Developing and sustaining mixed tenure housing developments

September 2008

This *Round-up* evaluates the strategic and policy context for housing development and neighbourhood renewal. The authors argue that integrating different housing tenures is an important prerequisite for developing 'housing of choice', but that there are many other aspects of sustainable communities which need to be given equal weight.

Key points

- Existing research suggests that well managed, mixed tenure communities have the potential to facilitate social interaction between residents without imposing on residents' privacy. They may help counteract social exclusion and adverse neighbourhood effects associated with mono-tenure estates.
- According to the research, existing residents are not normally aware of tenure as an issue in selecting where they live and who their neighbours are.
- The quality of design and master-planning of new developments has proven to be a major influence on social interaction.
- There is no evidence that mixed tenure adversely affects house prices or the ability to let or sell property.
- Mixed developments require careful management and monitoring – for example, systems need to be in place to maintain streets and public spaces.
- Further research is required into:
    - whether the mix of housing creates more opportunities for social interaction between different sections of the community, compared with mono-tenure developments;
    - whether there are different patterns of social interaction between residents in different tenures and differential usage of local facilities;
    - whether mixed communities are more expensive to develop than single tenure developments, and how these costs fall on the public and private sectors;
    - if there are additional management costs, whether these are off-set, for example, in the reduction of crime, improved educational attainment and lower levels of unemployment;
    - what factors residents take into account in deciding to transfer between houses and tenures in the same development as family size and household income changes; and
    - whether the proportion of housing in different tenures increases or decreases over time, and whether there is a tipping-point where the mix strategy is undermined.

Authors
Nick Bailey and Tony Manzi,
University of Westminster

JOSEPH ROWNTREE FOUNDATION

www.jrf.org.uk

Tenure mix in neighbourhoods and communities

It is now an accepted orthodoxy that mixed tenure communities should be an essential component of both new housing development and in the redevelopment of existing mono-tenure estates. This principle has now been fully embedded in central government policy (CLG, 2006a) and there are a growing number of developments which have adopted this approach. It is argued here, and in our evaluation of good practice (Bailey, et al., 2006), that there is no single formula which works in all situations, but that local stakeholders should assess local market conditions and agree a clear 'vision' at an early stage of the development process.

Tenure mix is often used as a proxy for mixing income groups so that new housing areas integrate populations with different lifestyles and with different age, household size and ethnic profiles. It is argued that substantial benefits arise from this but it is also necessary to ensure that developments are well designed and maintain a careful balance between privacy and communality. Hence, responsive systems of management need to be established early on to maintain the vision of social mix and to resolve the inevitable tensions which may arise between different sections of the community.

A review of strategies towards tenure mix opens up a number of issues for debate and draws on a wide range of research, but also highlights some gaps in our knowledge. As the emphasis on increasing housing provision of all kinds grows, and the number of schemes under a variety of initiatives expands, we need to examine the policy context. How far does national policy provide a clear and workable framework to guide local stakeholders in delivering 'neighbourhoods of choice'? Which other policy areas need to change to support this approach? Is the balance right between clear national guidance and autonomy at the local level to provide the right mix in the context of local housing markets?

There is some evidence to support the provision of mixed tenure communities but significant gaps remain in the evidence-base. We review some of the recent research funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) and others particularly in relation to best practice in creating sustainable neighbourhoods, the extent to which the full range of sizes and tenures of housing can be provided, developer attitudes and design issues. Studies which evaluate the successful features of long-established mixed developments are reviewed (for example, Groves, et al., 2003; Allen, et al., 2005).

We also highlight some aspects of good practice in management which can ensure that developments are sustained and remain attractive in the long-term.

While there is a growing consensus that the benefits of mixed tenure outweigh the disadvantages, there is some evidence that there can also be dis-benefits and challenges arising from a blanket application of the strategy. There is evidence from a number of surveys that many residents of new developments are often 'neutral' on the question of tenure mix; others may resent living close to households with very different lifestyles and patterns of consumption to themselves. Likewise, young, single people do not always mix well with pensioners or less affluent families with children. Blocking or grouping different forms of housing can resolve many of these issues, but this does not always mean that a strong, cohesive community will be created. In some cases, focusing on schools, community centres and other facilities as locations for social interaction may be more productive than assuming this takes place primarily in the home or the street.

There remain large gaps in our understanding of how different parts of the community respond to their neighbours and which design, management and other features encourage or discourage interaction. Evidence from Bournville (Groves, et al., 2003) and elsewhere suggests that residents use a number of different criteria in evaluating the quality of their home and these include the social and environmental conditions in the wider neighbourhood.

Tenure mix is likely to remain on the policy agenda for some time and is fully embedded in the Government's 'Sustainable Communities' strategy. We argue here that it has much to commend it to reduce social exclusion and to promote equity, yet its effectiveness depends on how far lessons can be learnt and how far positive features can be more widely disseminated. Government policy is also designed to encourage fluidity in housing tenure through strategies towards *HomeBuy* and intermediate housing. These can work against the desire to retain an adequate mix of tenures in any one development.

Current policy directions

While social balance and mixed communities have been principles of good planning since at least the 'Garden City Movement' and the British 'New Towns' (Casey, et al., 2007), it is only relatively recently that the policy has received greater attention. Both the Urban Task Force report (Rogers, 1999) and the Urban White Paper (ODPM, 2000) highlighted the need to improve 'liveability' in residential environments and to meet the housing requirements of all sections of the community. The 'Sustainable Communities Strategy' was launched in 2003 and this sought to "raise the quality of life in our communities through increasing prosperity, reducing inequalities, more employment, better public services, better health and education, tackling crime and anti-social behaviour, and much more" (ODPM, 2003, p.5). This set of aspirations is echoed by the Housing Corporation:

> Mixed communities contribute to the promotion of choice and equality, avoiding concentrations of deprivation and help address social exclusion and community cohesion. (Housing Corporation, 2006, p.9)

In 2006 more detailed guidance was issued to local planning authorities in PPS3 (CLG, 2006a). This requires local authorities to assess the housing needs in their area, set clear targets, ensure adequate land is available and "create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas, both urban and rural" (CLG, 2006a, p.6). Since 2003 a series of millennium villages, urban extensions, strategic growth areas, housing market renewal areas, eco-towns and other pilot projects have been announced, all of which incorporate the principle of mixed tenures. English Partnerships, for example, has fully embraced this approach and commissioned a 'Design Code' (EDAW, et al., 2005) for a development of 400 homes at Upton. Houses for rent and shared ownership are 'pepper-potted' throughout the estate. The Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust is planning an urban extension at Derwenthorpe, York, which is made up of a total of 540 units (JRF, 2001). At least 40 per cent of the housing will be affordable. Research by TCPA (2007) suggests that all large-scale developments include a wide mix of housing sizes and tenures which are distributed in integrated, segmented or segregated patterns. In Scotland, lead agencies such as housing associations (as in New Gorbals, Glasgow), local authorities (Ardler Village, Dundee) and special purpose agencies (as in Craigmillar, Edinburgh) are promoting similar mixed developments with the full range of house sizes and tenures (Bailey, et al., (2007).

While the development of greenfield sites often involves agencies such as English Partnerships and development corporations, there has also been a growing emphasis on neighbourhood renewal. Estates Renewal, Housing Action Trusts, Single Regeneration Budget, New Deal for Communities and, more recently, Local Strategic Partnerships have all been used to fund the renewal and diversification of what are often large estates of socially rented housing. Neighbourhood management pathfinders have piloted more integrated approaches to the delivery of services. Experience from all these programmes is increasingly being incorporated into mainstream services.

Policies relating to housing, sustainable communities and environmental issues are developing rapidly and, as well as constructing high quality homes in pleasant environments, housing providers are also required to meet demanding standards in relation to climate change (see for example, CLG, 2006b; CLG, 2006d).

Why promote mixed communities?

There are many motivations underpinning the commitment to mixed tenure communities. These may represent 'universal principles', or can be practical approaches which are supported by experience 'on the ground'. Mixed tenure developments are often advocated to:

- counter adverse neighbourhood effects and promote the improved provision of facilities and integrated services;

- promote social cohesion, reduce social exclusion and create stronger communities;

- assist families with children to play a full part in building inclusive communities;

- encourage developers and others to provide the full range of house sizes, types and tenures;

- enable residents to access a variety of training and employment opportunities;

- provide good quality amenities and facilities; or

- increase 'liveability' through high quality design, and facilitate innovative and responsive systems of management.

Mixed communities

This section sets out the evidence supporting the integration of different tenures in housing developments.

Evidence that mixed communities work

Following a range of studies commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and others, what recent evidence is available about the benefits of mixed income communities?

Countering adverse neighbourhood effects
The most important policy issue at present is concerned with the process of building stable and cohesive communities. Government policy has tended to focus on the 'neighbourhood'. A series of strategies have been devised over the last 30 years to improve the quality of housing and to deliver improved and integrated services to areas with often high levels of deprivation and social exclusion, particularly as research has shown that low-income households tend to become trapped within disadvantaged areas while higher-income groups are able to escape (Meen, et al., 2005).

Kintrea (2007) evaluates a series of neighbourhood-based and often time-limited programmes and finds evidence of only limited success. While most policy emphasis has been on improving services and housing quality in the most deprived neighbourhoods, residents often remain relatively isolated from job opportunities and services that more affluent areas take for granted. Atkinson and Kintrea (2002) review the evidence on 'neighbourhood effects' and find that policy is often too inward-looking and that "the most straightforward prescription is to find ways to deconcentrate poverty" (p.162). Evidence from other countries, such as the Netherlands (Kleinhans, 2004) and the USA (Berube, 2005), also supports the argument that the closer integration of tenures is desirable, but that national and local policy should also focus on improving residents' life chances by improving access to jobs and closing the gap between areas of affluence and poverty in all kinds of neighbourhood.

Although it is widely acknowledged that reputations can take years to change (Hastings and Dean, 2003; Tunstall and Coulter, 2006), there is evidence that mixed communities do not suffer from the stigmatisation and poor reputation attached to many traditional mono-tenure estates – they have at least average popularity and resident satisfaction (Allen, et al., 2006). In particular, studies have suggested that mixed income communities have had some success in improving *external* perceptions of neighbourhoods (Allen, et al., 2006).

Mixed tenure: twenty years on

Allen, et al., (2006) conducted a study of three mixed tenure areas which were developed over twenty years ago. The three neighbourhoods were Bowthorpe (located on the edge of Norwich), Orton Goldhay (south of Peterborough) and Coulby Newham (outside Middlesbrough). They found that all three remained popular, with little evidence of serious crime and disorder problems, despite having higher than average deprivation levels. The neighbourhoods had a high demand for rented properties, higher than average house prices, reasonably healthy local employment and relatively stable populations. They concluded that mixed tenure appeared to have made the area more desirable and the social mix had enabled residents to avoid the stigmatisation attached to many local authority estates.

The main finding from a variety of studies is that residents appear to be neither concerned nor inspired by the mixed nature of their estates (Jupp, 1999, p.10); they are described as 'agnostic' about their neighbourhoods. While residents hold differing views about the value of tenure mix (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.75), this was generally not an issue of great concern (Jupp, 1999; Silverman, et al., 2005): "Owners and renters regarded each other as 'ordinary people' and therefore similar to rather than distinct from each other. They were ambivalent towards mixed tenure which was considered to be a 'non-issue' and even an irrelevance" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.2).

Building social cohesion
There has been considerable concern about social cohesion following the disturbances in the north of England in 2001 and the publication of the Cantle report (Home Office Community Cohesion Unit, 2002). The emphasis on community cohesion maintains that community relations are formed within highly localised areas (Mumford and Power, 2003). Mixed communities should therefore mean more than simply income mix. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (ODPM, 2005) stresses the importance of a "sense of community identity and belonging" alongside "tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different culture, backgrounds and beliefs" (p.56). The impact of mixed communities on social cohesion is difficult to determine. While there has been some evidence of cross-tenure social networks (see box below), this varied widely from place to place.

Some studies maintain that neighbourhoods would become more integrated as households gain experience of living in mixed schemes (Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005) and there is evidence that a small proportion actively seek social mix. However, even among those groups actively seeking social mixing there appears to be considerable ethnic segregation (Butler, 2003).

> Most relatively new mixed estates are not characterized by inclusive social networks. Social policy analysts should therefore be very careful about making claims for a new sort of community on mixed estates … The hope that the current models of mixed tenure estates will foster widespread mutual support between people from different economic groups and or introduce role models into an area appears largely misplaced. (Jupp, 1999, p.11)

Those most likely to interact include those with close to average incomes and who have lived in the area for a long time (Jupp, 1999). However, there is a clear need for longitudinal studies (for example Allen, et al., 2006) to determine the broader impact of social mix. Tunstall and Fenton (2006) suggest that "we cannot expect rapid or dramatic progress on goals of mix which rely on interaction" (p.16). The development of social networks involves more than a simple income mix and there is little evidence that a mix of incomes produced 'role model' effects (Allen, et. al., 2006, p.4). Allen, et al., found that owners "tended to occupy different social worlds" from tenants. Nevertheless, "neighbouring

Developing community cohesion in Moss Side and Tottenham

A study by Hudson et al. (2007) considered a range of projects in Manchester and North London designed to promote ethnic and cultural integration within two highly diverse areas. Initiatives included: community radio schemes (for young people); carnivals and cultural celebrations; voluntary work in parenting and childcare programmes; multi-faith community clubs for over 50s and initiatives to develop training and work placements for disadvantaged and marginalised groups (such as the Somali community). Such schemes helped to promote community relations, reduce inter-ethnic tensions and to reduce transience within the neighbourhoods.

owners and renters tended to 'bump into' each other and described their relationships as civil and polite. Inter-household cooperation could take place but mainly in relation to *practical* rather than *personal* issues" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.2, emphasis in original). As Cole and Goodchild note, "the proximity of owners and renters does not lead to a 'bridging' between the two groups" (Cole and Goodchild, 2000, p.357).

One of the main difficulties is that of distinguishing the effects of tenure mix from other environmental improvements. For example, while some studies have indicated above-average house price increases in mixed-income areas, it was not clear whether this increase was due to the social mix or to other factors (for example Martin and Watkinson, 2003; Silverman, et al., 2005).

Nevertheless, one benefit is that increased levels of owner-occupation may result in residents being able to remain within their own neighbourhoods rather than being compelled to move elsewhere. Population turnover has been identified as a key problem within disadvantaged neighbourhoods (Hudson, et al., p.95); thus, enabling residents to stay within existing communities can assist in improving stability and ultimately cohesion (DETR, 2000; Pawson, 2000; Maxwell, 2005).

Assisting families and children
A study in 1999 found that "schools are by far the most important non-street site for local contact" (Jupp, 1999, p.11) and some mixed communities can support extended family networks (Allen, et al., 2006). Studies have identified the most significant areas of interaction at school level and maintain they can work for young families in particular "provided they are carefully planned, delivered and managed with families in mind" (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.75). This finding was confirmed by Allen, et al., who found that "stronger friendships were found between children, who mixed without regard to tenure" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.2).

A study by Silverman et al. (2005) considered the development of Mixed Income New Communities (MINCs) and their ability to attract and retain better-off family households in inner cities. They found that MINCs have considerable success as inclusive communities, bringing benefits to low income households, although this "may partly depend on their ability to attract families into the market-rate households". Crucially, they found that social interaction across tenures and wider benefits to schools demand a critical mass of families in both tenures (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.1).

Attracting and retaining families

In their study, Silverman et al. (2005) included two case studies of new mixed income new communities (MINCs) in East London: Greenwich Millennium Village and Britannia Village. Both developments were designed according to 'urban village' principles, with mixed tenure as a key mechanism to deliver social inclusion and resident involvement. Greenwich Millennium Village in particular was viewed as a good place to raise families due to the quiet location (it is a highly pedestrianised neighbourhood), its mixed uses and urban environment, and its waterside location, despite limited on-site retail facilities. Residents were generally predisposed to stay within the neighbourhood, assisted by favourable views of local schools, parks and open spaces.

However, not every mixed community will attract a mix of residents to education facilities, and other areas of policy may serve to undermine the mixed income agenda. For example, while Silverman et al. (2005) maintain that high quality secondary schools are essential they also contend that educational policies in general do not support mixed income communities (p.71).

Mixed tenure was also "found to have supported the maintenance of kinship support networks, for example, by allowing adult children to settle in the same areas as their parents, and by enabling *both* parents to remain living in the area in the event of relationship breakdown" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.2, emphasis in original).

Encouraging private developers and purchasers
A central feature in the development of mixed income communities relates to the role of private sector agencies; in particular developers and purchasers. Rowlands et al. (2006) questioned the assumption that these agencies are naturally hostile to the mixed community agenda, suggesting that the private sector is becoming accustomed to new development processes.

Attitudes of private developers and purchasers

Rowlands, et al. (2006) conducted a study of private developers and purchasers based on case studies of seven estates across England. They found there was no overriding problem in developing mixed tenure estates and that concerns about property values and attitudes of private developers was not the central issue in the debate. They found no evidence that mixed tenure had a negative impact on property values.

However, other studies have been critical of private developers on the grounds that they do not necessarily meet housing need and tend to provide smaller units – such as one-bedroom properties (Minton, 2002). When developers are left to their own devices at the implementation stage they will not necessarily build family homes (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.72). This means that "mechanisms need to be in place to make places that work, not just to provide housing" (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.72).

An additional claim for mixed communities is that they can increase the supply of social housing. While not contributing to an overall increase in supply, it has been demonstrated that section 106 agreements have had some success in providing social housing on otherwise single-tenure estates (see, for example, Monk, et al., 2005).

Case study: Promoting and regenerating Craigmillar (PARC)

The regeneration of Craigmillar in Edinburgh involves an innovative partnership arrangement between the City of Edinburgh Council and a public-private regeneration agency (PARC). Finance for the scheme was provided through a special purpose vehicle which enabled the local authority to maintain an arms-length relationship with the regeneration programme. This meant that the council retained an interest in the scheme and was able to exert influence over its subsequent development. (Bailey, et al., 2007)

Creating employment opportunities

For most residents the key determining factor of a sustainable community is the level of economic activity and the ability to support infrastructure and core services (Meen, et al, 2005). However, there is little evidence of these kinds of effects: "we conclude that mixed communities on their own do not significantly increase employment rates for social tenants and the lower income groups" (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006, p.15). Other studies support these conclusions (for example: Harding, 1998; Jupp, 1999; Beekman, et al., 2001). These research findings tend to emphasise other factors as more important, such as skills, education and access to local labour markets. As Berube (2005) notes:

> Government should devote fresh thinking to how housing policies can bring about greater economic integration where concentrations of deprivation now exist, and how local housing and planning agencies can use information to sustain currently mixed communities over time. (p.5)

Case study: Grahame Park Community Employment Initiative

Notting Hill Housing Trust has established an initiative based in Grahame Park in North London to enhance community employment. The scheme is offered to anyone who is unemployed, aged over 18 and who lives on or near the estate. It offers: professional careers advice; assistance with completing a CV; assisted job searches; help with completing application forms; training skills; access to telephone, stationery, internet and photocopying equipment, and access to a voluntary work placement programme. (Bailey, et al., 2006)

Case study: Caterham Barracks Community Trust

The establishment of a Community Development Trust in Caterham Village has provided a range of community facilities; the section 106 agreement provided that facilities would be handed over or sold to the Community Trust once they had been refurbished by Linden Homes. The Trust owns: a skate park with 7,000 members; a café; a restaurant; sports and leisure facilities and an enterprise hub in order to develop new businesses. (Bailey, et al., 2006, p.50)

Providing amenities and facilities

Local services have been found to be vital to the sustainability of mixed tenure areas, but research has pointed to limited provision of shops or private sector facilities in mixed income schemes; it was not clear that additional income helped to provide services which benefited all (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.74).

> A carefully planned layout and a high quality of neighbourhood facilities, including the landscape and the provision of quality local services such as schools and local shops are important determinants of resident satisfaction in these mixed neighbourhoods … the provision of local services linked by footpaths and cycle-ways remains relevant in facilitating social interaction and in engendering resident satisfaction. (Allen, et al., 2006, p.330)

While mixed communities can provide attractive services and facilities, these are found to be more often a product of planning policies rather than of specific mix itself (Beekman, et. al, 2001). Moreover, wealthier residents tend to spend a higher proportion of time and money outside their neighbourhoods (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2002), and one of the challenges is in providing amenities and facilities that will attract and retain higher-income residents and prove sustainable in the longer-term.

Improving 'liveability' and facilitating innovative management

The government has placed considerable emphasis on the importance of 'liveability'; creating places where people choose to live by providing clean, safe and green public spaces and improving the quality of the built environment. A number of studies point to resident satisfaction arising from the high quality of the physical layout (Allen, et. al., 2006, p.4) of mixed developments and there has been considerable debate about the extent to which schemes should have different tenures integrated (or 'pepper-potted') within schemes (see Roberts, 2007). Andrews and Reardon Smith (2005) strongly advocate pepper-potting as a means of avoiding tenure prejudice, whereas Bailey, et al. (2006) found that it was more important to pursue a tenure-blind approach. Tunstall and Fenton found that "pepper-potted estates are the exception rather than the rule" (2006, p.16). Design features that encourage walking and discourage car use have a significant impact on levels of social contact; residents "value the nature and extent of the contacts that these 'new urban' environments facilitate" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.318).

Case study: Ardler Urban Ranger Scheme

The urban ranger scheme in Ardler, near Dundee, is designed to enable the community to realise its natural heritage; involving care for wildlife and supporting projects that enhance the local environment. The urban ranger promotes understanding and awareness of the local environment. The urban ranger initiative supports environmental projects but also involves broader issues such as litter, vandalism, safety and sustainability. (Bailey, et al., 2007)

Some design features may assist in contributing to community interaction, such as cycle-ways, pedestrian walkways and Home Zones. Research undertaken by Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) indicates that design rather than social mix is a key feature to determining resident preferences and satisfaction, by helping to create a sense of place, dealing with cars, encouraging use of public transport and meeting neighbours. Examples include front doors opening onto streets and front gardens increasing opportunities for informal contacts (CABE, 2005a; 2005b).

Case Study: Hulme Design Guidance

A guide by Bailey et al. (2006) recommended the approach to design guidance applied in Hulme, This included the development of a masterplan and design code which outlined the urban character of the development and introduced an innovative, medium-density urban block layout. Despite initial opposition from RSLs and developers, problems were resolved through negotiation and consultation, with the support of tenants. The design code encouraged architectural variety within the rubric of the perimeter block. The resulting RSL development has been to a quality that continues to inspire passers-by to call in to the local RSL offices to ask if the homes are for sale.

Disadvantages and negative effects

As noted above, there is a strong presumption in policy terms that mixed communities have positive benefits. Nevertheless, there have recently been more critical voices which have questioned the way that the policy has been implemented. According to these critics, a number of disadvantages can be identified.

First, mixed income communities may result in less targeted provision and funding opportunities (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006). Some studies indicate that it is easier to target services (for example, to minority ethnic groups) if concentrated spatially (Silburn, et al., 1999; Robinson, et al., 2004). Moreover, while demands on public sector agencies had been reduced, it was not clear how much this was due to general improvements in stock condition and overall poverty levels rather the introduction of market-rate occupants (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.74).

A second criticism is that the policy is wrongly focused, treating symptoms rather than causes. Hence Kleinman (2000) contends that real problems of households in poverty stem from a lack of skills and a precarious position within an increasingly competitive global labour market rather than with local areas *per se*. According to writers such as Cheshire, social segregation reflects economic inequality rather than causing it. These arguments are supported by studies from St. Andrews University which indicate that social mix is only of economic benefit when owner occupiers are in the majority (Doherty, 2006). This raises the wider issue of which areas should be subject to 'tenure-mixing'. The tendency is for it to apply only in areas of local authority housing and new developments; should it also apply in areas of predominantly owner-occupied housing?

A number of writers maintain that there is insufficient evidence for the benefits of mixed communities. Hence, Cheshire (2007) describes the policy as "essentially belief-based" and Atkinson (2005) maintains that the policy relies on an intuitive rather than explicit evidence base (p.29). Indeed, Cheshire maintains that the evidence "suggests that in significant ways some poor people suffer if they move to richer neighbourhoods" (Cheshire, 2007, p.ix).

A further criticism related to some of the management strategies applied within mixed income schemes. These strategies have been characterised by a move away from housing need, creating what has been called 'balance through exclusion' (Cole and Goodchild, 2000, p.357). Hence, strategies such as estate profiling, controlling access and increasing individual discretion of front-line staff can result in the denial of services to particular groups (for example, through community letting schemes which give priority to locally based groups over other individuals in housing need).

While Rowlands, et al., (2006) find no evidence of a negative impact on property values, they nevertheless criticised the policy as a blunt instrument; one of only several tools to achieve social mix. They maintain that social mix grows organically rather than being planned, and even then is insufficient to prevent concentrations of deprivation (p.61). Moreover, they argue that the impact of private renting has been under-appreciated: "the contemporary debate is blind to the uneven growth and impact of the private rented sector" (p.61).

Mixing incomes can create management problems and may not be preferred by RSLs (Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005). Problems may be exacerbated where there are a range of different agencies taking responsibility for service provision (Manzi and Smith Bowers, 2004). In addition, high property values may price lower income families out of neighbourhoods (Silverman, et al., 2005; Varady, et al., 2005). These processes have been criticised by writers such as Lees (2003) as a form of "state sponsored gentrification".

A further concern for residents and developers has been the importance of "post-occupational management" (Bailey, et al., 2006). Rowlands, et al., maintain that tenure mix cannot be accurately managed after construction. Particular problems include the high numbers of private sector properties and the existence of 'buy to let' or 'buy to mothball' properties (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006, p.44). These issues require "longer term value management"; in particular, continuing asset management and neighbourhood governance (Rowlands, et al., 2006, pp.2-3).

Some studies have suggested that mixed-income schemes can reduce perceptions and the fear of anti-social behaviour (Beekman, et al., 2001). Mix might therefore be a useful policy tool to prevent anti-social behaviour through the absence of tenure prejudice.

One challenge relates to the issue of service charges (see HACAS Chapman Handy, 2004). There is considerable confusion about the most appropriate ways of attributing charges between different tenures and how to determine a fair allocation of responsibility.

These reservations do not negate the policy of mixed tenure housing but instead suggest that all aspects of the development need to be fully considered from the beginning.

Conclusions

Caution is needed about the claims and assumptions that a single approach can be adopted in all areas (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006, p.45). Mix is not a universal remedy for the problems of neighbourhoods.

> The notion of income mix and its benefits therefore needs to be unpicked for each local circumstance. It is not a panacea for low income communities and its impact will vary depending on who the better-off residents are. Benefits that cannot be gained through mix will need to be sought in other ways, including sustained public investment. (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.75)

Perhaps the best strategy is to create attractive housing and neighbourhoods which encourage residents to remain in their chosen area (Jupp, 1999, p.82), so that strong and cohesive communities evolve organically. In reality, people increasingly rely on a wide network of family and friends beyond their immediate neighbourhood (Jupp, 1999, p.82), have work and leisure contacts across a much wider area, and on average move house more frequently than in the past. It may be more effective to focus on transport and communications to ensure new neighbourhoods are well integrated in the wider urban fabric. Mix is a necessary but not a sufficient precondition for sustainable communities: "tenure mix by itself will not guarantee the success of a development" (Allen, et al., 2006, p.4) and "income mix does not alleviate the need for public funding" (Silverman, et al., 2005, p.71). Where tenure mix is adopted, careful attention needs to be paid to the design and layout of homes and their surroundings, the provision of the full range of facilities, as well as accessibility and integration into the wider locality.

About this paper

References

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

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

Atkinson, R. (2005) 'Neighbourhoods and the impacts of social mix: Crime, tenure diversification and assisted mobility', *CNR Paper 29*, Glasgow: ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.

Atkinson, R., and Kintrea, K. (2002) 'Area effects: What do they mean for British housing and regeneration policy?', *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 2(2), pp.147-166.

Bailey, N., Haworth, A, Manzi, T, Paranagamage, P, and Roberts, M. (2006) *Creating and Sustaining Mixed Income Communities: A Good Practice Guide.* Coventry/York: Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Bailey, N., Haworth, A, Manzi, and Roberts, M. (2007) *Creating and Sustaining Mixed Income Communities in Scotland: A Good Practice Guide.* Coventry/York: Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

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

Berube, A. (2005) *Mixed Communities in England: A US Perspective on Evidence and Policy Prospects.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Butler, T. (2003) 'Living in the bubble: Gentrification and its "others" in North London', *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, no.12, pp.2469-2486.

Casey, R., Coward, S., Allen, C. and Powell, R. (2007) 'On the planned environment and neighbourhood life: evidence from mixed-tenure housing developments twenty years on', *Town Planning Review*, 78 (3), pp.311-334.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) (2005a) *What Home Buyers Want: Attitudes and Decision Making Among Consumers.* London: CABE.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) (2005b) *What its Like to Live Here: The Views of Residents on the Design of New Housing.* London: CABE.

Communities and Local Government (CLG) (2006a) *Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing.* London: CLG.

Communities and Local Government (CLG) (2006b) *Code for Sustainable Homes: A Step-Change in Sustainable Home Building Practice.* London: CLG.

Communities and Local Government (CLG) (2006c) *Preparing Design Codes: a Practice Manual.* London: RIBA Publications.

Communities and Local Government (CLG) (2006d) *Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1.* London: CLG.

Casey, R., Coward, S., Allen, C. and Powell, R. (2007) 'On the planned environment and neighbourhood life', *Town Planning Review*, 78 (3), pp.311-334.

Cole, I. and Goodchild, B. (2001) 'Social mix and the balanced community in British housing policy – a tale of two epochs', *GeoJournal*, 51, pp.351-360.

DETR (2000) *Regeneration that Lasts: A Guide to Good Practice on Social Housing Estates.* London: DETR.

Doherty, J., Graham, E., Boyle, P., Hiscock, R. and Manley, D. (2006) *Is Mixed Tenure Good for Social Well Being?* Report to Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [unpublished]

EDAW, et al., (2005) *Upton Design Code (version 2).* London: English Partnerships, Northampton Borough Council and the Prince's Foundation.

Groves, R., Middleton, A., and Murie, A. (2003) *Neighbourhoods that Work: A Study of the Bournville Estate.* Bristol/York: The Policy Press and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

HACAS/Chapman Hendy (2004*) What Price Sustainability? Keeping Service Charges Affordable in High Density Mixed Tenure Development.* London: HACAS Chapman Hendy.

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

Hastings, A. and Dean, J. (2003) 'Challenging images: Tackling stigma through estate regeneration', *Policy and Politics*, 31(2), pp.171-184.

Home Office Community Cohesion Unit (2002) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team* London: Home Office.

Housing Corporation (2006) *Neighbourhood and Communities Strategy* London: the Housing Corporation.

Sparks, L., MacDonald, K., Lord Best and Marcus, P. (2001) *Masterplanning a New Community: Designs for a new town extension in York.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Kintrea, K. (2007) 'Policies and Programmes for Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods: Recent English Experience', *Housing Studies,* 22(2), pp.261-282.

Kleinhans, R. (2004) 'Social Implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: A Review of Recent Literature', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19, pp.367-390.

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

Kleinman (2000) 'Include me out? The new politics of place and poverty', *Policy Studies*, vol.21, no.1, pp.49-61.

Lees, L. (2003) 'Visions of "urban renaissance": the Urban Task Force Report and the Urban White Paper' in R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds.) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community and Urban Policy.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Manzi, T. and Smith-Bowers, W. (2004) 'So many managers, so little vision: Registered social landlords and consortium schemes in the UK', *European Journal of Housing Policy*, vol.4, no.1, pp.57-75.

Martin, G. and Watkinson, J. (2003) *Rebalancing Communities: Introducing mixed incomes into existing housing estates.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

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

Minton, A. (2002) *Building Balanced Communities: The US and the UK Compared.* London: Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.

Monk, S., Crook, D., Lister, D., Lovatt, R., Ni Luanaigh, A., Rowley, S. and Whitehead, C. (2006) *Delivering Affordable Housing through Section 106: Outputs and Outcomes*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Mumford, K. and Power, A. (2003) *East Enders: Family and Community in East London.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2000) *Our Towns and Cities: The Future.* London: ODPM.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2003) *Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future.* London: ODPM.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2005) *People, Places, Prosperity.* Cm.6425. London: ODPM.

Pawson, H. (2000) *Assessing the Impact of Tenure Diversification: The Case of Niddrie.* Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.

Roberts, M. (2007) 'Sharing space: Urban design and social mixing in mixed income communities'. *Planning Theory and Practice,* 8(2), pp.183-204.

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

Rogers, R. (1999) *Towards an Urban Renaissance: Final Report of the Urban Task Force.* London: E and FN Spon.

Rowlands, R., Murie, A. and Tice, A. (2006) *More than Tenure Mix: Developer and Purchaser Attitudes to New Housing Estates.* Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Federation.

Silburn, R., Lucas, D., Page, R. and Hanna, L. (1999) *Neighbourhood Images in Nottingham: Social cohesion and neighbourhood change.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Silverman, E., Lupton, R. and Fenton, A. (2005) *Mixed and Balanced Communities? Attracting and Retaining Families in Inner City Mixed Income Housing* Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

TCPA (2007) *Best Practice in Urban Extensions and New Settlements.* London: TCPA.

Tunstall, R. and Coulter, A. (2006) *Twenty Five Years on Twenty Estates: Turning the Tide?* Bristol: The Policy Press and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Tunstall, R. and Fenton, A. (2006) *In the Mix: A Review of Mixed Income, Mixed Tenure and Mixed Communities.* London: Housing Corporation, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and English Partnerships.

Varady, D., Raffal, J., Sweeny, S., and Denson, L (2005) 'Attracting middle-income families in the Hope VI public housing revitalization programme', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 27 (2), pp.149-164.

Wood, M. (2003) 'A balancing act? Tenure diversification in Australia and the UK', *Urban Policy and Research*, 21(1), pp.45-56.

Read more Round-ups at www.jrf.org.uk
Other formats available.
Tel: 01904 615905 email: info @jrf.org.uk

JOSEPH ROWNTREE FOUNDATION

Ref: 2295   **www.jrf.org.uk**