

Housing, Regeneration and Planning



The Scottish
Government

Mixed Communities Literature Review



social
research

MIXED COMMUNITIES LITERATURE REVIEW

**Sarah Monk, Anna Clarke and Connie P.Y. Tang
Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research
University of Cambridge**

Scottish Government Social Research
2011

This report is available on the Scottish Government Social Research website only www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch.

The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers.

© Crown Copyright 2011

Limited extracts from the text may be produced provided the source is acknowledged. For more extensive reproduction, please contact the Queens Printers of Scotland, Admail, ADM 4058, Edinburgh EH1 1NG. Email: licensing@oqps.gov.uk

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1 INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Definitions</i>	1
2 MIXED COMMUNITIES POLICIES IN THE UK	5
<i>Regeneration</i>	5
<i>Planning policy</i>	6
<i>The Scottish policy context</i>	6
3 THEORY OF SOCIAL MIX	8
4 GALSTER'S VIEW OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE BENEFITS OF SOCIAL MIX	10
<i>Does social mix improve equity?</i>	10
<i>The effects of social mix on society as a whole</i>	11
<i>The limitations of Galster's findings for Scottish policy</i>	12
5 EVIDENCE ON THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES	15
<i>Evidence on the problem</i>	15
<i>Evidence on addressing mix</i>	19
<i>Critical reviews</i>	24
<i>Evidence from outside the UK</i>	25
6 GAPS IN THE LITERATURE	28
<i>Methodological issues</i>	29
7 ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES	30
<i>Use of social housing lettings policies</i>	32
<i>Addressing the problems of poor areas directly</i>	32
<i>Sell social housing stock into owner-occupation</i>	33
<i>Sell social housing stock in areas where it dominates and invest proceeds purchasing it elsewhere</i>	34
<i>Improve social interaction among people within and between neighbourhoods</i>	34
8 CONCLUSIONS	36
<i>Aims of mixed communities policies</i>	36
<i>Evidence on whether aims are met in practice</i>	37
<i>The potential impact of abolition of Right to Buy</i>	38
<i>Galster's work and implications for Scotland</i>	38
<i>Alternative policies</i>	38
<i>Evidence on costs</i>	39
<i>Potential alternatives to mixed communities</i>	39
<i>Implications for policy in Scotland</i>	39
REFERENCES	41
ANNEX	
1 REVIEWS OF STUDIES INTO THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES	46
2 PRIMARY STUDIES AND SECONDARY DATA ANALYSES OF THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES	49

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- i. Social mix (or social balance) is thought to prevent or decrease societal problems, such as poverty and unemployment, or at least their concentration, and to avoid the stigmatisation of residents living in a specific neighbourhood (social mix is supposed to be achieved at neighbourhood level). This theory is based on the assumption that space has a deterministic effect on those who live in a specific area.
- ii. However, there are problems in defining what is meant by a mixed community. Is it income mix, ethnic mix, social mix or tenure mix? How mixed should the mix be? And at what spatial scale?
- iii. In the UK, a key focus has been on diluting or preventing concentrations of poverty that can arise from the spatial concentration of public housing. A further aim of UK governments has been to use tenure mix to achieve communities that are sustainable into the future.
- iv. A range of countries have made efforts to create mixed communities which are addressed in one of two ways: a) regeneration of existing estates; and b) planning policies for new housing developments.
- v. Galster's (2010) review of the evidence of mixed communities in the US, UK, Australia and Western Europe reported that there was some evidence that disadvantaged groups can benefit from social mix. His review of US evidence suggested that poverty rates above a threshold of around 15–20 per cent resulted in substantially higher levels of crime, extended poverty and unemployment. However, he found the evidence from Western Europe to be more varied. Overall, he suggested that mixing works best where the income differences are not too large.
- vi. The evidence in the UK seems to support the mixed tenure (as a proxy for mixed communities) approach to **new** developments. The evidence for increasing tenure mix in **existing** estates dominated by social housing or regeneration areas is less clear cut. In many cases, the operation of the Right to Buy has meant that estates are no longer mono-tenure, yet the residents (and their characteristics) have not changed and problematic poor areas remain.
- vii. Most empirical literature on mixed communities is based upon case studies, mainly using resident surveys and interviews. Although case studies have their merits, their results cannot be properly generalised. Almost all of the reviewed literature is based on cross-sectional measurement. Also, there is a lack of experimental design in policies and research.
- viii. The evidence on costs – financial, social and economic – in the literature is very limited. The costs of using mixed communities as part of regeneration of existing estates are very difficult to obtain. Social costs are inherently difficult to measure. Economic, or opportunity, costs are also hard to measure in financial terms because they involve questions of 'what if?' and so require

information not only on the financial costs of a mixed scheme but also of the alternatives on which those funds might have been spent.

- ix. Alternative policies to mixed communities that address problems associated with concentrations of poverty can be: a) social or sensitive lettings; b) addressing problems of poverty directly; c) selling social housing into owner occupation (e.g., Right to Buy); d) selling social housing in areas where it dominates and investing the proceeds to purchase new housing elsewhere; and e) improving mixing of existing residents between neighbourhoods through community initiatives or school allocation systems.
- x. This literature review on mixed communities concludes that there should be a range of policies to address the problems of concentrations of poverty, both in terms of avoiding the creation of new concentrations and addressing what is happening in existing neighbourhoods. Introducing mix as part of regeneration schemes can be successful if it is undertaken in a sensitive way with the full support of existing residents and minimum disruption, although this may be a tall order. The main conclusion is that mixed communities as a policy should not be seen as a panacea.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report reviews evidence on mixed communities and reflects on recent developments in this area of research, to inform thinking in Scotland. It is intended as a quick evidence review as opposed to a systematic review, and was conducted during November 2010. The literature review examines:
- Definitions and meanings of mixed or balanced communities;
 - The principles or theory behind the objectives of mixing communities, i.e., the problems it is intended to address and why;
 - The available evidence on whether mixed communities ‘work’, i.e., whether the objectives are met in practice;
 - A limited examination of the costs – financial, economic and social – of mixing communities;
 - Potential alternatives to addressing the problems identified; and
 - Policy implications of each element.
- 1.2 The report includes two annexes. Annex 1 summarises the findings from reviews of empirical studies, while Annex 2 summarises the findings from primary studies and secondary data analyses.

Definitions

- 1.3 One major problem when discussing mixed communities policy is that of defining them. There are questions about the concentration of the mix, its composition and spatial scale. Many studies are forced by data problems to analyse neighbourhoods at a very broad scale. It is therefore not surprising that many studies cannot discern the effects of mix, as it may be impossible to separate these out from other variables.
- 1.4 Lupton (2003) argues that quantitative studies fail to recognise the complex conceptualisation of neighbourhoods that are found in qualitative studies. Complex conceptualisations can get lost by the focus on weak conceptualisations. She argues that three broad understandings of neighbourhood emerge from qualitative research:
- a. Neighbourhood incorporates both people and place and the interactions between them create neighbourhood characteristics;
 - b. Neighbourhoods are not fixed, bounded entities nor are the objective characteristics of neighbourhoods experienced in the same way by all residents; and
 - c. Neighbourhoods cannot be seen in isolation – they are shaped by their relationship to other places as well as their internal features.
- 1.5 Looking at each of these in turn:

People and place

- 1.6 Lupton and Power (2002) describe neighbourhoods as having 'intrinsic' characteristics that are well established and hard to change, such as their housing stock and economic base. These determine who comes to live there – 'selection bias' (Harding 2002). However, the bigger challenge is to reflect that neighbourhoods are simultaneously physical and social. Disadvantaged people in an isolated area will form different social relations than those in a well connected area. The nature of social relations may impact on decisions to stay or move and on outcomes such as health and employment. So neighbourhoods are not fixed entities, but are constantly being recreated as the people simultaneously consume and produce them.

Size and boundaries

- 1.7 Massey (1994) states that neighbourhoods are overlapping sets of social relationships. Kearns and Parkinson (2001) suggest three levels – the home area, the locality and the urban district. Different boundaries of 'area' make sense for different aspects, e.g., relations with neighbours, with local school, with jobs search and travel to work.

Relation to the wider world

- 1.8 Atkinson and Kintrea (2001) find the biggest area effect was the perceived reputation of the area and its importance in structuring opportunities and experiences for residents. There was tension between how people spoke of their neighbourhood and how they thought it was perceived from outside.
- 1.9 The implications of these findings are that complex research design is needed to capture the mechanisms at work. Thus a successful quantitative study must:
- **Reflect both the idea that the 'poor might be bad for each other' and that 'the poor are systematically disadvantaged by living in areas with poor resources and weak comparative advantage'** (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001, page 8).
 - **Use appropriate boundaries that are relevant to the mechanisms being tested**, so unemployment should cover the wider travel to work area while peer group effects should be just a few streets. However, data constraints mean that the geographical units of analysis are often too large to have explanatory power. Burgess *et al.* (2001) used the US county covering 80,000 people which is too large an area for most of the identified mechanisms to operate (page 15). MacAllister *et al.* (2001) in contrast used bespoke neighbourhoods drawn around the homes of survey respondents.
 - **Reflect the different relationships between individuals and neighbourhoods.** The boundary problem arises, because people use social space in different ways for different activities. The neighbourhood for some uses is not the same as for another. Forrest and Kearns (2000) found that neighbourhood means more to some people than others. If

there is high unemployment, lone parents and poor pensioners in the area residents typically spend more time in the immediate vicinity of home than wealthier residents. So neighbourhood effects may be more marked in poor areas. Atkinson and Kintrea (1998) found social renters and owners on the same estates in Scotland had very different levels of interaction with neighbours. Renters' interactions were 60 per cent with their neighbours while owners' interactions were 75 per cent outside the neighbourhood.

- **Reflect relationships between neighbourhoods.** Most research examines 'within neighbourhood' effects assuming there is no interaction between neighbourhoods – so neighbourhoods with identical characteristics but with dissimilar relationships to other neighbourhoods are treated as identical.

1.10 In other words, quantitative studies have to be sufficiently sophisticated to measure the complexity of the neighbourhood or they risk finding no neighbourhood effects simply because they failed to find them (Lupton 2003).

1.11 In a paper aimed at assisting planners of mixed communities, Galster (2010) argues that the concept of "social mix" is slippery, and that particular attention must be paid to:

- Composition – on what basis are people being mixed: ethnicity, race, religion, immigrant status, income, housing tenure all, or some of these?
- Concentration – what is the amount of mixing in question? What amounts of which groups comprise the ideal mix, or are minimally required to produce the desired outcome?
- Scale – over what level(s) of geography should the relevant mix be measured? Does mixing at different spatial scales involve different causal processes and yield different outcomes?

1.12 There has been considerable variation in the components of mix that projects are concerned with. Table 1.1, below, sets out the main types used in different studies.

Table 1.1 Components of mixed communities

	Mixed household type	Mixed income	Mixed tenure	Others	Applied to
DoE, 1995			✓		England & Wales
Schwartz & Tajbakhsh, 1997		✓			USA
DETR, 1998	?	?	?		England
Social Exclusion Unit, 1998				Employed & unemployed	England
Urban Task Force, 1999			✓	Uses & activities	UK
DETR, 2000	✓				England
Ostendorf, Musterd & De Vos, 2001			✓	Low-quality & high quality houses	Amsterdam
Martin & Watkinson, 2003		✓	✓		England
ODPM, 2003	✓	✓	✓		England
Andersson, Bråmås & Holmqvist, 2010	✓	✓			Sweden
Baum, Arthurson & Rickson, 2010		✓	✓	Mix of racial or ethnic backgrounds	Australia
DCLG, 2010	✓		✓		UK
Livingstone, Bailey & Kearns, 2010			✓	Mix of ethnicity	England
Tunstall & Lupton, 2010		✓	✓		UK

1.13 Whilst income mix has been the major focus internationally, the UK has seen a particular focus on tenure mix. Cole and Goodchild (2001) comment, “The current policy agenda emphasises individual social mobility and is designed to combat those forces that prevent such mobility. Likewise, there is little mention of policies to change the social characteristics of social housing as a tenure” (p. 355).

2 MIXED COMMUNITIES POLICIES IN THE UK

- 2.1 Most countries, including the UK, have active housing and social mix programmes as an important part of their current housing policies. However, such programmes seldom make clear what mix is desirable and appropriate, only that mix is good. Mixed tenure policy in the UK appeared to develop in the late 1980s, after a period from 1979 to 1988, when a substantial set of policy tools focussed on tenure mixing or 'diversification' in local authority estates.
- 2.2 A range of countries have made efforts to create mixed communities which focus on two key strands of work: i) regeneration; and ii) planning policies for new housing. These are discussed further below.

Regeneration

- 2.3 In Europe, there have been large-scale investments aimed at restructuring large, homogeneous, post-war neighbourhoods and housing estates (through selective demolition, infill construction and the sale of social or public housing) so that they contain a greater diversity of housing types by price range and tenure. The dominant approach is to combine low-income and higher income households in the same development. Although smaller in scale, the redevelopment of US public housing developments as mixed-income complexes through the HOPE VI programme¹ is strategically comparable. Also, it is now required in several jurisdictions in both Europe and the US that new, larger-scale residential developments must set aside a minimum share of the dwelling units for social housing.
- 2.4 Some social housing agencies are now beginning to take social modelling through allocations a step further, through adopting techniques of 'estate profiling'. This requires the landlord to devise a 'profile' of the ideal social and economic structure of their neighbourhoods, according to a set of indicators that can be regularly updated and monitored. This represents a move from the 'negative screening' of exclusion to more direct attempts at social engineering (Cole *et al.*, 2001).
- 2.5 Tenure diversification in England was first introduced under Estate Action, the major English council estate improvement scheme of the late 1980s and early 1990s. Other urban regeneration programmes have also promoted the insertion of home ownership and housing association homes into areas dominated by council renting. Alongside the Right to Buy (RTB), which increased levels of home ownership in council estates, successive governments have actively promoted a range of other low cost home ownership initiatives, and schemes for building homes for housing associations, shared ownership and direct sale to replace or add to council homes. Recently, housing associations have started to develop homes for rent at market rates to supplement income, in some cases inserted into areas

¹ HOPE VI is a major US programme intended to revitalise the worst public housing projects into mixed-income developments. It began in 1992, with formal recognition in law in 1998. As of June 1, 2010, there had been 254 HOPE VI Revitalisation grants awarded to 132 housing authorities since 1993.

dominated by social housing to mix tenure. The effect of these policies was to increase tenure mix within council estates. The RTB scheme has been a popular option for existing tenants, but has not always had the effect of maintaining a mixed-income community. There are concerns that in some areas properties may have been purchased and then sold on to private landlords, which could result in poor maintenance.

Planning policy

- 2.6 Planning policy throughout the UK has increasingly sought to create 'mix' by inserting social housing into new developments intended mainly for home ownership. Planning legislation in both Scotland and the rest of Britain has sought to encourage mixed tenure developments, rather than large scale building by social landlords.

The Scottish policy context

- 2.7 As in the rest of the UK, tenure has been a key focus of mix in Scotland. Wilcox *et al.* (2010, p. 20) note that the degree of tenure polarisation in Scotland is far less marked than in the other three countries of the UK – England, Wales and Northern Ireland. This means that there are fewer areas dominated by owner occupation. However, there are still plenty of areas that have largely public housing.

- 2.8 A range of policies and guidance directly and indirectly focus on the Scottish Government's commitment to the creation of mixed communities:

*"Both central and local government agree that sustainable, mixed communities must be one of our key priorities for future housing supply and investment."*²

- 2.9 In February 2011 the Scottish Government published a new housing strategy, *Homes Fit for the 21st Century* which sets out its vision for 2020 and its strategic approach. As part of its commitment to mixed communities, the strategy includes

*"encouraging multi-tenure housing developments with developments for private sale or rent cross-subsidising the social rented sector"*³

- 2.10 The strategy points out the need for a strong private housebuilding sector that is a vital part of the Scottish economy. It improves affordability and reduces the pressure on social housing:

*"A strong housebuilding sector can also work with social landlords to developer mixed tenure communities."*⁴

- 2.11 The new housing strategy also states that:

² <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/regeneration/mixedcommunities/policy>

³ Scottish Government (2011) page 7, para. 6.

⁴ Scottish Government (2011) page 10, para 18.

*“We will adopt a **tenure neutral** approach, seeking sustainable choices for all rather than encouraging one particular tenure, and promoting mixed tenure communities.”⁵*

- 2.12 **The Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative** was launched in 2008. It focuses on both the environmental and social sustainability of new development. Innovative new proposals were invited to bid for assistance with master-planning and support progressing plans through the regulatory system.
- 2.13 The current planning framework is set out in **Scottish Planning Policy 3 (SPP3) – Planning for Homes** (Scottish Government, 2008a) which states that:
- “Scottish Government policy encourages more diverse, attractive and mixed-use residential communities, in terms of tenure, demographic and income. As far as possible, the tenure of housing should be indiscernible from its design, quality or appearance.”*
- 2.14 **Planning Policy Advice Note 74: Affordable Housing** (Scottish Government 2005) sets out the framework in which local authorities can require developers to ensure that a proportion of new housing developments are ‘affordable’ and sets a benchmark figure of 25 per cent to apply in most cases. Affordable is defined broadly to include housing build without subsidy such as entry level housing for sale, as long as it is affordable to groups identified in a local housing needs assessment. This mechanism therefore sets out a process both for the subsidy of affordable housing through the market, and also for ensuring that new developments include a mix of affordable and market housing, which may well include a tenure mix.
- 2.15 **Planning Advice Note 83** (Scottish Government, 2008b) outlines the importance of master-planning in achieving successful and sustainable places and provides advice on good practice.
- 2.16 The Scottish Government’s **Mixed and Sustainable Communities Learning Network** is a cross-Government initiative focussed on regeneration efforts to improve creation and management of mixed communities.
- 2.17 Scottish housing policy on mixed communities has been criticised by McIntyre and McKee (2009). They argue that policies of mixed communities in Scotland have acted to promote home ownership to marginal groups which may not be such a great idea now that there is a recession. At the same time, mixed communities policy has worked to further problematise social tenants who are seen as requiring role models from home owners to encourage them to participate in the labour market, or in other words to behave according to the social norms of the more affluent (McIntyre and McKee, 2009).

⁵ Scottish Government (2011) page 30, para 82.

3 THEORY OF SOCIAL MIX

- 3.1 The theory of social mix (or social balance) suggests that a socially mixed population is beneficial for a neighbourhood. Social mix is thought to prevent or decrease societal problems such as poverty and unemployment, or at least their concentration, and to avoid the stigmatisation of residents living in a specific neighbourhood (social mix is supposed to be achieved at neighbourhood level). This theory is based on the assumption that space has a deterministic effect on those who live in a specific area, even if empirical research shows that is not necessarily the case. Nevertheless, the perspective of social mix has been adopted in many political programmes in different countries.
- 3.2 Lupton (2003) summarises the potential benefits of mixed communities as follows:
- Access to beneficial networks and role models.
 - Sufficient income to support private services.
 - Sufficient influence to lobby for better public services.
 - Collective capacity to uphold social norms and regulate crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB).
- 3.3 Kearns and Mason (2007, Fig. 1) summarised four potential effects of mixed communities:
- **Better public and private services** – related to the latter, more local economic activity and increased local employment.
 - **Improved behaviours of residents** previously living in excluded social housing areas should improve – both in relation to crime and anti-social behaviour and in terms of the upkeep of housing and the local environment. The impacts upon behaviours and aspirations should feed into enhanced educational outcomes for local young people.
 - **Community-level effects** – an enhanced sense of community and place attachment, partly stemming from increased social interaction among neighbours who no longer fear public space occupied by anti-social neighbours. There would also be greater housing opportunities within the local area and a consequent reduction in residential turnover and its disruptive effects.
 - **Reduced stigma** associated with mono-tenure estates – neighbourhoods would be reconnected to their surrounding areas and the wider urban area; and information and useful intelligence, for example, about employment opportunities and other relevant developments, would be passed between residents with different connections and knowledge.

- 3.4 Concentrations of poverty are often thought to be related to *neighbourhood effects* which are defined as systematic observable changes to outcomes (such as employment, educational attainment, health, income) that are attributed to the neighbourhood's characteristics in addition to individual characteristics.
- 3.5 Silverman *et al.* (2006) discuss a number of possible neighbourhood effects from concentrations of poverty and the assumed benefits of mixed communities, as shown in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Scope of neighbourhood effects

Assumed neighbourhood effects of concentrated poverty	Assumed benefits of mixed communities
<p>Arising from lack of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of private sector facilities such as shops and banks • High demands on public services, and poor quality • Poor reputation • High crime and anti-social behaviour 	<p>Arising from availability of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More money to support facilities • Fewer demands on public services, particularly schools • More cultural and social capital to shape improved provision • Improved reputation • Less motivation for crime and anti-social behaviour
<p>Arising from limited interaction between groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure to disaffected peer groups • Isolation from job finding or health providing networks for adults 	<p>Arising from greater interaction between groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure to aspirational peer groups • Access to more advantaged and aspirational networks

Source: Silverman *et al.* (2006)

- 3.6 Glossop (2008) suggests that the aim of mixed communities is to create neighbourhoods that are able to attract and retain households on a wide range of incomes and avoid segregation and concentrations of poverty by providing a range of different housing types and tenures.

4 GALSTER'S REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE BENEFITS OF SOCIAL MIX

- 4.1 American economist George Galster has carried out a substantial body of work reviewing the evidence on the benefits of social mix in an international context. This section examines the findings he draws out and looks at their relevance for the UK and in particular for Scotland.
- 4.2 A recent paper (Galster, 2010) examines the main findings from the literature in the US, UK, Australia and Western Europe to explore what is known about the benefits of social mix. The focus is on providing better information for planners to engage with; he does not therefore look in any detail at the mechanisms by which mix might be achieved in existing areas. The focus is also largely on income mix.
- 4.3 In terms of the rationale for social mix, Galster differentiates between *equity* and *efficiency* goals.
- 4.4 For social mix to be justified on equity grounds it must therefore be the case that:
- Disadvantaged people suffer additional harm from having disadvantaged neighbours AND/OR;
 - Disadvantaged people benefit from having advantaged neighbours AND/OR;
 - Concentrations of disadvantaged people in a neighbourhood bring about further disadvantages to the residents because of stigma and/or resource restrictions.
- 4.5 To be justified on efficiency grounds a policy such as increasing social mix would have to bring about aggregate improvements in well-being across all members of society. The Hicks-Kaldor compensation principle is a necessary condition: financial winners must exceed financial losers (or at least be able to compensate them). It is therefore necessary to examine not just the potential positive effects on the disadvantaged, but also whether these may be outweighed by any negative effects on advantaged groups arising from having disadvantaged neighbours.

Does social mix improve equity?

- 4.6 From his examination of the evidence for increasing social mix on the grounds of equity, Galster concludes that:
- There are numerous studies from the US and Europe suggesting that living in a deprived neighbourhood impacts negatively on residents, in particular on young people, and that this derives from peer group effects and negative role models.

- There is substantial evidence that social mix is insufficient to induce substantial interaction between different social groups, especially if there are also racial differences.
- Evidence from Sweden suggests that disadvantaged groups benefit most from middle-income neighbours, possibly because they form more useful role models than the very rich.
- Neighbourhood stigmatisation is an important process in Europe, but the evidence is unclear as to whether this can be effectively addressed by increasing social mix.

4.7 Overall, Galster concludes that there is some evidence that disadvantaged groups can benefit from social mix, but this is most likely in cases where the social gulf between neighbours is not too large.

The effects of social mix on society as a whole

4.8 There is substantially less literature that explicitly addresses the issue of whether social mix improves aggregate levels of well-being, or that looks specifically at the effects of mix on the advantaged. The findings that do exist are mixed. Some studies suggest benefits (such as from reduced prejudice between ethnic groups); some suggest disadvantage (making it harder to find a job in areas where people have unemployed neighbours) and others find no measurable impact.

4.9 In order to explore the overall benefits of social mix, Galster draws attention to studies that examine the relationship between levels of disadvantaged residents and overall outcomes. If the relationship is non-linear this suggests there may be optimal levels of mix which confer overall benefits, or possibly thresholds above which levels of deprivation bring about additional disadvantages to overall outcomes for a neighbourhood.

4.10 Galster's review of US evidence suggested that poverty rates above a threshold of around 15-20 per cent resulted in substantially higher levels of crime, extended poverty and unemployment. However, the evidence from Western Europe is more mixed, with some studies detecting no non-linear relationships and others detecting highly inconsistent types of relationship. Clearer evidence was found of a non-linear relationship between poverty levels and property values.

4.11 Overall, Galster concludes that the evidence on there being a non-linear relationship between poverty levels and outcomes suggests that highly segregated neighbourhoods would be socially less efficient than more mixed ones. He also argues that the evidence (in the USA at least) suggests that levels of disadvantaged groups which remain below around 15-20 per cent do not create measurable negative effects for neighbourhoods.

The limitations of Galster's findings for Scottish policy

- 4.12 Galster's review of the evidence on the benefits of mixed communities has a strong focus on the overall relationship between levels of (income) mixing and outcomes, drawing on international evidence. There are however, several limitations to the findings from the study and in its relevance to the UK or Scottish context:
- a. As with all studies of this type, it is not possible to identify the direction of causation. If neighbourhoods with high rates of poverty suffer disproportionate problems, this does not necessarily mean these problems have arisen as a result of the concentration of poor people. It could, for instance, occur because the neighbourhoods in question are far removed physically from job opportunities or contain poor quality housing stock. It is not always possible to allow for all potential extraneous factors in regression analysis.
 - b. It is largely focussed on providing useful advice for planners planning new housing developments, with less attention to the mechanisms that would be needed to increase social/income mix within existing residential areas. The recent DCLG study (DCLG, 2010a) has highlighted some of the serious challenges encountered by ambitious efforts to make substantial changes to the tenure mix of existing areas. Cole and Green's (2010) study of living with change includes a case study of Oxfords in Edinburgh, but the findings are not significantly different from the other three case studies apart from a lower proportion of ethnic minorities in Oxfords compared to West Kensington or Burnley, but similar to Manchester (Huyton).
 - c. Any review of different studies, such as this, suffers from difficulties when studies employ very different spatial scales. Galster argues, as do most commentators, that mix should ideally be achieved at a small spatial scale – a few hundred households. However, some of the evidence on which his review depends uses evidence from much larger areas and should therefore be interpreted with caution. The degree to which mixed communities might benefit people depends on the scale over which they are mixed. Good practice in planning systems in the UK generally recommends mixing at the level of the development ("pepper-potting") to avoid neighbourhood stigma (Monk *et al.*, 2005, p. 20). Regeneration efforts tend to focus too on deprived neighbourhoods.
 - d. The Galster study draws widely on international evidence, which means that most of the evidence comes from countries that differ from Scotland in important respects:
 - i. The focus of much of the US literature is on the racial and income mix of areas and in much of Europe it is more about concentrations of immigrants, neither of which are major factors in the discussion around mixed communities in Scotland. Some of the observed benefits from increasing social mix may therefore not apply in the Scottish context.

- ii. The US, where the most solid evidence for the existence of maximum threshold levels of poverty comes from, has much higher levels of absolute poverty and a more unequal income distribution than other developed countries such as the UK. There is also a much greater spatial concentration of poverty, even when relative levels of poverty are compared.⁶
 - iii. Tenure mix, which is a key focus of the debate in the UK, is not considered explicitly, and is not an important part of the debate in many other countries, such as the US.
- e. The confounding effects of different tenure, welfare and planning systems need to be considered before adopting this as the basis for action in any given context. For instance, a greater degree of tenure mix can be achieved by selling off social housing stock, yet this may conflict with a policy goal of reducing levels of housing need or improving affordability. Another example where there may be a conflict of goals is the issue of parental choice in education systems in the UK, if parents choose to send their children to schools with others from the same social group particularly, in Scotland, in the case of faith schools.
 - f. Galster argues that academics should not prioritise between equity and efficiency arguments for a mixed communities policy as this is a value judgement. If, for instance, a mixed communities policy benefited a small number of poorer people but at a high overall cost and to the detriment of the rest of society, it could be justified on equity grounds but not on overall grounds of efficiency. These are decisions which politicians need to make.
 - g. Galster does not explore what the alternative policies might be to seeking to create mixed communities. Yet, arguably, a policy could only really be considered to be justified on either efficiency or equity grounds if its results couldn't be achieved more effectively by other means. Cheshire (2007, 2008), for instance, argues that the evidence on poorer people benefiting from mixed communities other than from the general improvements to their homes, the environment, schools etc. is very weak. These general improvements can be made without mixing communities, and a reallocation of resources in favour of poor people would be a more efficient and targeted policy.

4.13 Nevertheless, there are several findings from Galster's review which could usefully help inform policy in Scotland:

⁶ Data on benefit-dependent working age households (which comprise 16.6% of households in Scotland) indicate that no wards in Scotland contain over 50 per cent benefit-dependent households and just one per cent of the 1,222 wards contain over 40 per cent (mostly in Glasgow), with a total of 6.6 per cent containing over 30 per cent (source: poverty.org.uk). In contrast, data from the US on child poverty rates show that, at school district level (at a larger spatial scale than UK wards), 0.3 per cent contain over 50 per cent of children in poverty, 1.4 per cent contain over 40 per cent and 7.1 per cent over 30 per cent (source: census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/schools/data/2008.html).

- a. Planners need to be aware what kind of mix they are seeking to create, why, how it will occur, and whether there might be any other goals which might conflict with creating more mixed communities. There are also value judgements to be made about the benefits accruing to different groups.
- b. There are few, if any, measurable negative effects on neighbourhoods from accommodating a small proportion of poorer people.
- c. The evidence on the precise proportion of poorer people that can be accommodated without causing negative effects on the area, and at which spatial scale the proportion matters, is not clear.
- d. Social mixing is likely to be most effective between groups that are not too dissimilar.

5 EVIDENCE ON THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES

5.1 This section discusses more than 15 studies or reviews that relate specifically to the UK, looking at evidence on: the problem intended to be addressed by mixing; attempting mix; and critical reviews on mixed communities. The section concludes by looking at selected recent studies that provide evidence on mixed communities from outside the UK.

Evidence on the problem

Neighbourhood effects

- 5.2 There is an ongoing debate about neighbourhood effects. Their supposed existence has underpinned policy measures to create more mixed neighbourhoods, and for example, the Greater London Authority's strategic plan highlights the intention to 'break down the walls of social ghettos by encouraging mixed tenure across all of London's estates' (Greater London Authority, 2010, Part 1, page 11). Whether mixed communities actually deliver benefits is however a highly disputed area.
- 5.3 A key problem with measuring the effects of mixed or non-mixed communities is that poor and disadvantaged people tend to move to cheap or unpopular areas, or those dominated by social housing. Feinstein *et al.* (2008) however found significant residual impacts after controlling for the characteristics of social housing tenants, which they argue illustrates the existence of neighbourhood effects in explaining the disadvantage of particular populations. These can be:
- Place effects – arising from poor infrastructure and services, lack of transport, and lack of local employment opportunities.
 - People effects – relating to the damaging effect of living with a high proportion of other workless people, including limited information about jobs and lack of positive role models.
- 5.4 However, they advise caution – it has not been demonstrated that changing an area from a social housing to a mixed tenure or mixed income area will remove the effects, as compared with shifting people with the greatest needs to other areas.
- 5.5 Propper *et al.* (2007) used the first ten waves of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) covering 1991–2000 to examine the impact of neighbourhood on the income of individuals living in social housing in the UK. A sample size of over 5,500 households covered more than 10,000 people. They observed no differences in the inverse relationship between residence in the most disadvantaged neighbourhood quartile and the individual's income level ten years hence across age, gender, education and ethnic groups, although income growth over this period appeared more attenuated by neighbourhood disadvantage for whites than for non-whites.

- 5.6 Lupton *et al.* (2009) undertook a cohort study of people in social housing and found some associations between childhood housing tenure and later disadvantage, for those born in the later 1970 cohort although there was no clear evidence that there is something inherent in social housing that causes disadvantage. They also point out the difficulty of separating ‘tenure effects’ from wider bundles of characteristics associated with particular tenures, such as location, area, cost, quality and status. So, although there were negative impacts associated with housing tenure for people born in 1970, these might be due to other factors. There may be significant place effects, for instance, where social housing is located in the wrong places for current economic activities, or the impact of personal factors (people entering social housing as a result of trauma in their lives or other unmeasured disadvantage). There is a lack of research on whether the effects related to social housing apply similarly in large estates dominated by social housing and to pepper potted social housing.
- 5.7 There is a correlation between the concentration of poor people in social housing and lower levels of employment and economic output but this does not prove a direct causal link. Tenants on low earnings can find they are in a poverty trap in which the marginal gains from entering work are reduced to close to zero (Glossop, 2008). However, the poverty trap is a function of people having low earning power, related to lower levels of workplace skills, rather than the tenure.

Is social housing the problem?

- 5.8 In a section on Housing and Poverty, Regeneris and Oxford Economics (2010) look at the association of poor housing with crime and anti-social behaviour and at the increasing segregation of people into sink areas in which social problems are concentrated. Much of the debate focuses on the social rented sector into which those in greatest need have become concentrated in recent decades, although many of the observed effects also occur in cheaper private rented and owner occupied stock. While there is consensus on some issues, there is debate on the extent to which negative outcomes result from sub-standard housing, neighbourhood effects or simply reflect the fact that the people who move into it are poor.
- 5.9 DTZ (2006) similarly note that one side effect of Right to Buy legislation and the falling number of social homes has been that social landlords increasingly have had to let only to those in greatest need. This has led to greater concentration of workless households in social housing and in turn, to a greater concentration of poverty and deprivation in areas with the least attractive and poorest quality social housing.
- 5.10 Hills (2007) also highlights this, and points out that there is far less movement between tenures than in and out of private renting – more than 80 per cent of social tenants today were also social tenants ten years ago.
- 5.11 Hills (2007) also notes the relationship between social housing and a lack of job mobility, but Feinstein *et al.* (2008) point out that this is contested, and the strongest argument that can be made on the basis of the available evidence is

that some people may be constrained in their geographical mobility by their tenure.

- 5.12 Using the Survey of English Housing, Kearns and Mason (2007) analysed the effects of housing tenures and housing tenure mix upon the incidence of serious problems and on the desire for local service improvements within neighbourhoods in England. Their findings indicated that the level of social renting is a more important influence upon neighbourhood conditions than the degree of tenure mixing. They found that 'balanced communities' in tenure terms offer no guarantee that neighbourhood problems will be reduced. Such findings provide more support for tenure dispersal policies and less for tenure dilution strategies, such as promoting a modest degree of owner occupation on social housing estates.

Lack of mix as a cause of neighbourhood problems?

- 5.13 Bramley and Power (2009) use data from the Survey of English Housing to examine the relationships between key aspects of urban form, density and housing type, and selected social sustainability outcomes while controlling for other socio-demographic factors. They found that more dense (compact) urban forms, and their associated housing types, tend to be associated with somewhat worse outcomes in terms of dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood and the incidence of neighbourhood problems. The study also confirms other work showing that neighbourhood concentrations of poverty and social rented housing are often more strongly associated with adverse social outcomes than urban form per se. In other words, who lives where within the urban form and with what resources and choices may be critical to making urban communities work (p. 46).
- 5.14 A national level study covering Great Britain (i.e. including Scotland) used census data to investigate the relationship between mixed tenure and social well-being (Graham *et al.*, 2009). Social well-being was measured by means of unemployment, limiting long-term illness, standardised mortality and premature mortality. Mixed tenure was defined as being between 10 per cent and 70 per cent social renting meaning that the "mono-tenure" areas in the analysis are a mixture of those with over 70 per cent social renting (of which there are very few), and those with less than 10 per cent. This seems a strange comparison to be making, since there has never been much policy concern with mono-tenure neighbourhoods where the dominant tenure is owner-occupation. It also means that the category of mono-tenure neighbourhoods in fact contains the two extremes of levels of social housing, though in very different proportions. The data presented suggests that over 98 per cent of mono-tenure areas are in fact neighbourhoods with over 90 per cent owner-occupation.
- 5.15 The analysis applied a regression analysis to the data. Having factored in variables including the percentage of social renting, overcrowding, rates of vacant housing, demographics, social class and rates of car ownership, the study found little correlation between social well-being and whether a neighbourhood was mixed tenure. However, there was some evidence to suggest that levels of social renting of over 60 per cent were somewhat

correlated with negative outcomes, and levels of under 30 per cent with positive outcomes (Graham *et al.*, 2009).

5.16 Fordham and Cole (2009) undertook primary research on mixed communities. They selected nine case studies to provide examples of estate transformation involving wider regeneration and renewal. These ranged from existing large social housing estates to ex-mining and iron works villages, to new build on brownfield sites. Three sets of issues constantly emerged from the case studies:

- The definition of a mixed community. Most stakeholders simply assumed it was restricted to mean mixed tenure.
- Mixed communities may or may not be a necessary condition for neighbourhood transformation, but it certainly is not sufficient.
- Communities are dynamic, but not enough attention is paid to sustaining them over time.

5.17 The study found that while it was difficult to assess outcomes, in all the case studies where work had started, housing refurbishment, new build and environmental improvements had increased demand for both rented and for sale property. There were significant price rises, faster than in the surrounding district. This reflects the traditional housing cycle where prices of lower value housing lag the higher value housing market, but meant that new build was taking place at the right time.

5.18 Employment and incomes increased but only to reflect the nature of the incomers, not those of the original residents. Data on crime and safety showed mixed results – there was a reduction in some types of offences and surveys showed that fear of crime had fallen. The relationship between the quality of local schools and place making was not quantifiable because school catchment areas were wider than the mixed communities and incomers were reluctant to change their children's schools.

5.19 In conclusion, Fordham and Cole (2009) found nothing to undermine the idea that de-concentrating deprivation is useful. However, they caution that mixed communities policies have limits. Most of the case study areas are still relatively deprived because of the nature of the mix – mixing the very poor with the slightly less poor – and evidence of the impact on the original residents is limited, especially where they leave the area, as around half never returned and nothing is known about what happened to them.

5.20 Fordham and Cole argue that the lack of understanding of the policy objectives was reflected in the failure to connect housing with regeneration and job creation. It was clear that the processes of residential sorting mean that segregation is deeply ingrained, so mixed communities policies are trying to counter very powerful forces. The study concluded that there is no 'one size fits all' and success depends on the local context, particularly location and the travel to work area. Connectedness is important for residents to access jobs (Fordham and Cole, 2009).

Neighbourhood attachment and ethnic mix

- 5.21 Research has also explored whether residents in mixed communities have a greater attachment to their neighbourhood. Livingstone, Bailey and Kearns (2010) used qualitative methods to examine in depth the nature of place attachment in four contrasting case study neighbourhoods in Northern England at the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007. Case study areas were located in one city-region (Greater Manchester in Northern England). The four case study areas were neighbourhoods which all had relatively high concentrations of deprivation, but were designed to have contrasting levels of turnover and of social mix in terms of tenure and ethnicity. In total, 40 interviews (ten in each case study) were undertaken, and the sample was limited to adults aged 20–40. Respondents in the stable/high ethnic mix area almost universally identified ethnic mix as positive in itself and as not having a negative influence on their attachment to their neighbourhood.
- 5.22 White respondents expressed a tolerance for non-White groups while those from minority ethnic groups indicated few problems with (White) neighbours. Ethnic mix was viewed much more negatively in the area selected as unstable/low mix where there had been rapid change in recent years with a growth in the minority ethnic population since the Census (p. 422).
- 5.23 Overall, the authors concluded that there was little evidence that social mix in any dimension reduced attachment significantly. However, high residential turnover and a rapidly changing (ethnic) mix in one area had led to increased anxieties and reduced attachments. The research showed that rather than systemic factors being dominant, place attachment in deprived areas is very context dependent (e.g., in terms of where the neighbourhood is located in relation to others). For an individual, experiential, historical and personal factors are also strong determinants of attachment.

Evidence on addressing mix

Mixed communities created through the planning system

- 5.24 The use of the planning system to deliver new affordable housing has been seen as highly successful in England. Not only does it appear to lever in additional funding from the developer or landowner, but also it contributed to mixed communities, provided the affordable housing is built on the same site as the market housing. However, it has been suggested that the developer contribution is not necessarily 'additional' in the sense of reducing the need for public grant, as the vast majority of units required grant in addition to the developer contribution (Monk *et al.*, 2005). Rather, the main impact of the policy in England has been to change the geography of new affordable housing by delivering it in more expensive areas.
- 5.25 Another study based on England found some evidence that developers accept the policy of providing affordable housing on market sites provided the proportions of social housing are not too high, although it is not clear how this is defined (CCHPR and the University of Sheffield, 2005). The study also found that off-site provision of affordable housing delivered more units than

on-site provision on a greenfield site, but that this did not contribute to mixed communities. The most successful schemes were seen as those where the affordable housing was indistinguishable from the market housing, which generally meant that the private developer built out the entire site and then sold a proportion of homes to a housing association at a discounted price. However, developers remain convinced that the presence of social rented housing in a market scheme has an adverse impact on house prices and makes the units more difficult to sell. It is also argued that housing associations dislike “pepper potting” as it increases maintenance and service costs. It is more difficult to achieve in blocks of flats where service charges are a real issue for social tenants.

- 5.26 In Scotland, the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (s75) “gives planning authorities the power to enter into agreements with landowners for the purpose of restricting or regulating the development or use of the land, either permanently or during such period as may be prescribed by the agreement. In addition, they may contain such incidental and consequential provisions (including financial ones) as appear to the planning authority to be necessary or expedient for the purposes of the agreement”. Not all agreements entered into under this legislation involve a developer contribution. Many are used just to regulate the use of a development, for instance by ensuring that houses built for agricultural workers can only be occupied by those working in agriculture, or restricting the range of goods that can be sold in a retail park (McMaster *et al.*, 2008, p. 9).
- 5.27 The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (section 69) gives local authorities the power to enter into agreements in order to facilitate the discharge of any of their functions. It can be implemented through a simple Minute of Agreement between parties and can be used for developer contributions where a single up-front payment is made, without the need to register the Agreement for application to the land in perpetuity (*ibid*, p. 10). Fenton (2010) found that in practice more affordable homes were delivered through section 69 than section 75. This is probably because section 69 agreements are used where there is a one-off contribution whereas section 75 which runs when the land is required on larger developments where there are phased contributions. Such large schemes are presumably less common than smaller ones where section 69 is used.
- 5.28 In terms of the contribution to mixed communities, Fenton (2010) found that new social housing delivered through the planning system was also more likely to be located in more expensive, less deprived areas than that delivered with grant funding alone. However, Scottish local authorities were more likely to accept commuted payments in lieu of affordable housing in these more expensive areas. This would seem to reduce the contribution of section 75 to mixed communities because the new affordable housing is not on the same site as the market housing.
- 5.29 Bramley and Morgan (2003) found that new private house building in Greater Glasgow had been quite successful at diversifying tenure in some areas previously dominated by social housing, and hence at shifting middle-income residents into poor areas. Of course, introducing owner occupation into

deprived social housing estates would help to 'thin' indices of deprivation. This might suggest that the poor had become better off, when in fact this was a simple statistical effect of introducing better off people to the area and so raising average incomes.

Outcomes of policies to create mix in existing areas

- 5.30 Allen *et al.* (2005) studied three mature mixed tenure communities that had been in existence for 20 years and reported that mixed tenure had produced 'ordinary' places and countered tenure prejudice. Despite some deprivation associated with tenants of affordable housing, demand for housing in all tenures and all three localities remained high. The study concluded that some of the claims for mixed tenure were probably exaggerated. There was little evidence of transfer of know-how between neighbours or that owner occupiers acted as role models. But, many of the children interviewed had friends from different backgrounds and others stressed that they had a broader outlook because of the mix of people they knew at school. This raises the question of whether it is school mixing rather than simply tenure mixing that is important.
- 5.31 Silverman *et al.* (2006) examined four inner city mixed income new communities: two in low-income areas (in Glasgow and Manchester) and two on regenerated brownfield sites (in, London). The main focus of this study was on the middle income families living in the market homes since families are generally seen as preferring to live in the suburbs (if they can afford to) rather than the inner city. Although only 12 per cent of the residents were families with children, they lived in flats and maisonettes, something that surprised the developers. Of the two London communities, Greenwich had been more successful in attracting and retaining families than Britannia particularly due to the primary school, open space provision and a clean and safe environment. In Britannia, there was less integration between tenures (so that the social housing was separated and obviously different) and household incomes were highly polarised.
- 5.32 Atkinson and Kintrea (2000) investigated the social networks of renters and owners in housing estates with a view to assessing whether renting households were socially isolated, and the potential for new owner occupiers to change the social networks that exist. It involved the completion of diaries which required residents to record their daily activities over a period of seven days. The diaries were supplemented by interviews in which issues of territoriality, social mix and isolation were explored to see whether tenants mixed with the new owners, and vice versa. The study focussed on three estates in Paisley, Motherwell and Edinburgh which were formerly run down and which had all experienced tenure diversification and the introduction of owner occupied housing in the 1990s. Thirty-eight households took part and 49 diaries were completed. The authors observed that compared with middle-income home owners, lower-income social housing tenants are less mobile and likely to spend more time at home. Conversely, home owners carry out most of their activities outside of the estates and appear more detached from their localities. Hence, even though income differences between social housing tenants and home owners were not large, there was a lack of

everyday social interaction between the two groups. The research concluded that if more affluent residents are introduced into the estates then there is likely to be even less social contact between neighbours. However, similarly to the findings of Allen et al, Atkinson and Kintrea (2000) found that children's activities often led to greater involvement in the locality regardless of tenure, although this affected women (mothers) more than men.

- 5.33 Cole and Goodchild (2001, pp. 356-357) note that there are two types of mixed tenure schemes in England, those that they term "flagship" schemes and less ambitious, more "mainstream" projects undertaken by local authorities and housing associations. Flagship schemes involve extensive neighbourhood remodelling, sustained capital investment, tenure transformation and community development. The Hulme estate in Manchester is perhaps the best documented of such schemes in England, though similar plans are being developed in other cities to transform the social as well as physical character of previously unpopular neighbourhoods. Social diversity has been a central aim of such projects, but they have all required huge amounts of additional capital investment to produce physical transformations alongside social changes in the neighbourhood. They are not capable of widespread replication, though they may help to produce a positive 'demonstration effect' to other agencies. However, studies of both types of scheme consistently report that there is little social interaction between people in different tenures. There is partial support for the social capital thesis – not bridging within the community, but external links with the wider neighbourhood especially in terms of the external reputation and appearance of the neighbourhood. This of itself may be sufficient justification for supporting a mixed tenure policy however (p. 357).
- 5.34 Tunstall and Fenton (2006) found that mixed communities have reduced the stigma of a neighbourhood. The policy has led to a reduction in crime, the provision of better services and amenities supported by a wider range of incomes, and increased neighbourhood satisfaction and quality of life.
- 5.35 There was a three year (August 2006 to July 2009) evaluation of the DCLG Mixed Communities Initiative demonstration projects (DCLG, 2010). The Mixed Communities Initiative was developed as one of the models for regeneration – large scale housing development and holistic regeneration designed and managed through local strategy, and funded primarily through private investment. Such an initiative involves large up-front costs to the public sector for improved facilities and infrastructure, such as health centres, schools and transport. The largest financial costs of the ongoing projects related to land (p. 97).
- 5.36 The demonstration projects where the physical regeneration was making progress were all those which had access to major sources of public funding to meet the up-front costs, including New Deal for Communities funds in some cases, Urban Development Corporation or Regional Development Agency (p. 14). Other projects that lacked such funding had made much less progress.
- 5.37 The economic downturn brought a halt to almost all the private development in the schemes, with delays expected of two to five years, and additional

public monies being sought to keep the projects afloat and improve their viability and attractiveness to developers. The schemes still appear deliverable, but they are going to be more costly to the public sector and may achieve lower levels of mix than was originally intended (p. 16).

- 5.38 The Mixed Communities Evaluation reported that there was no evidence that the 'mix' element of mixed communities had added any value in these demonstration projects (p. 12). It also commented that it is difficult to obtain the data necessary to calculate imputed costs, even in relation to land and assets, as well as the less tangible opportunity costs of staff time or lost social housing lettings (p. 98).
- 5.39 A recently completed study funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation looked at the impact of change on 'challenging communities'. Cole and Green (2010) in paper 6 of this series looked at four case study areas, including Oxfords in Edinburgh, which were compared with Hillside in Huyton, Wensley Fold in Blackburn and West Kensington in London. This highly qualitative study focused on in-depth interviews with residents conducted at the start of the study and then in two further waves approximately one year apart. This allowed time for the changes to take effect and for people to reflect on the experience. The changes involved demolition of council housing and new building of both social and market housing (the latter often ending up available for private renting). The study found many similarities in people's experiences of change across all four areas, but there were also some differences, notably the role played by ethnicity in social relations. In West Kensington, where the ethnic mix was by far the greatest and most diverse, race and ethnicity was barely mentioned whereas in Wensley Fold, social difference was described in terms of ethnicity rather than income or tenure. In both Huyton and Oxfords, the proportion of ethnic minorities was much lower so it is not surprising that it did not arise as an issue.
- 5.40 In two of the areas, Wensley Fold and Oxfords, the changes were seen as having a positive influence on the perception of the neighbourhood's reputation and the new housing attracted residents from outside the immediate area which was often resented. In Hillside, the changes were seen as negative in the short term, but this was partly because much of the new housing had not yet emerged on the vacant sites. In West Kensington, the changes had been more cosmetic, upgrading the existing housing rather than creating new market housing – yet that could still change in the future with plans by the council to create more 'mixed and balanced communities'.
- 5.41 The study concludes by noting some 'rather unsettling lessons' about policy initiatives promoted under the banner of mixed communities (Cole and Green, 2010, p. 39). The two areas that were subjected to the more moderate interventions with no explicit aim of promoting social mix (Wensley Fold and Oxfords) seem to be experiencing a relatively stable transition to greater neighbourhood diversity. The area that has had the greatest number of measures to promote tenure and income diversity, Hillside, appears to be experiencing increasing social divisions. West Kensington, the area already relatively mixed, is about to become demolished and residents displaced. According to the authors, "Not for the first time, one is struck by the gap

between intention and outcome in policy measures designed to promote neighbourhood social mix” (ibid., p. 39).

Critical reviews

- 5.42 A great deal of the UK literature on the benefits of mixed communities involves secondary reviews of existing evidence rather than large scale primary studies.
- 5.43 Bond *et al* (2010) have recently used systematic review methods to critically appraise other reviews for the evidence that mixed tenure policies and strategies have achieved any of their expected benefits. Of the six UK reviews of primary studies that they looked at, most drew on less than half the available primary studies, none provided a critical appraisal of individual studies and they made no comment on conflicting evidence between and within studies. While the reviews gave indications of the deficiencies of the evidence base, rather than focus on the implications of these deficiencies, four of the six reviews emphasised the positive effects of tenure mix. Bond *et al.* (2010) conclude that none of the six studies they reviewed answered the key question of whether or not mixed tenure policies achieve the desired social, environmental or economic outcomes. The message to policy makers is that just because something is termed a ‘review’ does not give it a higher level of independence or rigour. Policy makers need to be more demanding of the evidence, rather than accepting limited or weak evidence as sufficient simply because it appears to support government policy (Bond *et al*, 2010).
- 5.44 Bond *et al* (2010) also argue that reviews and primary studies need to be clearer about what mixed tenure might achieve, including possible adverse effects. Conventional wisdoms such as that mixed tenure communities will resolve problems of ‘concentrated poverty’ need to be questioned (p. 23).
- 5.45 Tunstall and Lupton (2010) provided a critical review on the published research on mixed communities and on evidence from the evaluation of the Mixed Communities Initiative demonstration projects. They cited the following counterarguments:
- “There is limited evidence that the new resources that may come with higher income residents (e.g., shops) either materialise or are beneficial to people on low incomes” (p. 3).*
- “Achieving regeneration through cross-subsidy from private sector new build is clearly less likely in peripheral areas of long-standing low housing demand and widespread low income than it is in areas of mixed housing stock close to the centre of major cities” (p. 4).*
- 5.46 Cheshire (2007) argues that there is scant evidence that making communities more socially mixed improves the life chances of poor people living in them. He reviews longitudinal research from Canada and the UK which shows that the character of the neighbourhood people lived in ten or 20 years previously has no impact on current prosperity. Instead, the apparent “neighbourhood effects” simply reflect the concentration of people on low incomes in specific

areas – they reflect income inequality rather than cause it. Therefore, tackling poverty is better addressed by redistributing resources from richer to poorer people than by trying to create more socially mixed areas.

5.47 There are, however, spill-over effects of poor housing, which is not the same as spatial concentrations of poor people, except to the extent that poor people end up in poor housing. Maclennan (2008) suggests that these include:

- The size and quality of the homes people live in influence their mental health, space for learning and other contributors to wellbeing.
- The neighbourhood context that the household chooses jointly with housing also influences health, learning, safety and economic linkages.
- The location of the household affects access to sites for household activity, while the systematic sorting of similar income, age and ethnic groups in urban areas shapes wider metropolitan structures with spill-over effects, most obviously the environmental effects of travel to work.

5.48 Maclennan concludes by noting that these findings are relevant in highlighting the mismatch between the ongoing emphasis in national and regional policy and practice in creating mixed communities, and the contested evidence base on which such policies are founded.

Evidence from outside the UK

5.49 Policies aiming to increase mix outside the UK often have a very different focus. In particular, the lack of explicit tenure mix goals in the UK contrasts with countries abroad. For example, in France, *loi d'orientation sur la ville* (the Guidance Law for the City) of 1991 established a minimum proportion of 20 per cent social housing for all communes with more than 1,500 people (later adjusted to 3,500) in urban areas. In Australia, individual states have set goals for reducing social housing by or to a certain percentage of the total (Tunstall, 2003).

5.50 In the Netherlands, a policy of housing-quality mixing was formulated which aimed to restructure the urban housing market at the neighbourhood level and mix low-quality with high-quality houses. Ostendorf, Musterd and De Vos (2001) compared neighbourhoods that already have a 'mixed' housing stock to homogeneous neighbourhoods. They found that mixing does not in fact reduce poverty. They also demonstrated that diversification is not even a sensible strategy if the goal is to decrease the number of underprivileged people in an area (p. 377).

5.51 In Sweden, social mix policies have always been launched voluntarily. The commonly used approach is neighbourhood regeneration, which is implemented either through building new housing within a specific area, either changing the tenure and apartment structure in parts of the existing stock, or refurbishing the area, with the aim of attracting targeted households types.

- 5.52 Research based on empirical data for Sweden shows that in general, the association between housing mix and social mix is not very strong. Andersson, Bråmås and Holmqvist (2010, p. 251) conclude that,

“The current lack of systematic studies makes it hard to estimate the potential of this type of policy [housing mix and social mix policy] in countering or reducing residential segregation. The assessment, based on what is known from earlier studies, is that it has a potential to affect levels of segregation, in the sense that it will probably lead to greater social diversity at the neighbourhood level. Whether it will also lead to more contact between different groups, however, is more uncertain.”

- 5.53 In the USA, the housing policy increasingly emphasises two approaches that de-concentrate the poor. The dominant method is to disperse the poor throughout a metropolitan region by providing them with rental vouchers for use in privately owned housing. The other approach is to combine low-income and higher income households in the same development. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has invested US\$234 million in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) demonstration program, begun in 1994. MTO provides housing vouchers and other types of assistance to public housing residents in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. Indeed, New York City’s public housing probably has the nation’s largest amount of mixed-income housing (Schwartz and Tajbakhsh, 1997).

Neighbourhood satisfaction

- 5.54 Baum, Arthurson and Rickson (2010) used a combination of survey data and aggregate census data in Australia to consider how, net of other factors, the socioeconomic mix of the local neighbourhood impacts on satisfaction. They found that the socioeconomic mix characteristics of the neighbourhood do matter in understanding neighbourhood satisfaction:
- a. As the neighbourhood becomes more mixed in tenure terms, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied with their neighbourhood declines (p. 476).
 - b. As the percentage of people born in non-English-speaking countries increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied declines (p. 477).
 - c. As the proportion of high-income households increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied rises (p. 477).
 - d. As the proportion of low-income households increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied with their neighbourhood decreases (p. 478).
- 5.55 The overall evidence showed that as neighbourhoods became more mixed across all three types of socioeconomic mix (a mix of housing tenures, a mix of incomes and a mix racial/ethnic backgrounds), the likelihood that a resident would be satisfied declined. For tenure, it was the absolute mix that was important. For both income and ethnicity, it was the relative mix of low to high

income and non-English-speaking to English-speaking country of birth that was important. Residents were generally more satisfied if they lived in neighbourhoods with higher shares of owners/purchasers, high-income households or people born in English-speaking countries.

Poverty

- 5.56 Anderson *et al.* (2007) explored the degree to which a wide variety of 1995 neighbourhood conditions in Sweden are statistically related to earnings for metropolitan and non-metropolitan men and women during the 1996–99 period, controlling for a wide variety of personal characteristics. They found that the socio-economic composition of neighbourhoods is the most important dimension, at least in terms of individuals' incomes.

Social interaction

- 5.57 Kleinhans' (2004) review of the recent studies on social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal in England and the Netherlands found that there is usually limited interaction between owners and tenants because of diverging lifestyle and socio-economic characteristics. He argued that lifestyle is a far more important determinant of social interaction than tenure (p. 383).

Social segregation

- 5.58 Préteceille (2003) analysed the correlation between low social status of the area and high percentage of social housing population in Paris. He found that:

“Areas which concentrate social difficulties seem to be more correlated with social class, occupation and job position, than with housing per se. At the small area level, the correlation is strong between social housing and popular status areas. It is less so at the municipal level. And at the scale of départements, it is even more ambivalent.” (p. 21)

- 5.59 Tunstall (2003) noted that there have been few claims of positive neighbourhood effects of mixed tenure areas over areas dominated by home ownership. But, there is a richer, international body of evidence on the neighbourhood effects of social mix, covering outcomes including educational participation, health and mortality, early fertility, drug use, crime, business development, attitudes to the community and the level of community participation, public service quality, employment and deprivation (p. 157). The kinds of mix sought are diverse and include ethnic mix, educational levels and household composition, though the main focus is on income and on reducing concentrations of low income households.

6 GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

- 6.1 Schwartz and Tajbakhsh (1997, p. 80) summarise that the current literature provides useful information, but much remains to be done. In particular, we still need to know:
- The income thresholds and mixes that “make or break” a mixed-income housing project.
- 6.2 To date, there have been no studies that specifically addressed the income thresholds. Galster’s (2010) review of US evidence suggested that poverty rates above a threshold of around 15–20 per cent resulted in substantially higher levels of crime, extended poverty and unemployment.
- The conditions under which mixed income developments can attract and retain middle-income households.
- 6.3 Martin and Watkinson (2003) reported the success of the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust’s SAVE (Selling Alternate Vacants on Estates) programme in attracting middle income families into the ‘model’ village of New Earswick, a forerunner of the Garden Village movement. However, there was only limited follow-up of the new residents, especially in terms of whether they stay over the longer term.
- The economic (employment) effects, if any, for low-income households.
- 6.4 Fordham and Cole (2009) found that employment and incomes increased, but only to reflect the characteristics of the incomers, not those of the original residents (low income households). Glossop (2008) argued that low income households fall into a poverty trap which is a function of having low earning power and lower levels of workplace skills, rather than tenure. However, available evidence points to a relationship between social housing and a lack of job mobility (Hills, 2007).
- The challenges of financing mixed income developments.
- 6.5 The DCLG’s (2010) evaluation of the Mixed Communities Initiative Demonstration Projects provided some information about the issues of financing mixed income developments. However, it highlighted the difficulties of assessing economic costs, especially opportunity costs, as well as social costs and benefits. It also commented that it is difficult to obtain the data necessary to calculate imputed costs, even in relation to land and assets, let alone the less tangible opportunity costs of staff time or lost social housing lettings.
- The effect of racial and ethnic demographics on the viability of mixed-income housing.
- 6.6 A UK study by Livingston *et al.* (2010) examined in depth the impact of place in terms of stable/high ethnic mix, on area attachment in four contrasting case study neighbourhoods in Northern England at the end of 2006 and the

beginning of 2007. They did not find any evidence suggesting that ethnic mix can sustain the viability of mixed income housing. This is either because people would still like to be able to move out of very deprived areas if they could; or because social mix in income or tenure terms is not in itself valued highly by residents – people were much more interested in the values and norms of their co-residents than in markers of social position such as income or housing tenure. Overall, the authors concluded that high residential turnover and a rapidly changing (ethnic) mix in one area had led to increased anxiety and reduced attachments.

- The interaction between the development and operating costs of mixed-income housing; its design, size, location, and amenities; the socioeconomic composition (income, race, ethnicity) of its residents; and the strength of the regional housing market, which influence the feasibility of mixed-income housing projects.

- 6.7 There have been no UK studies to our knowledge that have addressed this last ‘gap’, probably because as noted above it is very difficult to get reliable estimates of costs.
- 6.8 Schwartz and Tajbakhsh (1997) note that these questions could be explored through a comparative analysis of existing mixed income housing developments. Such research would involve a comparative analysis of the development pro-formas and operating budgets of otherwise similar mixed-income and low-income developments. It would also entail in-depth interviews with the sponsors and managers of mixed-income housing developments regarding the challenges of achieving and maintaining mixed-income occupancy (p. 81).

Methodological issues

- 6.9 Kleinhans (2004) points out that most empirical literature is based upon case studies, mainly using resident surveys and interviews. Although case studies have their merits, their results cannot be properly generalised. That is one of the reasons for the claim that the evidence base for social mix issues is insubstantial and locally orientated. Almost all of the reviewed literature is based on a cross-sectional measurement. They mainly yield results that are locally orientated and are valid for a certain point or a limited period in time.
- 6.10 There is indeed a lack of experimental design in policies and research. Very seldom is the evaluation of specific interventions designed in a way (e.g., by using control groups of participants and non-participants) that helps to establish outcomes with any certainty. Kleinhans (2004) notes that in most countries, longitudinal data sources are not available to allow for comprehensive over time follow up of individuals and neighbourhoods being targeted by policy-initiated interventions. However, the GoWell research programme in Glasgow aims to cover people in four waves over a ten-year period.

7 ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES

- 7.1 As discussed in Section 2, there are two main ways in which mixed communities policies operate:
- Through the planning system, ensuring new housing developments contain a proportion of affordable housing.
 - Through regeneration programmes seeking to reduce the concentration of social housing in estates in which it forms the majority of housing, or are otherwise problematic.
- 7.2 However, there are also other ways in which the intended benefits of mixed communities could potentially be achieved, as outlined in Table 7.1 and discussed in the section below:

Table 7.1 Possible alternative ways to achieve the benefits of mixed communities

Method	Policy examples	Possible benefits	Possible drawbacks or limitations
Use of social housing lettings policies	Sensitive lettings	Reduced concentration of very poor or problematic tenants in certain areas	Reduced housing options for those deemed unsuitable for the lettings
		Very low cost of implementation	Only addressing mix within social housing; requires there to be some social housing in unproblematic areas
Addressing the problems of poor areas directly	Targeted policing	Efficient provision of services targeted at the poor, workless or areas in need of investment	Does not address possible neighbourhood effects
	Sure Start		
	New Deal for Communities		
	Working Neighbourhoods fund	Ensures problems are tackled rather than just dispersed	Does not address stigma or neighbourhood reputation
Selling social housing stock into owner-occupation	Right to Buy	Decreased proportion of social housing in areas where it dominates	Loss of social housing stock
			No immediate change to neighbourhood composition as existing tenants stay put
Selling social housing stock in areas where it dominates and invest the proceeds to purchase new housing elsewhere	SAVE	Decreased proportion of social housing in areas where it dominates	Net loss of social housing if it costs more to purchase it in more desirable areas
		Increased proportion of social housing in areas dominated by other tenures	
Improve mixing of existing residents within and between neighbourhoods	Various community initiatives	Encourages greater social mixing without anyone having to move to a new home	Does not address neighbourhood effects
	Schools admissions policies		May not address stigma or neighbourhood reputation

Use of social housing lettings policies

- 7.3 There has been increasing concern over recent years throughout the UK that allocating social housing purely on the basis of need can have the effect of concentrating the most vulnerable households in the worst areas (Hills, 2007; Scott *et al.*, 2000), and that the needs of the individuals seeking housing need to be balanced against the needs of local communities (Scottish Government, 2010).
- 7.4 Increasingly, local authorities are introducing these 'sensitive lettings' policies in order to tackle a range of problems associated with public housing on estates and in neighbourhoods (Scottish Government Housing, 2009). Sometimes termed 'local lettings', 'restrictive lettings' or 'flexible lettings' policies, the policies attempt to deliver mixed and balanced communities by placing restrictions on the type of tenants who should be housed in certain places.
- 7.5 The motivation behind such policies is usually to improve areas with particularly high levels of crime, drugs or anti-social behaviour. By introducing additional criteria around who may move in to these areas (based on age, employment status, number of children or past behaviour), it is hoped that these problem areas can begin to recover. The UK government allows for this in the Code of Guidance for Allocation of Accommodation under the provision of 'local lettings policies' allowing local authorities and housing associations to set their own criteria for the allocation of some properties.
- 7.6 Earlier work carried out by the Scottish Government in 2001 had explored the extent of 'local letting' policies in Scotland and found that just under half of local authorities and around 15 per cent of housing associations had at least one area where they operated a local lettings policy (Scottish Executive, 2001). In most areas, the policies covered just a small proportion of stock (such as one estate) but in two areas, over 10 per cent of housing was covered by such policies.
- 7.7 Previous work (Cole and Goodchild, 2001) has however raised concerns that local lettings policies can amount to 'social engineering', as embodied in the French system of estate profiling. Preventing certain types of household from accessing some areas can clearly be a useful tool in addressing specific areas experiencing particular problems, but does reduce the ability of some households to obtain housing, and may risk concentrating more vulnerable households in other areas.

Addressing the problems of poor areas directly

- 7.8 Cheshire (2007) argues that the evidence base for mixed communities in terms of providing direct benefits to the poor is weak. Rather than being a cause of deprivation, poor neighbourhoods simply reflect the distribution of income across space. Introducing mixed communities is costly and its effectiveness in helping poor people is not proven. Instead, policy should focus on activities that help the poor directly, such as improved services and a redistribution of resources in favour of the most deprived areas. This includes

physical improvements to housing and the environment. Cheshire notes that the type of local services available in more affluent areas may not address the needs of poorer households, whereas estate based shops may give credit or 'tick' which can be more important than trying to access cheaper prices at a less accessible supermarket.

- 7.9 In England, the New Deal for Communities was the most recent major area-based initiative in the UK which aimed to tackle the problems of poor neighbourhoods. A recent overview of its success concluded that it had proved more successful in tackling 'area based' problems (such as crime, ASB and dereliction) and had improved the popularity of areas, but had been less able, even eight years after starting, to tackle more individual-level outcomes such as educational attainment, health or worklessness (Lawless *et al.*, 2010). This suggests that the success of area-based initiatives may depend on the type of problem that they are trying to tackle. It may be unrealistic to expect area-based initiatives to address individual-level outcomes unless they can be combined with people-based policies which tend to be better resourced.

Sell social housing stock into owner-occupation

- 7.10 A study undertaken in England by Martin and Watkinson (2003) found that over 70 per cent of a sample of social landlords (88 housing associations and 100 local authorities) has taken some initiative to 'rebalance the communities' on their single tenure estates by introducing a mix of tenures and incomes (other than through the Right to Buy).
- 7.11 The experience of the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust's SAVE (Selling Alternate Vacants on Estates) programme in York is that the benefits associated with mix justify selling alternative vacant properties on the open market. The proceeds are reinvested in replacement property. The policy was introduced to address the process of decline in its 'model' village of New Earswick, a forerunner of the Garden Village movement. By the end of 2002, 21 per cent of the stock was either leasehold, low cost home ownership or fully owner occupied. There has been a significant change in the perceptions of the villagers, property rates have risen beyond local increases and middle-income families are keen to move onto the estate.
- 7.12 The SAVE programme was initiated in 1997, an attempt to rebalance existing mono-tenure rented communities. The scheme allows for 50 per cent of relets in the village to be offered on the open market for full sale or shared ownership. Martin and Watkinson (2003) reported the following direct financial benefits:
- a. An upturn in the local economy.
 - b. A higher proportion of economically active residents living on an estate helps support the sustainability of local shops and services – which in turn can provide employment opportunities for other members of the community.

- c. Having more parents with jobs means more role models of working households.
- d. Increased the property value of the area, e.g., increased by 88 per cent from first quarter 1998 to third quarter 2002, when estate agents or other marketing professionals were employed to assist the sales in raising the profile and sales price.
- e. Selling vacant properties can have the double advantage of bringing life back into a community and saving the high social and monetary cost of demolition.
- f. Reduce turnover and related cost savings.

Sell social housing stock in areas where it dominates and invest proceeds purchasing it elsewhere

- 7.13 The Right to Buy policy was the major policy that aimed to diversify social housing estates. It did lead to more tenure diversity and benefitted a great many social tenants who were able to purchase under the scheme, but the failure to reinvest the proceeds in new social housing led to a substantial decline in the availability of social housing for other tenants and the policy has recently be discontinued in Scotland. It was, nevertheless, a successful policy in its own terms of diversifying tenure and broadening access to owner occupation (Stephens *et al*, 2005). Similar initiatives in the future could form part of a strategy to improve mix, and in particular tenure mix, of estates where social housing dominates, possibly with improved mechanisms for reducing or eliminating the net loss of social housing.

Improve social interaction among people within and between neighbourhoods

- 7.14 Concern has been raised that increasing tenure or income mix in an area does not necessarily lead to increased interaction between people from different backgrounds (Tunstall and Lupton, 2010). If this is the case, there would be little opportunity for any role model effects or benefits from increased social capital to improve the lives of the poor.
- 7.15 Conversely, people living in poor neighbourhoods could potentially benefit from these effects if they increased the extent to which they mixed socially with others from different backgrounds, either inside or outside their neighbourhoods.
- 7.16 Specific policies can serve to increase the mixing, at least of children, from different backgrounds, or can exacerbate divisions between groups. School catchment areas are a key factor in determining the popularity of different areas and hence it is argued, should be integrated into efforts to combat neighbourhood segregation (Worpole, 2000). Concern has been expressed that schools' desire to admit more able pupils, coupled with better-off parents' increased ability to get their children into the school of their choice, results in some schools taking much higher proportions of more able pupils (Tough and Brookes, 2007). New alternative methods of allocating school places have

been piloted, such as using a lottery in Brighton and Hove. An early evaluation of this experiment found little impact on segregation within schools, though concluded that this may be because the use of catchment areas as the first criteria for allocating places had been retained (Allen *et al.*, 2010).

- 7.17 There are few policies that we are aware of that specifically set out to increase mixing between income groups. Efforts to increase mixing between ethnic or religious groups are more commonplace.
- 7.18 However, it has also been found that residents report greater levels of mixing with other kinds of people in areas where the neighbourhood composition is more mixed (DCLG, 2010), suggesting that it may be difficult to achieve the benefits of integration in highly segregated areas.

8 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 These conclusions are intended to draw out the main thrust of the evidence in terms of its relevance to Scotland. The review set out to examine the following questions:

- Definitions and meanings of mixed or balanced communities.
- The principles or theory behind the objectives of mixing communities.
- The available evidence on whether the objectives are met in practice.
- A limited examination of the costs – financial, economic and social – of mixing communities.
- Potential alternatives to addressing the problems identified.
- Policy implications of each element.

Aims of mixed communities policies

8.2 The aims of mixed communities policies have been criticised as not being clear (Bond *et al.*, 2010). This may be partly because of the problems of defining what is meant by a mixed community – is it income mix, ethnic mix, social mix or tenure mix? How mixed should the mix be? And at what spatial scale? A key focus in the UK context has been on diluting or preventing concentrations of poverty that can arise from the spatial concentration of public housing. This is very different from the US where the emphasis has been on race and income mix, and from other parts of Europe where it is more about immigration. In the UK, the link between poverty and tenure has been at the forefront of the debate and hence policy.

8.3 A further aim of the UK government has been to use tenure mix to achieve communities that are sustainable into the future (in the sense of not requiring additional resources to address problems such as crime and anti-social behaviour).

8.4 A key question is whether mixed communities policies have achieved their aims in practice. The answer to this question will depend on the perceived mechanisms at work in terms of causing the problems often associated with poor neighbourhoods. There is debate over whether mono-tenure estates are undesirable because they are places where poverty is concentrated, or is social housing of itself harmful because it provides perverse incentives to poor people (e.g., not to work)? If concentration itself is undesirable, is this because of internal factors (peer group effects, imitation and ‘cultures of worklessness’) or external (discrimination, stigmatisation and inadequate public services)? How important are wider sub-regional economic trends in determining local neighbourhood decline and recovery?

8.5 These different viewpoints imply quite different types of public policy. Thus, if much of the fate of many poor neighbourhoods is linked to long term weak

labour demand in some regions (including in Scotland, parts of Clydeside, the Borders, Highlands and Islands), then this implies that poor neighbourhoods need ongoing services and support rather than being the focus of radical housing regeneration aimed at relieving poverty in the longer term. If, on the other hand, there is potential demand for labour then incentives to remain outside the labour force should be addressed. If such pressures stem from particular peer group cultures, such as gangs, affecting social excluded people, then a mixed communities approach is more likely to have a chance of success.

Evidence on whether aims are met in practice

- 8.6 Overall, the evidence seems to support the mixed tenure (as a proxy for mixed communities) approach to **new** developments. There is evidence that developers are increasingly accepting of onsite mix and its contribution to mixed communities (CCHPR and the University of Sheffield, 2005). The study found that the policy had introduced affordable homes into wealthier, more expensive areas where they would not have been delivered through 'traditional' means (built by housing associations with government grant). The study also found that off-site provision of affordable housing delivered more units than on-site provision on a greenfield site, but that this did not contribute to mixed communities. However, Fenton (2010) found that in Scotland local authorities were more likely to accept commuted payments in lieu of affordable housing on developments sites that were located in less deprived areas. This reduces the contribution of section 75 to mixed communities by limiting new affordable housing to more deprived areas. It also suggests that in Scotland, developers are less accepting of the contribution to mixed communities that onsite affordable housing can make.
- 8.7 The evidence for increasing tenure mix in **existing** estates dominated by social housing or regeneration areas is less clear cut. In many cases, the operation of the Right to Buy has meant that estates are no longer mono-tenure, yet the residents (and their characteristics) have not changed and problematic poor areas remain. This suggests that mixing tenure alone is not the immediate answer to concentrations of poverty. Many studies have been unable to demonstrate that there are positive benefits arising to residents (and particularly to the original inhabitants) from increasing tenure mix that would not accrue equally from a traditional estate regeneration programme that improved the buildings, environment, service, schools and shops. However, this may depend on the time period which these evaluations cover – a mixed communities regeneration may look more successful after 20 years compared to a standard physical regeneration of a poor housing estate. There are clear costs involved through introducing mixed tenure to existing estates, although some are difficult to measure, such as disruption of an established community or of family ties, etc. One criterion might be the degree of dilapidation of the existing housing stock and hence the need for demolitions and total housing renewal. The scope for increased densities on low rise estates might also be relevant given the overall shortage of housing and particularly affordable housing.

The potential impact of abolition of Right to Buy

8.8 In terms of particular relevance for Scotland, the recent abolition of the Right to Buy may affect tenure spread and the proportion of social rented housing. It might be expected to have a small positive impact on diversity within the social rented sector by retaining some better-off households who otherwise would have switched tenure. But, abolition will prevent any further tenure dilution on existing housing estates unless it is replaced with some other means, such as selling social housing in large estates and buying on the open market elsewhere. One example is the SAVE approach used by Joseph Rowntree on its York housing estate.

Galster's work and implications for Scotland

8.9 Galster's (2010) work is not always directly relevant to Scotland given that its strongest evidence about thresholds comes from the US, although some work has included Scandinavia and the Netherlands. There are, as he notes, issues about scale as well as composition and degree of concentration which are empirically measured by a range of segregation indices and dimensions. This has not been undertaken to any degree in the UK. The 15–20 per cent threshold is not entirely out of line with experiences in England on new housing estates with affordable housing delivered through Section 106. However, that experience has been mixed – Silverman *et al.* (2006) found problems in Britannia Village in London that were associated with non-integrated tenures, poor management and highly polarised income distributions. This accords with Galster's view that mixing works best where the income differences are not too large. Overall, the three main lessons for Scotland that emerge from Galster's work are:

- a. Planners need to be aware of the kind of mix they want, why, how it will occur, and whether there are any other conflicting goals.
- b. There are few, if any, measurable negative effects on neighbourhoods from accommodating a small proportion of poorer people.
- c. Social mixing is likely to be most effective between groups that are not too dissimilar.

Alternative policies

8.10 Galster (2010) does not address the question of alternative policies to tackle concentrations of poverty. Yet, a policy can only really be considered to be justified on either efficiency or equity grounds if its results could not be achieved more effectively by other means. Cheshire (2007, 2008) argues that the evidence on poorer people benefiting from mixed communities other than from general improvements to their homes, the environment, schools and services is very weak. These general improvements can be made without mixing communities, and he argues that a reallocation of resources in favour of poor people would be a more efficient and targeted policy to address concentrations of poverty. This raises a host of further questions, such as school allocation systems – still used in parts of the US to combat inequalities

resulting from spatial concentrations of ethnic groups – and how far general funding allocations reflect spatial patterns of need in terms of health, education and deprivation. Indeed, it is often argued that housing should not be considered independently of these other issues. However, this would require further study.

Evidence on costs

8.11 The evidence on costs – financial, social and economic – in the literature is very limited. The costs of mixed communities on new developments using Section 75 (or Section 69) are potentially the loss of land that would have been used for market housing, which arguably contributes to further house price inflation. The costs of using mixed communities as part of regeneration of existing estates are very difficult to obtain, not least because most schemes involve the sale of land to private developers and issues of confidentiality prevents disclosure of prices particularly as in some cases the land deals are still being negotiated. Social costs are inherently difficult to measure although they can be described, such as disruption to communities and families, or the loss of local services (shops, schools) during redevelopment. Economic, or opportunity, costs are also hard to measure in financial terms because they involve questions of ‘what if?’ and so require information not only on the financial costs of a mixed scheme but also of the alternatives on which those funds might have been spent. The conclusion must be that we do not really know about the relative costs of different approaches, but that using a mixed communities approach on new schemes is perhaps likely to be less costly in terms of public funding than in the case of regeneration.

Potential alternatives to mixed communities

8.12 Alternatives to mixed communities include:

- Social or sensitive lettings.
- Address problems of poverty directly.
- Sell social housing into owner occupation (e.g., Right to Buy).
- Sell social housing in areas where it dominates and invest proceeds by purchasing it elsewhere.
- Policies to improve mixing of existing residents between neighbourhoods (community initiatives, school admissions).

Implications for policy in Scotland

8.13 These conclusions point to the use of a range of policies to address the problems of concentrations of poverty, both in terms of avoiding the creation of new concentrations and in addressing what is happening in existing neighbourhoods. Introducing mix as part of regeneration schemes can be successful if it is undertaken in a sensitive way with the full support of existing residents and minimum disruption, although this may be a tall order. The

main conclusion is that mixed communities as a policy should not be seen as a panacea. There will always be a problem of people who are poorer and more disadvantaged than the majority and simply diluting concentrations of poverty will not of itself eliminate it.

- 8.14 In these times of serious financial stringency, it is probably more important than ever to grow more effective local communities which are self adjusting and self generating. A traditional strength of earlier forms of Scottish city and burgh development was the intimate mix of house types and tenures found in many places. To some extent the resilience of such places have been dissipated by the flow and ebb of commercial property development and the disengagement that comes from the decline in walking and public transport and by the migration of both rich and poor to increasingly segregated areas.
- 8.15 Attention to the longer term objectives behind tenure mix, the creation of local resilience and local sustainability, can be addressed in three ways:
- Strategic policy direction to encourage all agencies to support and cooperate in financial mechanisms that facilitate a more enterprising and flexible pattern of house-holding.
 - Careful design to combine simplicity with energy saving and companionable developments that will encourage a healthy living community.
 - On-the-spot management to empower self-supporting initiatives, avoid frustration and waste and nip emerging problems in the bud.
- 8.16 It goes without saying that for the most part the focus will have to be largely on existing communities and developments, with all their inadequacies, to encourage all round good practice at these three levels and to measure the empowerment of natural local processes of growth. Unless there is pressing need to demolish and start again from scratch, the best way to improve existing neighbourhoods is to make constant minor changes, sensitive infill, and continuing good management – ideally involving the local community itself.

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.
- Allen, R., Burgess, S. and McKenna, L. (2010) *The Early Impact of Brighton and Hove's School Admission Reforms*, Bristol: Centre for Market and Public Organisation.
- Andersson, R., Bråmån, A. and Holmqvist, E. (2010) Counteracting segregation: Swedish policies and experiences, *Housing Studies*, 25 (2): 237-256.
- Andersson R., Musterd S., Galster, G. and Kauppinen, T. (2007) What mix matters? Exploring the relationships between individuals' incomes and different measures of their neighbourhood context, *Housing Studies*, 22 (5): 637-660.
- Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2000) Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts, *Policy and Politics*, 28 (1) 93-108.
- Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2001) Disentangling area effects: evidence from deprived and non-deprived neighbourhoods, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12): 2277-2298
- Baum, S., Arthurson, K. and Rickson, K. (2010) Happy people in mixed-up places: the association between the degree and type of local socioeconomic mix and expressions of neighbourhood satisfaction, *Urban Studies* (47) 3: 467-485
- Bramley, G. and Morgan, J. (2003) Building competitiveness and cohesion: the role of new housebuilding in central Scotland's cities, *Housing Studies* (13) 4: .447-471.
- Bramley, G. and Power, S. (2009) Urban form and social sustainability: the role of density and housing type, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* (36) 30-48.
- Bond, L, Sautkina, E. and Kearns, A. (2010) Mixed messages about mixed tenure: do reviews tell the real story? *Housing Studies* (25) 7: 1-26.
- Burgess, S., Gardiner, K., and Propper, C. (2001) *Growing Up: School, Family and Area Influences on Adolescents' Later Life Chances*, CASE paper 49, London: CASE, London School of Economics.
- CCHPR and University of Sheffield (2005) *Value for Money of Delivering Affordable Housing through Section 106*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Cheshire, P. (2007) *Segregated Neighbourhoods and Mixed Communities: A Critical Analysis*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Cheshire, P. (2008) Policies for mixed communities: faith-based displacement activity? *International Regional Science Review*, 32 (3): 343-375.
- Cole, I. and Goodchild, B. (2001) Social mix and the balanced community in British housing policy – a tale of two epochs, *GeoJournal*, 51: 351-360.
- Cole, I. and Green, S. (2010) *Neighbourhood Social Mix: Contrasting Experiences in Four Challenging Neighbourhoods*, Research Paper 6, CRESR, Sheffield Hallam University.

- Cole, I., Iqbal, B., Slocombe, L. and Trott, T. (2001) *Social Engineering or Consumer Choice? Rethinking Housing Allocations*, York: Chartered Institute of Housing with Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- DCLG (2010a) *Evaluation of the Mixed Communities Initiative Demonstration Projects*, London: DCLG.
- DCLG (2010b) *Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing*, London: The Stationery Office.
- Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions (1998) Circular 06/98 *Planning and Affordable Housing*, London: The Stationery Office.
- DETR (2000) *Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All – The Way Forward for Housing*, London: DETR.
- DTZ Consulting and Research (2006) *Housing, Economic Development and Productivity Literature Review*, London: DBERR.
- Feinstein, L., Lupton, R., Hammond, C., Mujataba, T., Salter, E. and Sorhaindo, A. (2008) *The Public Value of Social Housing: A Longitudinal Study of Relationships Between Housing and Life Chances*, London: Smith Institute.
- Fenton, A. (2010) *The Contribution of Housing, Planning and Regeneration Policies to Mixed Communities in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Fenton, A., Tyler, P., Markkanen, S., Clarke, A. and Whitehead, C. (2010) *Why do Neighbourhoods Stay Poor? Deprivation, Place and People in Birmingham*, Birmingham: Barrow Cadbury Trust.
- Fordham, G. and Cole, I. (2009) *Delivering Mixed Communities – Learning the Lessons from Existing Programmes*, London: DCLG.
- Forrest, R. and Kearns, A. (2001) Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12): 2125-2143
- Galster, G. (2010) *Neighborhood Social Mix: Theory, Evidence, and Implications for Policy and Planning*, paper presented to 2009 International Workshop at Technion University: "Planning as if People Mattered: Looking Back to the Future", Haifa, Israel, June, 2009 and updated in 2010.
- Galster, G., Andersson, R. and Musterd, S. (2010) Who is affected by neighbourhood income mix? Gender, age, family, employment and income differences, *Urban Studies*, 47 (14): 2915-2944.
- Glossop, C. (2008) *Housing and Economic Development: Moving Forward Together*, Cambridge: Centre for Research and Market Intelligence, Housing Corporation.
- Goetz, E. (2010) Desegregation in 3D: displacement, dispersal and development in American public housing, *Housing Studies*, 25 (2): 137-158.
- Graham, E., Manley, D., Hiscock, R., Boyle, P. and Doherty, J. (2009) Mixing housing tenures: is it good for social well-being? *Urban Studies*, 46 (1): 139-165.

- Greater London Authority (GLA) (2010) *Strategic Plan 2010-2012*, London: GLA.
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Strategic%20Plan%202010%20Part%20One.pdf>
- Harding, D.J. (2002) *Counterfactual Models of Neighbourhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on High School Dropout and Teenage Pregnancy*, Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, Harvard University (cited in Lupton 2003).
- Hills, J. (2007) *Ends and Means: The Future Role of Social Housing in England*, London: LSE CASE report 34.
- Kearns, A. and Mason, P. (2007) Mixed tenure communities and neighbourhood quality, *Housing Studies*, 22 (5): 661-691.
- Kearns, A. and Parkinson, M. (2001) The significance of neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12): 2103-2110.
- Kintrea, K. and Atkinson, R. (2001) *Neighbourhoods and Social Exclusion: The Research and Policy Implications of Neighbourhood Effects*, Urban Change and Policy Research Group Discussion Paper No. 3, University of Glasgow.
- Kleinhans, R. (2004) Social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: a review of recent literature, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19 (4): 367-390.
- Lawless, P., Foden, M., Wilson, I. and Beatty, C. (2010) Understanding area-based regeneration: the New Deal for Communities in England, *Urban Studies*, 47 (2): 257-275.
- Livingstone, M., Bailey, N. and Kearns, A. (2010) Neighbourhood attachment in deprived areas: evidence from the north of England, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25 (4): 409-427.
- Lupton, R. (2003) *Neighbourhood Effects: Can we Measure Them and Does it Matter?* CASE report 73, London: LSE.
- Lupton, R., Tunstall, R., Sigle-Rushton, W., Obolenskaya, P., Sabates, R., Meschi, E., Kneale, D. and Salter, S. (2009) *Growing Up in Social Housing in Britain*, London: LSE.
- MacAllister, I., Johnston, R., Pattie, C., Tunstall, H. and Rossiter, D. (2001) Class dealignment and the neighbourhood effect: Miller revisited, *British Journal of Political Science*, 31: 41-60.
- McIntyre, Z. and McKee, K. (2009) Creating sustainable communities through tenure-mix: the responsabilisation of marginal homeowners in Scotland, *Geojournal*, 74: 1-13.
- McMaster, R., U'ren, G., Carnie, J. and Cooper, S. (2008) *An Assessment of the Value of Planning Agreements in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research, <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/03/05114332/0>.
- Maclennan, D. (2008) *Housing for the Toronto Economy*, Toronto: Research Paper 212, Cities Centre, University of Toronto.
- Martin, G. and Watkinson, J. (2003) *Rebalancing Communities: Introducing Mixed Incomes into Existing Rented Housing Estate*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

- Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Monk, S., Crook, T., Lister, D., Rowley, S., Short, C. and Whitehead, C. (2005) *Land and Finance for Affordable Housing: The Complementary Roles of Social Housing Grant and the Provision of Affordable Housing through the Planning System*, York: JRF.
- ODPM (2003) *Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future*, London: ODPM.
- Ostendorf, W., Musterd, S. and De Vos, S. (2001) Social mix and the neighbourhood effect: policy ambitions and empirical evidence, *Housing Studies*, 16 (3): 371-380.
- Préteceille, E. (2003) *Is Social Housing Contributing to an Increase of Segregation? Recent Trends in the Paris Metropolis*. Paper presented at the ISA-RC21 conference "Challenging Urban Identities", University of Milano-Bicocca, 25–27 September.
- Propper, C., Burgess, S., Bolster, A., Leckie, G., Jones, K. and Johnston, R. (2007) The impact of neighbourhood on the income and mental health of British social renters, *Urban Studies*, 44 (2): 393-415.
- Regeneris and Oxford Economics (2010) *The Role of Housing in the Economy*, London: HCA.
- Scott, S., Currie, H., Fitzpatrick, S., Keoghan, M., Kintrea, K., Pawson, H. and Tate, J. (2000) *Good Practice in Housing Management: A Review of Progress and Good Practice in Housing Management*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2001) *Good Practice in Housing Management: A Review of Progress and Good Practice in Housing Management – Case Studies, Conclusions and Recommendations*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government (2005) *Planning Advice Note 74: Affordable Housing*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2008a) *Scottish Planning Policy SPP 3: Planning for Homes, Revised 2008*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2008b) *Planning Advice Note 83*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2010a) *Social Housing Allocation: A Practice Guide*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2010b) *Housing: Fresh Thinking, New Ideas*, Discussion Paper, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2011) *Homes Fit for the 21st Century: The Scottish Government's Strategy and Action Plan for Housing in the Next Decade 2011-2020*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government Housing (2009) *Balanced Communities, Individual and Community Need – Paper 1-Broad Concepts*, Allocations Policy Review Advisory Group
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/Housing/16342/management/socialhousingaccess/allocations/AdvisoryGroup/276274>

- Schwartz, A. and Tajbakhsh, K. (1997) Mixed-income housing: unanswered questions, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 3 (2): 71-92.
- Silverman, E., Lupton, R. and Fenton, A. (2006) *A Good Place for Children? Attracting and Retaining Families in Inner Urban Mixed Income Communities*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Consultation on Deprived Neighbourhoods*, London: The Stationary Office.
- Stephens, M., Whitehead, C. and Munro, M. (2005) *Lessons from the Past, Challenges for the Future for Housing Policy: An Evaluation of English Housing Policy 1975-2000*. London: DCLG.
- Tough, S. and Brooks, R. (2007). *School Admissions: Fair Choice for Parents and Pupils*. London: IPPR.
- Tunstall, R. (2003) 'Mixed tenure' policy in the UK: privatisation, pluralism or euphemism? *Housing, Theory and Society*, 20: 153-159.
- Tunstall, R. and Fenton, A. (2006) *In the Mix: A Review of Research on Mixed Income, Mixed Tenure and Mixed Communities*. A joint publication from Housing Corporation, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and English Partnerships.
- Tunstall, R. and Lupton, R. (2010) *Mixed Communities: Evidence Review*, London: DCLG.
- Urban Task Force (1999) *Towards an Urban Renaissance*, London: E&FN Spon.
- Wilcox, S., Fitzpatrick, S. with Stephens, M., Pleace, N., Wallace, A. and Rhodes, D. (2010) *The Impact Devolution: Housing and Homelessness*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Worpole, K. (2000) *Linking Home and School*, London: Demos

ANNEX 1: REVIEWS OF STUDIES INTO THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES

Author	Date	What type of study	What is all about?	Findings
Schwartz & Tajbakhsh	1997	A systematic review of empirical studies	A review of various types of mixed-income housing in USA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mixed-income housing can be costly. 2. Its attraction to middle-income household depends on quality of the project, location, etc. 3. Its success is also dependent on the housing market in the area.
Petticrew & Morrison	2001	A systematic review of empirical studies	Systematic review of experimental and non-experimental housing intervention studies that measured quantitative health outcomes. Data were extracted from studies dating from 1887, in any language or format, identified from clinical, social science, and grey literature databases, personal collections, expert consultation, and reference lists. The main outcome measures were socioeconomic change and health, illness, and social measures. 18 completed primary intervention studies were identified. 11 studies were prospective, of which six had control groups. Three of the seven retrospective studies used a control group. The interventions included rehousing, refurbishment, and energy efficiency measures.	Many studies showed <i>health gains after the intervention</i> , but the small study populations and lack of controlling for confounders limit the generalisability of these findings.
Kleinhans	2004	A systematic review of empirical studies	A review of the recent Dutch and English empirical research into the social consequences of housing diversification and the resulting social mix in urban renewal areas dominated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a strong consensus with regard to the positive impacts of housing diversification on the physical characteristics housing diversification on the physical characteristics. 2. Lifestyle is a far more important determinant of social interaction than tenure.

			by social rented or council housing.	
Bond, Sautkina & Kearns	2010	A systematic review of literature review	A review of all literature reviews of primary UK studies published between 1995 and February 2009, and focused on the effects of mixed tenure on social cohesion and social capital, social norms (attitudes and expectations), area reputation, health and health related behaviour, economic effects and environmental effects	Of the six UK reviews of primary studies, most drew on less than half the available primary studies, none provided a critical appraisal of individual studies and made no comment on conflicting evidence between and within studies. While the reviews gave indications of the deficiencies of the evidence base, rather than focus on the implications of these deficiencies, four of the six reviews emphasised the positive effects of tenure mix.
Galster	2010	A review of empirical studies	A review of the evidence base related to three dimensions of social mix: 1. Composition - On what basis(es) are we mixing people: ethnicity, race, religion, immigrant status, income, housing tenure...all, or some of the above? 2. Concentration - What is the amount of mixing in question? Which amounts of which groups comprise the ideal mix, or are minimally required to produce the desired outcomes? 3. Scale - Over what level(s) of geography should the relevant mix be measured? Does mixing at different spatial scales involve different causal processes and yield different outcomes?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Composition: mixing on the basis of economic status seems more important than on the basis of immigrant status; there should not be too great a gap between the economic groups being mixed; 2. Concentration: the U.S. research indicates that the mix should not exceed roughly 15-20% poverty populations; evidence less clear for Europe; 3. Scale: mixing should be accomplished at the spatial scale of multiple hundreds of households.

Tunstall & Lupton	2010	A review of the evidence	A review of the evidence on mixed communities as an approach to renewal and regeneration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited evidence of any benefits from a mixed communities approach above and beyond the benefits from traditional renewal. 2. Addressing area reputation and stigma is one aspect that may be best addressed by improving the mix. 3. Better services do not necessarily emerge in more mixed communities. 4. People in mixed neighbourhoods do not necessarily mix. 5. There is substantial diversity of situations in which a mixed communities approach is sometimes used - the features required to make it work may be present in some but not others. 6. There are costs associated with operating a mixed communities approach
-------------------	------	--------------------------	--	---

ANNEX 2: PRIMARY STUDIES AND SECONDARY DATA ANALYSES OF THE BENEFITS OF MIXED COMMUNITIES

Authors	Date	What type of study	What is it all about?	Findings
Atkinson & Kintrea	2000	A primary study	Through diaries which described the movements of individuals 38 households (27 owners and 11 renters, 49 individuals in total) outside their homes for a period of seven consecutive days, they charted residents' networks and assessed the potential for owner-occupation to 'reconnect' existing residents with society beyond the local neighbourhood.	There was a degree of support that tenure diversification can overcome stigma. However, owners and renters in regeneration areas largely inhabit different social worlds and that the introduction of owner-occupation makes little difference to renter' networks
Ostendorf, Musterd & De Vos	2001	Analysis of secondary data sources	A database of a research project carried out in Amsterdam in 1994 with a random sample of about 4,000 Amsterdam residents of 18 years and older. Statistical analyses of Amsterdam in terms of the shares of owner occupied dwellings and of private (i.e., not social) dwellings in cells (each cell have 100 in Amsterdam) to check the relationship between the concentrations of underprivileged people and the quality of the housing stock (in terms of the shares of owner occupied dwellings and private dwellings).	The exploratory analysis presented was limited. The low share of underprivileged people does limit the analysis of the spatial configuration of these underprivileged people.

Martin & Watkinson	2003	A primary study	Based on the result of one of the SAVE (Selling Alternate Vacants on Estates) programme executed by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Trust.	<p>They reported several direct financial benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An added benefit of this policy is an upturn in the local economy; 2. A higher proportion of economically active residents living on an estate helps support the sustainability of local shops and services – which in turn can provide employment opportunities for other members of the community; 3. Having more parents with jobs means more role models of working households; 4. Increase the property value of the area, e.g., increased by 88% from first quarter 1998 to third quarter 2002
Fenton <i>et al.</i> 2010	2010	A primary study	Why poor neighbourhoods remain poor - a study of four deprived neighbourhoods in Birmingham with a focus on the experiences of young adults (aged 16-35)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wider economic factors play a considerable part in limiting the potential of people living in deprived neighbourhoods; 2. Inner city neighbourhoods serve as popular destinations for new immigrants, as households establish themselves and increase their earnings they tend to move out, to be replaced by new migrants; 3. Suburban outlying neighbourhoods typically have high concentrations of social housing which tends to attract poorer households. They too may move out if their incomes improve, to be replaced by other poor households; 4. Young adults' experiences of living in deprived neighbourhoods are mixed - experience of crime is an issue, but a strong sense of belonging to a community is also a factor.

DCLG	2010	A primary study	An evaluation of the early stages of development of 12 Mixed Communities Demonstration Projects - all neighbourhoods in England with problems associated with concentrations of poverty and (in most cases) social housing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans to establish mixed communities with funding entirely dependent on the high value of the land are particularly vulnerable at times of economic downturn. Non-housing related projects fared better; 2. Benefits from mixed communities projects cannot be measured in the first three years - they are expected to take much longer to occur; 3. Residents generally interpret "mixed" to refer to ethnic mix, not tenure. Residents are unsure whether improving the income mix of their area will bring benefits; and 4. The local authorities undertaking mixed communities projects had not developed methods of appraising the full financial costs of the programmes, or the means to assess the outcomes.
Livingstone, Bailey & Kearns	2010	A primary study	40 interviews (ten in each case study) to examine the nature of place attachment in four contrasting case study neighbourhoods in Northern England at the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007. Case study areas were located in one city-region (Greater Manchester in Northern England). The four case study areas were neighbourhoods which all had relatively high concentrations of deprivation but which were designed to have contrasting levels of turnover and of social mix in terms of tenure and ethnicity.	There was little evidence that social mix in any dimension reduced attachment significantly. However, high residential turnover and a rapidly changing (ethnic) mix in one area had led to increased anxieties and reduced attachments.
Clark & Drinkwater	2002	Analysis of secondary data sources	Data from the Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities (1993-94) and 1991 Census micro-data. A sample of 11,772 males and 11,818 females.	Members of ethnic minorities in England and Wales who live in enclaves experience a higher risk of unemployment and a lower probability of self-employment than comparable individuals who live in less concentrated areas.

Edin, Fredriksson & Åslund	2003	Analysis of secondary data sources	Data from the LINDA database that contained a panel of around 20% of the foreign-born population in Sweden. A sample of 6,418 immigrants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The least skilled are the ones who gain most from living in ethnic enclaves: the earnings gain associated with a standard deviation increase in ethnic concentration is 13%. 2. The quality of the enclave seems to matter. Members of high-income ethnic groups gain more from living in an enclave than members of low-income ethnic groups.
Préteceille	2003	Analysis of secondary data sources	2002 survey " <i>Enquête sur le parc locatif social</i> " (ELPS) France. GIS study of the correlation between low social status of the area and high percentage of social housing population in Paris	Areas which concentrate social difficulties seem to be more correlated with social class, occupation and job position, than with housing per se. At the small area level, the correlation is strong between social housing and popular status areas. It is less so at the municipal level. And at the scale of <i>départements</i> , it is even more ambivalent.
Andersson, Musterd, Galster and Kauppinen	2007	Analysis of secondary data sources	Data from the Statistics Sweden Louise files that contain all individuals age 15 and above in Sweden. To explore the degree to which a wide variety of 1995 neighbourhood conditions in Sweden are statistically related to earnings for metropolitan and non-metropolitan men and women during the 1996–99 period, controlling for a wide variety of personal characteristics.	The socio-economic composition of neighbourhoods is the most important dimension, at least in terms of individuals' incomes.
Kearns & Mason	2007	Analysis of secondary data sources	Survey of English Housing 2001 and 2002. A total sample size of 39 175 respondents (approximately one in 530 households in England); two sets of questions asked in the SEH, one about neighbourhood problems and the other about improvements required to services and facilities in the neighbourhood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The level of social renting is the more important factor determining the incidence of problems; 2. 'Balanced communities' in tenure terms offer no guarantee that neighbourhood problems will be reduced; and 3. There are some respects in which social renting can offer satisfactory, quiet environments.

Propper, Burgess, Bolster, Leckie, Jones and Johnston	2007	Analysis of secondary data sources	The first ten waves of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) covering 1991–2000 to examine the impact of neighbourhood on the income of individuals living in social housing in the UK. A sample size of over 5,500 households covered over 10,000 people.	No differences in the inverse relationship between residence in the most disadvantaged neighbourhood quartile and the individual's income level ten years hence across age, gender, education and ethnic groups, although income growth over this period appeared more attenuated by neighbourhood disadvantage for Whites than for non-Whites.
Baum, Arthurson & Rickson	2010	Analysis of secondary data sources	Data from the Household Income and Labour Dynamics Australia survey and the 2001 Australian Census of Population and Housing. A dataset of 8,437 observations. Understand how neighbourhood satisfaction, measured at the level of an individual, is associated with characteristics of the neighbourhood in which an individual lives, in particular the socioeconomic mix of that neighbourhood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the neighbourhood becomes more mixed in tenure terms, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied with their neighbourhood declines; 2. As the percentage of people born in non-English-speaking countries increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied declines; 3. As the proportion of high-income households increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied rises; 4. As the proportion of low-income households increases, the likelihood that an individual will be satisfied with their neighbourhood decreases; and 5. Neighbourhood satisfaction was found to be lower in more mixed areas.
Galster, Andersson & Musterd	2010	Analysis of secondary data sources	Data from the Statistics Sweden Louise files that contain 1.67 million adults consistently residing in the three Swedish metropolitan areas from 1991 to 1999. To analyse the degree to which the mixture of low-, middle- and high income males in the neighbourhood affects the subsequent earnings of individuals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lower-income metropolitan Swedish males and females over age 30 experience a gain in their labour income when either lower-income (i.e., males in the lowest 30th percentile) neighbours or (although to a smaller degree) higher-income (i.e., males in the highest 30th percentile) neighbours are replaced by an equivalent share of middle-income (i.e., males in the 31st to 70th percentile) neighbours; 2. This neighbourhood mix effects are consistently stronger for parents and those who do not work full-time, independently of other individual dimensions; and 3. A combination of personal attributes typically governs the vulnerability of the individual to the effect of neighbourhood income mix.

Social Research series

ISSN 2045-6964

ISBN 978-1-78045-116-9

web only publication

www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch

APS Group Scotland
DPPAS11451 (03/11)

