

Kintrea found that the process of tenure diversification did not appear to affect the activity patterns of social renters significantly, as only 40% of the activities of social renters in Niddrie in Edinburgh, then undergoing tenure diversification, were conducted outside the estate (1998). Pawson *et al.*'s study of Niddrie after tenure diversification used data on use of local public and private sector services as a proxy for interaction. They showed those in private tenures was nearly as likely to make use of estate shops as social rented, and those with children were nearly as likely to send them to the local school. They were as likely to use the library, community centres and child care, and social services, and more likely to use leisure facilities, but only 55% use public transport compared to 76% of all residents (2000). They stated, "these findings would suggest that owner occupiers are fairly well integrated into community life. However, questions remain regarding the frequency of use between the different resident groups" (2000, p.45). In addition, Jupp's evidence suggested caution in the use of service choice as a proxy for interaction. He found that the use of schools and nurseries was influential in enabling residents, including those of different tenures, to meet, but that other facilities were not significant places to meet people for the first time (1999). The frequency of use of local newsagent had only borderline significance for whether mixed tenure residents know someone from another tenure, and that usage of supermarkets, pub, post office and place of worship had no significance (1999). Atkinson and Kintrea found that owner occupiers did most of their shopping outside the estate, in places reached by car, and only used estate shops for convenience items (1998).

Page's study of life in deprived council estates suggested that social – particularly employment - mix might be more important than tenure mix, as differences in location of activity and nature of social networks were found amongst social renters, "those in work spent less time on the estates and knew fewer people than their counterparts... newcomers, particularly those in work, who often found it hard to 'fit in' to the estate" (2000, p.73).

Pawson *et al.* found that despite significant tenure diversification in Niddrie in Edinburgh, and rising employment levels generally, the gaps between the area and the rest of the city remained large and "joblessness amongst social sector tenants is, if anything, higher" (2000 p.32). There are numerous other examples of regeneration initiatives including tenure mixing having limited impact on the employment status of tenants (eg. DETR, 2000a) Hiscock said the 'social capital 'interaction' pathway' was not a route to reducing unemployment amongst social renters (2001.). Significantly, Jupp found that only 4% of residents in mixed tenure estates thought they could rely on someone from another tenure for assistance that might improve socio-economic circumstances: to help find a job, deal with problems at work, get advice about money or fill in forms (1999).

It has been argued that mixed tenure may lead to more collective action or to increased social capital, with greater potential for effective collective action (Jupp, 1999, Hiscock, 2001). Research for the DETR found numerous examples where owner-occupiers introduced to social-rented dominated areas were instrumental in the organisation of resident involvement (2000a). Jupp found that some of the residents who thought mixed tenure offered a better physical environment than social housing dominated areas thought this was because "owners are perceived to 'keep the council on its toes'" (1999, p70).

Fears about the potential negative effects of mixed tenure on social interaction have been amongst the greatest barriers to the development of more mixed tenure. However, this area has not been much explored in research. Jupp found that some housing managers and developers were concerned that mixed tenure, particular at small scale, could create negative perceptions and antagonism between those in different tenures (1999). These concerns were felt to feed into lower prices for the owner-occupied homes. He found some evidence that for a small minority of residents, tenure differences were in themselves a barrier to interaction (1999).

Is there evidence for changes to resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation and/or interaction?

Some claims made for mixed tenure effects which could be attributed to either of both of the observational or interactional processes.

There appears to be no evidence that mixed tenure is associated with disproportionately lower maintenance and management costs for landlords. Available evidence for tenure diversification with areas dominated by social housing suggests the reverse. For example, mixed tenure created some difficulties in management and over leasehold charges (DoE 1988). Delays or non-participation by Right to Buyers in estates improvement schemes could increase costs, and reduce the overall visual and other impact of the work (DETR, 2000a). The DETR study of estate regeneration found that in some areas vendors unable to find owner occupiers are selling to private landlords – diminishing the scope for social landlords to collaborate over issues such as enforcing tenancies in relation to anti-social behaviour. (DETR, 2000a). Tenure diversification in council estates through development by one or more RSLs may increase the costs and difficulty of management or worsen quality. It can lead to a "fragmentation of the management of housing and public open space" (Pawson *et al.*, 2000).

Evidence on the impact of mixed tenure on the variability of services does not support claims made. Pawson *et al.*, 2000 tested whether a diversity of tenures might increase support a wider range of local services, but did this through examining whether the range of incomes – social mix - had widened.. They noted that incoming owner occupiers to social renting dominated areas were less likely to use public transport, local schools or shops than those in other tenures, so tenure diversification in social-rented dominated areas could threaten the viability of these services (2000).

Despite the lack of attention paid to political attitudes and behaviour in the literature on tenure mix, there is evidence of a neighbourhood tenure mix effect. Making a static comparison between council-dominated tenure areas and those dominated by home ownership, Johnston *et al.* found a neighbourhood tenure effect on voting patterns at all spatial scales from enumeration district to constituency (2001). Residents in areas with higher levels of council housing were more likely to vote Labour than those in other areas, regardless of their own tenure. This was particularly true for owner-occupiers and to a lesser extent, probably because of abstention effects, of council tenants too. Johnston *et al.* tested other variables to determine whether tenure effects might be being driven by atypical characteristics of occupiers in areas of high council tenure, including education, class, income or identification with working class status. The neighbourhood effect appeared to remain after these tests. Johnston *et al.* hypothesised that this could have been due to either 'conversion by observation' or by 'conversation'. However, as there is no evidence available on the impact tenure mixing might have on voting patterns, the implications for political use are unclear.

Is there evidence for changes to non-resident attitudes and/or behaviour via observation of the neighbourhood or residents and/or or interaction with residents?

Examining static tenure mix, Hiscock found that residents in Strathclyde postcode sectors with an average of 29% social housing were more than twice as likely to say that the area's reputation was not a problem than those in areas with an average of 62% social housing, who were in turn twice as likely to agree as those in areas with an average of 82% social housing (2001). A manager of social housing within a mixed tenure estate interviewed by Jupp argued

that the mix meant that the estate wasn't seen as a 'council estate' and that this improved outsiders' perceptions, but did not affect the views residents of each tenure held of each other (1999).

Examining tenure mixing, Pawson *et al.*, 2000 found that tenure diversification involving a shift from local authority donation to a mixed had been "instrumental in altering the character" of Niddrie in Edinburgh (2000, p59). The DETR gave examples of similar effects and set out the process through which they were achieved in one areas (see Figure 2). However, Jupp who also examined this estate felt that environmental improvements were the main cause of improvements and the introduction of private housing only "probably made some impact" (1999 p.62).

Figure 2: The example of Town End Farm in Sunderland

- i) The high specification of the new houses built for home ownership attracted buyers from across Sunderland;
- ii) Similar standards of modernisation of council stock have made it difficult to distinguish between council, RSL and private property;
- iii) Both the changed appearance and the changed tenure mix have helped eliminate the stigma that once attached to the estate;
- iv) Voids have been virtually eliminated and there is a substantial waiting list of applicants wanting to move onto the estate.

Source: DETR 2000a

However, these processes do not operate in all cases of tenure diversification within social renting dominated areas, particularly where the area remains social renting dominated. For example, Hastings and Dean's study of three stigmatised council estates undergoing regeneration showed that this could not be guaranteed as programmes which included some tenure diversification were not able to overcome stigma (2000).

Is there evidence for changes to resident housing behaviour via provision of additional tenure options?

Research for the DETR stated "there is some evidence that tenure diversification which introduces owner occupation to estates can enhance long-term stability" (DETR, 2000a). It noted, for example, that in Bessemer Park, tenure diversification added to stability of population by offering aspiring residents currently in social housing who may have been considering leaving to buy a chance to buy in the neighbourhood.

Pawson *et al.*, found from research in Niddrie that overall, "neighbourhood stability has been enhanced as a result of regeneration" including tenure diversification (2000, p70). Nearly half the LCHO buyers in the council-dominated area came from the same postal district, and the vast majority intended to stay at least 2 years, which was lower than the figure for social rented tenants. However, a majority were incomers, and the authors did not know whether these households would have left the areas without the scheme. They also felt there has been little impact on turnover in remaining social housing, which was influenced instead by levels of improvement spending, areas and landlord, so the effect on turnover overall appeared to be a compositional effects rather than a 'neighbourhood effect'

Rosenburg found that low turnover could not be guaranteed even for the buyers themselves. He found "alarmingly high" levels of repossession of homes sold through LCHO initiatives on council estates in Scotland between 1984 and 1992 (1995 p292), with peak rates of 8% repossessed per year, almost ten times the national peak rate, and almost one fifth of original purchasers suffering repossession (1995). This appeared to be due to the financial vulnerability of purchasers rather than differences in policy between lenders or to national economic trends. He also found relatively high rates of voluntary resale with about half of all homes being sold to another owner within the period (1995). He also found significant differences in the sustainability of home ownership between schemes in different estates and even in different parts of the same large estates. Research for the DETR noted that transfer of homes for sale into the PRS, which is associated with higher turnover rates, could happen when local ownership market became saturated (DETR, 2000a).

Is there any other evidence of the characteristics of mixed tenure areas?

There is very little information on the characteristics of mixed tenure areas that attempts to control for compositional effects. This section gives some general information to illustrate the characteristics of mixed tenure areas.

Harvey *et al.* found that while 'mixed tenure' enumeration districts made up 8% of all enumeration districts, they made up 25% of all 'deprived' enumeration districts coming in the top 10% on the Index of Local Conditions 1996 (1997). Enumeration districts where no one tenure was more than 50% came between those dominated by social housing and those dominated by home ownership in Index of Local Conditions deprivation levels (1997). Harvey *et al.* found a wider range of deprivation scores for enumeration districts where no tenure made up more than 50% of households, with some enumeration districts more deprived than any for owner-occupied, PRS or RSL-dominated enumeration districts, and some enumeration districts less deprived than any PRS- or RSL-dominated enumeration districts. This is at least partly because the mixed group of enumeration districts were larger than these two latter groups.

Docherty *et al.* compared residents in a marginally mixed tenure area with a marginally LA-dominated one and two home ownership dominated ones (2001). The mixed tenure area had higher proportions of residents in social class C1 and C2 and fewer in classes D and E than the LA-dominated one; the owner-occupied dominated one had higher proportions in classes A, B and C1 than the mixed tenure one. The mixed tenure areas had intermediate levels of one parent headed households, but no other clear demographic pattern between the areas could be identified. Hiscock compared residents in mixed tenure ACORN category post-code sectors, where on average 29% of households were in social housing and 70% were owners, to those in areas with 62% social housing and those with 82% social housing. Mixed tenure areas residents were less likely to be on low incomes, be lone parents, to live in a flat, and more likely to be on high incomes, in social class 1 and 2, to be working or studying and to have central heating (2001).

ACORN categorisations of the socio-economic, demographic, housing and consumption characteristics of mixed tenure areas, fit mixed tenure areas into the 'aspiring' and 'striving' groups, and describe them as 'Blue collar areas; low-rise estates with older workers' and as 'areas of terraced houses/flats, council areas, health problems'.

Jupp felt that the mixed tenure estates he studied "seemed to be avoiding the downward cycle of environmental, economic and social problems characteristic of the 'worst' estates" (1999 p77). Jupp compared resident perceptions of their neighbourhoods in mixed tenure estates to national survey data. The private housing residents from the national sample had an overall net satisfaction rate of +73%, compared to private housing residents of mixed tenure areas at +57%, social housing residents generally at +50% and social housing residents of mixed tenure areas at 37%. Private residents from the national sample the highest net satisfaction of all the groups for more than half of the variables, including privacy, security, noise, friendliness, maintenance and 'greenery' (1999). Private housing residents in mixed tenure areas were generally considerably less satisfied than those in private housing generally, but more satisfied than social housing residents of mixed tenure estates for all factors except maintenance and transport. Social housing residents of mixed tenure were generally considerably less satisfied than those of social rented tenants generally, but more satisfied with cleanliness, maintenance, architecture, and greenery. Differences declined when the social tenants in mixed tenure areas were compared to those in inner city areas. Jupp suggested that lower incomes and newer residence across tenures for all residents in the mixed tenure areas might account for lower levels of satisfaction than those from national surveys.

What kinds of mix and mixing are associated with most effects?

What ratio between tenures produces the most effects? There is very little evidence for this from the UK. Anecdotal evidence suggests that insertion of small proportions of home ownership into areas dominated by social renting may have very little effect. However social rented homes pepperpotted in areas dominated by home ownership tend to be more popular than average.

Research by Galster *et al.* into thresholds for neighbourhood effects in the USA examined the relationship between various neighbourhood indicators in 1980, including housing tenure, and 1980-1990 changes in levels of the poverty rate, adult non-employment, the proportion of households headed by female lone parents, and secondary school drop out for census tracts across the country. All three variables were less likely to increase over time in areas that were heavily dominated by owner-occupation than those with over a third of households renting and more likely to increase in areas that were heavily dominated by renting and which had virtually no homeowners. However, the authors cautioned that these were an unusual minority of areas, and that for "most US metropolitan neighbourhoods – the patterns are less consistent" (ibid. p723).

Table 9: Evidence on threshold effects of different tenure mixes in the USA

Tenure mix in 1980	Variable	1980-1990 change
Up to 32% renting	Female lone-parent headed households	Increased
32-85.5% renting	Female lone-parent headed households	Decreased
Up to 60% renting	Adult non-employment	Increased
60-85.5% renting	Adult non-employment	Decreased
Up to 85.5% renting	Poverty rate	Increased
85.5%+ renting	Female lone-parent headed households	Increased
	Adult non-employment	Increased
	Poverty rate	Increased

Source: Adapted from Galster *et al.* 2000

They found that "the relationships between rental tenure rates and various indicators of neighbourhood quality of family life are neither uniform nor neatly meshed with current nostrums" (2000 p719). The data show that there are threshold effects for tenure mix; tenure mixes have different relationships and different thresholds for different variables. The authors also cautioned that these census tract level tenure mix effects may be driven by different regional contexts or other local variables such as density or public service quality, but they urged that preventative and remedial policy such as tenure mixing should be carefully targeted on areas respectively on either side of key thresholds.

Hiscock's evidence suggests that the tenure mix threshold for employment and studying in the UK may lie between mixed tenure and home ownership dominated areas at post-code scale, while for exchanging favours and feeling part of the community it may be between social housing dominated and extremely social housing dominated areas (2001).

What size of area produces the most effects? There is uncertainty about scale at which neighbourhood tenure mix effects and neighbourhood effects in general might work. Researchers tend to investigate areas for which data is available, particularly electoral wards and estates in the UK and census tracts in the USA, although these may have no meaning for local residents and may not be the areas over which any putative neighbourhood effects might work. Estates may have more meaning for residents than wards, and there is considerable qualitative evidence and speculation about 'estate effects'. (eg. Page, 2000) however, there has been little formal work to assess estate effects. In Johnston *et al.*'s investigation of electoral neighbourhood effects, they argued "Little is known about the spatial scale of social interaction and the extent of the communities within which either the informal social interactions that might generate neighbourhood effects takes place... or people observe their neighbours' situations" (2001 p.201).

However, it has been widely suggested that beneficial effects of mixed tenure may not work unless the mix has a fairly small grain. Jupp felt "the biggest single barrier to contact is that properties of different tenures tend to be different streets or parts of streets", as people were most likely to get to know immediate neighbours (1999, p45). Jupp argued that mixed tenures within streets was preferable to mixed tenure between streets, because it did not seem to be associated with more problems and was linked with higher overall satisfaction (1999). Dave Cowans, Chief Executive of Places for People, the largest UK RSL, said in evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport, Local Government and the Regions in 2001 "if you just put a high-income silo in the middle of a very disadvantaged area that does not help much really. So the issue of mixed tenure housing has to be addressed in a much more pepper-potted way". (Stationery Office, 2001).

What context for mixed tenure is most likely to encourage social interaction? Stability of population, children and schools and other facilities for young people, designs and layouts have been identified as particularly important to social networks (Forrest and Kearns, 1999). Jupp found that those most likely to know people of another tenure were more likely than average to know a lot of people, to use the community centre, to have a child, to be fairly close to the average income of the estates, and to have lived in the estate for more than 6 years. Qualitative interviews suggested that owners' work and social links outside the estate and the use of cars limited contact, but that communal facilities and children would assist mixing (Jupp, 1999). Management and design, particularly the grain of tenure mix, also appeared to be important (ibid). Perri 6 argues that single purpose residential areas do not give people a reason to mix, so even if tenure is mixed they will not result in social mixing (1997 p34). In this case, 'the mixed community may be more of a statistical artefact than a daily reality for its residents' (ibid. P5). Lack of transport and psychological barriers could also affect interaction between residents of estates and other areas (Forrest and Kearns, 1999).

Page emphasised importance of development size, dwelling mix and allocations policies with social housing as well as tenure (1994), and regional labour market (Page, 2000)

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There are major regional, area and neighbourhood differences in tenure mix. There are trends away from mixed tenure at regional and local authority levels, and possibly at ward and enumeration district level too.

If a mixed tenure area is one in which no tenure accounts for more than 50% of households, there are no mixed tenure regions and only a handful of mixed tenure local authorities in the UK. Mixed tenure enumeration districts make up 8% of the total in England.

Tenure patterns have become less mixed over the last twenty years at regional and local authority level. This may be true at wards and enumeration district level too.

Policies to encourage mixed tenure have not reduced interregional and inter-local authority differences in tenure patterns and may not have prevented reductions in tenure mixing at all scales, although they have created some new mixed tenure areas in a proportion of formerly local authority renting dominated areas.

The evidence base for the effects of mixed tenure and tenure mixing is weak. Evidence for the mechanisms through which they might operate is also weak. Available evidence suggests effects are not strong, and there are some negative effects. It is not clear if effects are due to regeneration, social mix or tenure mix. In summary, the evidence does not justify promotion of mixed tenure and tenure mix.

Some of these gaps in evidence will be addressed by forthcoming research by Joe Doherty, Elspeth Graham, Paul Boyle and Rosemary Hiscock.

It is possible that the emphasis on mixed tenure may have had harmful effects, through the opportunity cost of not following other policies, and potential equity issues in focusing attention on social renting dominated areas.

Alternatives to the past policies of promotion of tenure mixing which should be considered in the light of existing and emerging evidence include tighter targeting of tenure mixing on regions, local authorities and neighbourhoods with non-mixed tenure, wider policies to break the link between tenure and social variables, such as widening access to social housing increasing supply or reducing access to home ownership, and policies to address neighbourhood social mix directly rather than through housing policy.

Bibliography

- Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K (1998) *Reconnecting excluded communities: The neighbourhood impacts of owner occupation* Scottish Homes research report 61 Edinburgh: Scottish Homes
- Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K (1999) 'Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts' *Policy and Politics* (28)10 pp93-108
- Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K (2001) 'Disentangling area effects: Evidence from deprived and non deprived urban neighbourhoods' *Urban Studies* 38(12) pp2277-2298
- Bramley, G and Morgan, J (1998) 'Low cost home ownership initiatives in the UK' *Housing Studies* 13(4) pp567-586
- Burrows and Rhodes (1998)
- Burrows, R and Rhodes, D (1998) *The geography of misery: Area disadvantage and patterns of neighbourhood dissatisfaction in England*. York: JRF
- Callaghan, G (1998) 'The interaction of gender, class and place in women's experience: A discussion based in focus group research' *Sociological Research Online* 3(3)
- Capita (1996) *An evaluation of six early Estate Action schemes* London: HMSO
- Central Statistical Office (1981) *Regional Trends* London: HMSO
- Central Statistical Office (1982) *Regional Trends* London: HMSO
- Central Statistical Office (1986) *Regional Trends 21* London: HMSO
- Central Statistical Office (1987) *Regional Trends 22* London: HMSO
- Cole, I; Dixon, L; Hobley, J and Reid, B (1998) *Estate profiling and community balance: A report for the Housing Corporation* London: Housing Corporation/SRESR
- Coulson, NE and Fisher, LM (2001) 'Tenure choice and labour market outcomes' *Housing Studies* 17(1) pp35-50
- Crook, ADH; Darke, RA and Disson, JS (1996) *A new lease of life? Housing association investment on local authority housing estates* Bristol: Policy Press
- Dean, J and Hastings, A (2000) *Challenging images: Housing estates, stigma and regeneration* Bristol: Policy Press
- Department of the Environment (1996): *An evaluation of six early Estate Action schemes* London: HMSO
- DETR (2000a) *Regeneration that lasts* London: DETR
- DETR (2000b) *Millennium Villages and Sustainable Communities Final Report* London: DETR
- Docherty, I; Goodlad, R and Paddison, R (2001) 'Civic culture, community and citizen participation in contrasting neighbourhoods' *Urban Studies* 38(12) pp2225-2250
- DoE (1988) *The Right to Buy: A national survey of tenants and buyers of council homes* London: DoE
- DoE (1989) *Estate Action: Ministerial guidelines for local housing authorities* London: DoE
- DoE (1991) *New life for local authority estates: Guidance for LAs on estate Action and Housing Action Trusts and links with related programmes* London: DoE
- Evans, R and Long, D (2000) 'Estate-based regeneration in England: Lessons from Housing Action Trusts' *Housing Studies* 15(2) pp301-318
- FEANTSA (2001) *Housing policy as a way of reinforcing social cohesion 13th European Meeting of Housing Ministers, Brussels/Chalois 1-2 October Final Communiqué Edited summary* Brussels: FEANTSA
- Forrest, R and Murie, A (1991) *Selling the welfare state: The privatisation of public housing* Revised edn. London: Routledge
- Forrest, R; Murie, A and Gordon, P (1995) *The resale of former council homes* London: HMSO
- Galster, G; Quercia, RG and Cortes, A (2000) 'Identifying neighbourhood thresholds: An empirical exploration' *Housing Policy Debate* 11(3) pp.701-
- Gaster, L with Damart, G; Harrison, L; Forrest, R and Stewart, M (1995) *Interim evaluation of the Ferguslie Park Partnership Environment Research Programme Research Findings No.13* Edinburgh: The Scottish Office
- Harloe, M (1992) 'Housing inequality and social structure in London' *Housing Studies* 7(3) pp.189-204
- Harvey, J; Tomkinson, G; Graham, R and Quayle, Q (1997) *Mapping local authority estates using the Index of Local Conditions Housing Research Report* London: DoE
- Hiscock, R (2001) 'Are mixed tenure estates likely to enhance the social capital of their residents' Paper presented to the HSA conference, Cardiff, 3-4th September
- Johnson, RJ; Pattie, CJ; Dorling, DFL; MacAlister, I; Tunstall, H and Rossier, DJ (2001) ??? in *Electoral Studies* 20 pp.195-216
- Kleinman, M (1999) *A more normal housing market? The housing role of the London Docklands Development Corporation 1981-1998* LSE London Discussion Paper No.3 May
- Kleit, RG (2001) 'Jobs search networks and strategies in scattered-site public housing' *Housing Studies* 17(1) pp83-100
- Lee, P and Murie, A (1997) *Poverty, housing tenure and 'social exclusion'* Bristol: Policy Press
- Murie, A and Nevin, B (1997) *Beyond a halfway housing policy: Local strategies and regeneration* Birmingham: CURS/London: IPPR
- National Statistics, 2001
- NHF (ud) *Delivering social inclusion: Social housing and regeneration* London: NHF
- NHF/CIH (1996): *Leasehold management by social landlords* London: NFA

- Ostendorf, W; Musterd, S and de Vos, S (2001) 'Social mix and the neighbourhood effect: Policy ambitions and empirical evidence' *Housing Studies* 16(3) pp.371-380
- Overman, HG (1999) 'Neighbourhood effects in small neighbourhoods' ???
- Page, D (1995) *Developing communities* London: Sutton Hastoe
- Page, D (2000) *Communities in the balance: The reality of social exclusion on housing estates* York: YPS
- Page, D and Boughton, R (1997) *Mixed tenure housing estates* London: Notting Hill Housing Trust
- Parkinson, M (1998) *Combating social exclusion: Lessons from area-based programmes in Europe* Bristol: Policy Press
- Pawson, H; Kirk, K and McIntosh, S (2000) *Assessing the impact of tenure diversification: The case of Niddrie, Edinburgh* Scottish Homes Research Report 79 Edinburgh: Scottish Homes
- Peach, C (1996) 'Does Britain have ghettos?' *Transcriptions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21 pp.216-235
- Power, A and Tunstall, R (1995) *Swimming against the tide: Polarisation and progress on twenty unpopular council estates 1980-95* York: JRF
- Price Waterhouse (1997) *Mapping local authority estates using the Index of Local Conditions* London: DETR
- Reingold, DA (1995) 'Public housing, home ownership and community participation in Chicago's inner city' *Housing Studies* 10(4) pp.445-469
- Robson, B *et al.* (1994): *Assessing the impact of urban policy* London: Department of the Environment
- Rohe, WM; Van Zandt, S and McCarthy, G (200) 'Home ownership and access to opportunity' *Housing Studies* 17(1) pp51-62
- Rosenbaum, JE; Reynolds, L and Deluca, S (2001) 'How do places matter? The geography of opportunity, self-efficacy and a look inside the black box of residential mobility' *Housing Studies* 17(1) pp71-82
- Rosenburg, L (1995) 'Monitoring low cost home ownership initiatives: A longitudinal analysis of housing market trends within the privatised areas of four council-built estate in Scotland' *Housing Studies* 10(3) pp.285-303
- Somerville, P and Knowles, A (???) 'The difference that tenure makes' *Housing Studies* ????
- SPARK (2001) *Scoping report into low cost home ownership* London: DTLR
- Taylor, M (1995) *Unleashing the potential: Bringing residents to the centre of regeneration* York: JRF
- Thatcher, M (1993) *The Downing Street Years* London: HarperCollins
- Whitehead, C (1998) 'Are housing finance systems converging within the European Union?' pp.19-31 in eds. Klienman, M; Matznetter, W and Stephens, M *European Integration and housing policy* London: Routledge/RICS
- Whitehead, C (2002) 'Response: Housing tenure and opportunity' *Housing Studies* 17(1) pp.63-70
- Wilson, W (1999) *The Right to Buy* House of Commons Research Paper 99/36 London: House of Commons