

Tenure integration in housing developments

A literature review



Research review

NHBC Foundation
NHBC House
Davy Avenue
Knowlhill
Milton Keynes
MK5 8FP
Tel: 0844 633 1000
Email: info@nhbcfoundation.org
Web: www.nhbcfoundation.org
Twitter: @nhbcfoundation

Acknowledgements

This literature review was researched and written by Sarah Harrison, assisted by Kirsten Burrows, PRP.

The NHBC Foundation is grateful to Jane Briginshaw and Alison Mathias, Homes and Communities Agency, for their guidance during the development of this review.

Photograph credits:

Page viii: Steve Speller / Alamy

Page 9: Anthony Weller / Archimage

Page 10: reproduced by kind permission of Oxfordshire County Council

Photographic Archive

Page 12: Jack Sullivan / Alamy

Methodology note

The reports studied in this literature review broadly divided into two camps: academic reports from universities which provided detailed secondary research derived from studies in the field alongside national statistics; and industry reports from housing umbrella organisations and think tanks, such as the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH), Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF), Shelter and the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), which focused more on the qualitative aspects of mixed communities from the point of view of developers, RSLs and residents through case studies, focus groups and interviews.

Generally, the research uncovered focused on the redevelopment or regeneration of existing neighbourhoods across England and Scotland, the exception being Markovich's (2014) review of two new urban extensions at Poundbury, Dorset, and New Gorbals, Glasgow, and Bernstock's (2008) review of three developments in the Thames Gateway (Greenwich Millennium Village, Gallions Reach and Ingress Park). Only one report was discovered on the effects of mixed tenure on smaller new developments (Rowlands et al. 2006); this report provided useful insights from the point of view of developers, RSLs and other stakeholders.

Tenure integration in housing developments

A literature review



Research review

September 2015

About the NHBC Foundation

The NHBC Foundation, established in 2006, provides high-quality research and practical guidance to support the house-building industry as it addresses the challenges of delivering 21st-century new homes. To date, it has published more than 65 reports on a wide variety of topics, including the sustainability agenda, homeowner issues and risk management.

The NHBC Foundation is also involved in a programme of positive engagement with the government, academics and other key stakeholders, focusing on current and pressing issues relevant to house building.

To find out more about the NHBC Foundation, please visit www.nhbcfoundation.org. If you have feedback or suggestions for new areas of research, please contact info@nhbcfoundation.org.

NHBC is the standard-setting body and leading warranty and insurance provider for new homes in the UK, providing risk management services to the house-building and wider construction industry. All profits are reinvested in research and work to improve the construction standard of new homes for the benefit of homeowners. NHBC is independent of the government and house builders. To find out more about the NHBC, please visit www.nhbc.co.uk.

The NHBC Foundation Expert Panel

The NHBC Foundation's research programme is guided by the following panel of senior representatives from government and industry:

Rt. Hon. Nick Raynsford

Chairman of the NHBC Foundation and Expert Panel

Jane Briginshaw

Head of Design and Sustainability, Homes and Communities Agency

Andrew Burke

Policy Officer, National Housing Federation (retired)

Richard Cook

Head of Residential Development, Lend Lease

Claire Curtis-Thomas

Chief Executive, British Board of Agrément

Hywel Davies

Technical Director, Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE)

Andrew Day

Director, Architecture, Design & Sustainability – New Homes and Communities, Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd

Russell Denness

Group Chief Executive, Croudace Homes Group

Michael Finn

Design and Technical Director, Barratt Developments plc

Cliff Fudge

Technical Director, H+H UK Ltd

Richard Hardy

Managing Director, BRE Global

Richard Harral

Head of Technical Policy, Building Regulation and Standards Division, Department for Communities and Local Government

Richard Hill

Chief Executive, Spectrum Housing Group

Neil Jefferson

Director, NHBC and Chief Executive, Zero Carbon Hub

Rod MacEachrane

Director, NHBC (retired)

Robin Nicholson CBE

Senior Partner, Cullinan Studio

Tadj Oreszczyn

Director, The Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources

Geoff Pearce

Executive Director of Regeneration and Development, Swan Housing Association

Mike Quinton

Chief Executive, NHBC

Helen Saunders

Group Marketing Director, Crest Nicholson plc

Steve Turner

Head of Communications, Home Builders Federation

Andy von Bradsky

Chairman, PRP Architects LLP

Karl Whiteman

Divisional Managing Director, Berkeley Homes

Tony Woodward

Managing Director, Kingerlee Homes

Neil Smith

Head of Research and Innovation, NHBC, and Secretary to the Expert Panel

Contents

Foreword	v
Executive summary	vii
1 Introduction	1
2 Findings	3
2.1 The rationale for mixed tenure	3
2.2 Spatial configuration of tenures	4
2.3 Tenure blindness	4
2.4 Effects on property values	4
2.5 Stigmatisation of social housing	5
2.6 Social interaction	5
2.7 Changes in tenure mix over time and the private rented sector	6
2.8 Good design	7
2.9 The role of public spaces and other communal facilities	7
2.10 Infrastructure delays	8
2.11 Local schools	8
2.12 Effects on the local economy	9
2.13 Gentrification	9
2.14 Management	9
2.15 Service charges	11
2.16 Absentee landlords	11
2.17 Resident involvement	12
2.18 Management challenges for RSLs	12
2.19 Allocation policies	13
2.20 Post-occupancy support for residents	13
2.21 Socio-economic benefits	13
2.22 Crime	14
2.23 Education	15
2.24 Employment	15
3 Conclusions and suggestions for further research	17
References	20
Bibliography	21

Foreword

One of the curious features of mid 20th-century planning and housing policies was the creation of mono-tenure communities on a large scale. Indeed, at the very time we were building the largest number of new homes ever (300,000 a year in the 1950s, 400,000 a year in the 1960s), tenure segregation was at its height. Almost all the new houses of that era were built for either owner-occupation or council tenancies, and rarely, if ever, were they built on the same site.

The underlying assumption that people of different economic or social status should be housed in separate locations was not only to prove unsound – as highlighted by the extensive problems of deprivation and social exclusion on stigmatised ‘sink estates’ – it was also at variance with the way people had lived for thousands of years. Look at the patterns of housing built in medieval, Tudor or Georgian times and you will see integrated tenure, with rich and poor not just living in the same street or village, they often lived in the same house. Of course, wealthier people enjoyed much grander and more comfortable accommodation and within the home ‘upstairs’ and ‘downstairs’ were clearly delineated. But the idea that people with different income levels should live in entirely separate areas didn’t take hold until the second half of the 20th century. It proved a very unhappy experiment.

So the move to promote integrated tenure over the past two decades is entirely understandable and appropriate. But inevitably questions have been raised about how this is best achieved and how to respond to potential problems. For example, there are differences of view about the management of ‘pepper-potted’ developments and also about the long-term implications when properties originally designed for owner-occupation are converted in significant numbers into private rented accommodation.

This report reviews the evidence about tenure integration in new housing developments and provides a very useful summary covering a range of different themes. Most of the conclusions are encouraging. The evidence does not suggest that there are immovable barriers to successful mixed-tenure developments, and demonstrates that fears that such developments will threaten the value of owner-occupied housing are not substantiated. They do point to the need for careful planning and good design to ensure the creation of successful communities and they reinforce the case for high-quality management.

I hope the report will be of interest and value to all those involved in planning and developing new integrated-tenure housing schemes in the coming years.

Rt. Hon. Nick Raynsford
Chairman, NHBC Foundation

Executive summary

The NHBC Foundation, in collaboration with the Homes and Communities Agency, commissioned this review of existing literature to explore issues surrounding tenure integration in new housing developments. The review primarily considers the success of the various approaches to locating and distributing social housing in mixed-tenure developments, and secondarily answers specific research questions on the perceived benefits of tenure integration.

The initial aim of the review was to research the role of tenure integration in new developments, but much of the literature studied focused on the impact of the complex web of historical government policies relating to existing neighbourhoods housing socially mixed communities, which included mixed tenure. In addition, some researchers concluded that much of the evidence base on the benefits of mixed tenure was of poor quality and devalued by the lack of measurable non-mixed tenure control groups and long-term evaluation.

However, despite this, the literature review has revealed useful findings relating to the role of tenure integration within new developments. The key findings are set out below, followed by suggestions for potential areas of additional research.

The research shows:

1. Mixed tenure is part of UK life

Most researchers agreed that the building of mono-tenure developments was considered a thing of the past and no longer had a role in the strategic objectives of many developers or social landlords. This was despite the fact that the financing of mixed-tenure developments, with its increasing reliance on cross-subsidy, was seen to be challenging for all those involved and the main barrier to mixed tenure in the future.

2. Tenure integration does not reduce property prices

This is true as long as the design of the overall development and the quality of the housing is of a high standard. Many researchers emphasised the importance of 'place-making' rather than tenure configuration, ie, the building of attractive neighbourhoods that knitted the development into the surrounding area.

3. A range of house types and sizes could help to stabilise neighbourhoods

A wider range of typologies and unit sizes could encourage residents to move from private rented to purchase, or those in apartments to family housing, thereby encouraging long-term value in terms of social relationships across income groups and tenures, neighbourhood stability and economic success.

4. The management of mixed-tenure developments is complex and under-researched

Management structures and associated costs should be agreed before building, to ensure future clarity around roles and responsibilities for long-term management. There was little specific research in this important area and significant gaps included: the lack of industry skills for the management of mixed tenures; the management demands of the technical complexities of new developments; and the challenge of ensuring service charges are apportioned fairly and appropriately between tenures with different expectations around the level of services to be provided and different notions of affordability.

5. The impact of the boom of the private rented sector on mixed tenure developments is particularly under-researched

High levels of privately rented properties were found to considerably change the anticipated tenure mix on a development, providing both advantages (greater income-related integration between tenures) and disadvantages (greater turnover of properties and lack of management accountability).

Further research could show:

- The optimum mix to encourage social cohesion, maintain property prices and help create long-lasting communities.
- The impact of changes to tenure mix and the extent of social interaction between tenures over a period of time.
- A clear link between improved life outcomes for individuals and mixed-tenure neighbourhoods.
- The effect that the buy-to-let sector has in mixed-tenure communities and how engagement with private landlords and their residents could be improved.
- How to manage different tenure expectations, particularly in apartmented and high-rise developments.



Bournville in Birmingham is an example of a popular and sustainable socially mixed community

1 Introduction



'Part of what makes a community sustainable is a well-integrated mix of decent housing of different types and tenures to support a wide range of households of different sizes, ages and incomes.' (ODPM 2005)

The NHBC Foundation, in collaboration with the Homes and Communities Agency, commissioned this review of existing literature to explore issues surrounding tenure integration in new housing developments. The review primarily considers the success of the various approaches to locating and distributing social housing in mixed-tenure developments, and secondarily seeks to answer specific research questions relating to the perceived benefits of tenure integration:

- How does the spatial configuration of tenures affect residents' perceptions of their neighbours and neighbourhoods?
- Is there any evidence that tenure integration affects the local economy or property values?
- Do public spaces or other communal facilities play a role in encouraging social cohesion within integrated-tenure developments?
- What are the implications of tenure integration for housing management?
- Does tenure integration have an effect on crime, school attainment and job opportunities?

The review has unearthed a considerable amount of literature on the subject of mixed tenure, most of it focusing on the perceived social benefits of mixed communities.

In order to provide a framework and to ensure robustness in the selection of relevant primary research findings relating to the specific research questions, the following criteria were applied. To be included in this review, reports needed to:

- be undertaken within the past 30 years and include primary/secondary research in the UK
- be published by a reputable organisation or research group
- demonstrate robust primary and/or secondary research methodologies and cite a comprehensive list of references and
- include case studies from around the UK, particularly England and Scotland.

The literature search identified a natural division of the available research into reports produced before and after 2009. Pre-2009 findings have been informed in the main by two round-up reports:

- *Developing and sustaining mixed tenure housing developments* by Bailey and Manzi (2008)
- *Mixed evidence on mixed tenure effects: Findings from a systematic review of UK studies, 1995-2009* by Sautkina et al. (2012).

These two reports provided considerable insight into literature on the subject of mixed tenure between 1995 and 2009, a period when there were wide-ranging government policies and funding initiatives to regenerate and develop more mixed, and theoretically more socially sustainable, communities.

No such equivalent reports were found that wrapped up research after 2009 and therefore this literature review concentrates on reports published from 2009 onwards. This division of research undertaken before and after 2009 is also a considered choice, given the change in 2010 to a new Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition government and the substantial changes in housing and community policy that followed.

Although this review is about tenure integration in new developments, the research uncovered focused generally on the effects of mixed tenure in the redevelopment or regeneration of existing neighbourhoods and urban extensions across England and Scotland. The study by Rowlands et al. (2006) was the only report within this review that specifically studied the effects of mixed tenure in new developments, providing useful insights from the point of view of developers, registered social landlords (RSLs) and other stakeholders.

In Chapter 2, the findings of the review are summarised – the headings reflect the order of the research questions set out above.

Chapter 3, the Conclusion, also includes some suggestions for future research.

Terminology

Although the subject of this research is 'tenure integration', the term was rarely used in the literature reviewed. Instead, the terms 'mixed tenure', 'tenure blindness' and 'mixed communities' were commonly used interchangeably, all terms that have become synonymous with the notion of social and income mix.

2 Findings



'None of the evidence suggests that tenure mix is undesirable, indeed the argument is generally one that tenure mix is a desirable but not sufficient approach to building successful communities which will house lower income households and will prevent the segregation of the poor.'
(Rowlands et al. 2006)

2.1 The rationale for mixed tenure

Since 2005, a number of government directives have encouraged mixing tenures on new developments to promote a 'well-integrated mix of decent housing of different types and tenures' (OPDM 2005). Underpinning these directives were the notions of making neighbourhoods less reliant on repeated regeneration funding initiatives, and that high concentrations of very poor people needed to be avoided. It was considered that 'just living in a deprived neighbourhood' had a negative influence and reduced the opportunities for residents to improve their lives. The policies assumed that poorer households would benefit from living in close proximity to better-off residents where a good social mix and range of household incomes would help to improve their individual 'life chances' by encouraging social interaction through tenure integration. As a result, mixed-economy activities would thrive and crime and anti-social behaviour would be reduced (Sautkina et al. 2012).

More recently, tenure integration has been encouraged as a way of resolving the shortage of affordable housing. Government directives were introduced that set out minimum social housing quotas for all new developments, with policy and guidance around executing tenure mix being passed on to local government in the form of Policy Planning Statements. Affordable housing targets were set at around 35-50% for all new developments across the UK, apart from in London where the London Plan¹

¹ In 2011, this London target was replaced by an overall number of 'affordable homes' to be delivered across the capital, with percentages negotiated locally between local authorities and developers.

set a target of a 50:50 mix in larger developments. These quotas were reinforced by local planning consents mostly using Section 106 (England and Wales) and Section 75 (Scotland) agreements.

However, the acquisition of affordable housing via Section 106 agreements on private sector-led sites was historically dependent on capital grants from the government, and as these grants have been reduced over the past 10 years, so too has the reliance placed on them by the social housing sector. A number of larger RSLs prefer instead to purchase and develop out sites themselves, with their own market sales cross-subsidising their affordable housing (Savills Research 2013).

2.2 Spatial configuration of tenures

The intention of this review was to shed light on issues relating to the spatial configuration of mixed-tenure developments and the associated socio-economic benefits; however, few reports explored these links in detail. This is one of the major criticisms of the available research put forth by Sautkina et al. (2012) who found that few of the studies examined made any mention of the spatial configuration of the tenures despite the widespread assumption of its importance. In addition, while recognising that the scale of a development (in terms of numbers of homes or residents), the percentages of mix and whether it is a regeneration or newbuild scheme may result in different outcomes, a number of writers were not entirely clear what the ideal social mix should be within an optimally diverse neighbourhood. However, where spatial configuration was discussed, there was generally agreement around the terminology used for the different approaches to the positioning of the different tenures within a development. Groves et al. (2003) defined these as:

- 'integrated' or 'pepper-potting' where tenures are located side-by-side and are indistinguishable; various types and sizes
- 'segmented' where social rented and market properties are divided by blocks or properties characterised by short culs-de-sac; short terraces, etc.
- 'segregated' where different tenures are geographically separated; for example in extreme cases, gated communities.

2.3 Tenure blindness

The term 'tenure blindness' was often used synonymously with 'integrated' or 'pepper-potting', although it could equally apply to a 'segmented' configuration; its main premise being that there should be no architectural distinction (particularly the external specifications and standard of finishes) between the tenures. It was found that many developers and RSLs preferred a 'tenure-blind' approach in order to eliminate visible identification of tenures and to avoid the stigmatisation of social housing.

On schemes where tenure blindness had been positively encouraged and there was a versatile mix of attractive properties of different sizes and types, residents tended to be less aware of the differences in tenure and reported good neighbourly relationships. By contrast, negative feelings and/or a strong sense of difference and division tended to run highest when the architectural distinction between the different tenures was clearly visible – with people in apartments feeling more isolated and less likely to chat to neighbours than those in houses.

However, uniformity of property sizes and finishes across the private and RSL sectors are not so easy to provide. For example, although space standards were seen as important for social housing, with RSLs increasingly using their own standard house types for affordable housing in the interests of efficiency, private developers equally preferred to define their own standards for market housing where they could ensure more features such as garages and en-suite bathrooms and a higher standard of finishes and 'extras' than RSLs could afford.

2.4 Effects on property values

Whereas the 'integrated' approach was promoted in numerous reports as being the most popular with developers and RSLs in terms of maintaining property values, there

was little evidence of either positive or negative effects of this approach on the local economy or property values. Two reports (Bretherton and Pleace 2011; Clarke 2012) discussed resident and developer perceptions of property values based on interviews and surveys; however, the qualification of these perceptions was limited – it was not clear upon what evidence these preconceived ideas were based or how many of the respondents felt this way. The exception to this was the Rowlands et al. (2006) report whose findings were based on interviews with a number of the larger house builders in England including both traditional house builders and RSLs. Rowlands et al. found that good design was crucial to the saleability of new homes, and developers were confident that tenure mix alone did not affect the saleability or price of their units on well-designed developments. Much more important was the location of the development, the design and quality of the homes, and the quality of the layout and public realm. Developers considered shared ownership a more ‘palatable’ affordable option than social housing for rent and, as it carried less stigma, the potential impact on property values was less marked. In more expensive housing markets, they preferred not to accommodate tenure mix at all, as this was seen as detrimental to the sale values of their private properties (Rowlands et al. 2006).

Rowlands et al., through their interviews, also established that prices for properties on mixed-tenure developments were generally comparable with the local market and found no evidence that mixed tenure alone had a negative impact on property values. In addition, in interviews with new owner-occupiers, the researchers found that 92% were aware that they were living in a mixed-tenure estate, with 76% aware at the point of sale; mixed tenure had not deterred them from purchase.

2.5 Stigmatisation of social housing

There was a perception by some owner-occupiers that poorer households were ‘inherently bad neighbours’. Owner-occupiers – who said they were strongly aware of which homes fell within each tenure – were often quick to blame the social renters for some of the problems in a development; a stereotyping that researchers found was usually unfairly directed and resulted more from poor management rather than the location of the tenure. This stigmatisation of social renters, by private renters as well as owner-occupiers, further reduced the likelihood of social mixing (Rowlands et al. 2006; Bretherton and Pleace 2011).

A key consideration regarding residents’ perceptions of their neighbours was found to be at the point of sale and the extent to which potential owner-occupiers were informed about the amount of social housing on a scheme, with some sales materials criticised for not explicitly mentioning the presence of social housing. However, if new purchasers understood that social renters would be their immediate neighbours, and they still wished to purchase, then positive outcomes could result (Bretherton and Pleace 2011).

Mostly though, owner-occupiers realised that mixed tenure was likely, especially at the lower end of the market and generally their concerns were not given as reasons for them moving or wanting to move elsewhere. Although some feared that their housing investment could be devalued by their proximity to social housing, Rowlands et al. found that only 16% were definite that tenure mix would affect the value of their property when they sold on, with 28% thinking it could have some impact and 48% confident that it would have no impact (Rowlands et al. 2006; Bretherton and Pleace 2011).

2.6 Social interaction

‘Owners and renters were found to occupy distinctive social worlds and opportunities for social interaction were limited.’ (Kearns et al. 2013)

Whereas Sautkina et al. (2012) warned that they found little firm evidence relating spatial configurations and social interaction outcomes (as most studies did not specifically reference the tenure configurations in their qualitative findings), many researchers suggested that residents of different tenures led parallel lives, living in close proximity, sharing communal spaces, but not actually mixing with each other. Often a feeling of ‘us’ and ‘them’ was seen to develop, although the presence of

families with small children and a smaller gap between income divisions were shown to improve the likelihood of interaction and sense of community (Tunstall and Lupton 2010; Markovich 2014).

Bailey and Manzi (2008) found considerable evidence that for many residents the question of tenure mix within a neighbourhood was not an issue of great concern, although some residents resented living close to households with very different lifestyles. Markovich (2014) talked about the desirability of 'affinity clustering' on the basis that social rented tenants may prefer to live next to other tenants rather than owner-occupiers, and segmented or segregated approaches were shown to be preferred in high-value areas.

First-time owner-occupiers were generally found to have few local attachments to their chosen neighbourhood, many spending their time outside their communities. They were seen as less likely to make contact with their new neighbours. Social tenants, by contrast, spent more of their time at home and in their immediate neighbourhood. They tended 'to regard owners with suspicion and usually did not know any of them' (Kearns et al. 2013). 'They're only here to live...They don't really care whether they mix or not...They just see it as more as a plus-thing...because it's near their workplace or it's a good base for them...they don't seem to mix as well as what you would do if they come from your area' (Markovich 2014).

2.7 Changes in tenure mix over time and the private rented sector

Despite careful planning and commitment to mixed tenure at the planning stage, there was often a difference between the planning consent given for a new development and what was eventually delivered. Targets for affordable housing within a new development could sometimes increase or decrease with the challenge of maintaining a viable business plan. Homes of different tenures could fall into different phases or be released in small numbers over a long and unpredictable time frame. These changes could be unhelpful in supporting emerging communities and at times were found to cause tensions between tenure groups. Some studies suggested that the character of early phases may shape the longer-term reputation of the whole development (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Bernstock 2008).

However, the greatest change to the predicted mix at the planning stage was the impact of the private rented sector (PRS). The purchase of properties designated for outright ownership by the private rented market, and specifically the buy-to-let market (where a property is purchased, usually as an investment, with the explicit aim of renting it out), has been found to change the anticipated tenure mix considerably. The traditional bi-tenure model of owner-occupation and social rent has changed radically over the past two decades with the introduction of a range of new intermediate tenures, but more importantly from the significant rise of the PRS. By 2006, in five of Rowlands et al.'s case studies, the proportion of private rented properties ranged from 27% to 61% of all the properties for sale. And by 2015, private renting has become a larger sector than social renting in some places in Britain, particularly in the South East (Livingston et al. 2013; Carter Jonas 2015).

The PRS has now become an established sector with the average PRS element increasing 'from approximately 90 PRS units per scheme for existing schemes, to approximately 175 PRS units' (Carter Jonas 2015). And yet despite taking up a large proportion of new properties, the potential impact of this tenure was often found to be underestimated at the planning stage in terms of its impact on management strategies and neighbourhood cohesion. The high turnover of population and short periods of stay, typical of privately rented properties, meant that the development of strong links between neighbours and the process of forming and maintaining a community were arguably more difficult. This issue was seen as one of growing importance UK wide (Rowlands et al. 2006; Bernstock 2008; Carter Jonas 2015).



Broad equality in architecture between tenures aids good neighbourly relationships

2.8 Good design

'Where housing is attractive, irrespective of tenure, households will stay longer in the neighbourhood or will commit themselves more to the area, and there may be greater cohesion.' (Groves et al. 2003)

Rather than focusing on tenure mix and spatial configuration, a number of writers agreed that the degree of choice residents had in moving, and the reputation and quality of the estate were much more important factors for its long-term success. A good mix of dwelling sizes and types that would work with different tenures in the future was seen as equally important.

Bailey and Manzi (2008), among others, stressed the importance of high-quality design and layout of the homes and their surroundings, as well as their integration into the wider area. They referred to research undertaken by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)² indicating that design rather than social mix was the key to resident satisfaction and encouraging neighbourliness. This included creating a sense of place, with good car parking arrangements, front doors opening on to the street and front gardens increasing opportunities for informal contact. Allen et al. (2005) stressed that layouts designed to encourage walking and discourage car use could have a significant positive impact on levels of social contact.

2.9 The role of public spaces and other communal facilities

'There was evidence that good layout and design of buildings and public spaces can promote positive relationships between neighbours, which is a crucial system of informal support.' (Bernstock 2008)

Evidence exploring the benefits of public spaces within a development was limited, but where it was discussed, it was in the context of the importance of good overall scheme design and the development of attractive neighbourhoods that people

² CABE merged into The Design Council on 1 April 2011.

wanted to stay in; both factors are seen as significant contributors to encouraging social cohesion. Equally, where public spaces were poorly designed and maintained this was found to have the opposite effect and significantly reduced the opportunities for cross-tenure interaction and social integration (Bernstock 2008; Markovich 2014).

It was found that the main beneficiaries of open spaces and community facilities were families. In their study on Greenwich Millennium Village, Silverman et al. (2005) found that the inclusion of quality parks and open spaces promoted social interaction and contributed to it being a good place to raise families. Markovich (2014) agreed with the premise but stressed the importance of such spaces being secure, and preferably overlooked, so that residents felt confident to let their children play out on their own.

Some researchers cited the additional benefits brought by funded community initiatives to support both environmental awareness and social interaction, for example the Urban Ranger scheme in Ardler, Dundee, which promoted community involvement in a range of projects to support the local environment (Bailey and Manzi 2008).

Research focusing on well-established communities provided stronger evidence for the benefits of shared open spaces between tenures. In the long-standing and highly populated neighbourhoods of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, social housing interviewees emphasised the importance of maintaining shared spaces and activities to encourage the sense of community between tenures (Bates et al. 2013).

However, some developers preferred to segregate spaces by tenure, seeing public space as a potential source of difficulty, especially where these were poorly managed or where residents felt threatened by teenagers congregating. But where open spaces were designated for owner-occupiers only and not available to social renters, the opportunity for social interaction between tenures was found to be reduced allowing the more affluent residents to effectively ignore the social renters (Rowlands et al. 2006; Markovich 2014).

A common concern for researchers was the additional cost related to the upkeep of maintaining high-quality open spaces, and the associated question of who is going to pay for it. This question could be exacerbated when people using such spaces were from outside the development. In Greenwich Millennium Village, for example, the generous open spaces were regularly visited by neighbouring communities, however, the cost of service charges relating to the maintenance of the spaces was paid for by the Greenwich Village residents, which became contentious (Bernstock 2008).

2.10 Infrastructure delays

Due to the uncertainty of funding, and associated difficulties around the phasing of complex regeneration and development schemes, it was found that there was often a considerable time lag between people moving in and the provision of community facilities. Developers tended to concentrate initially on the residential accommodation with the infrastructure design elements often left until the end of the process. This was seen to be counter-intuitive in assisting early social interaction between residents, as the first few months in a home is usually the time when new friendships are formed. Researchers concluded that, where possible, the communal facilities and external spaces should come on stream at the same time as the housing; where this was not possible, on larger developments particularly, a role was identified for local authorities to boost the success of a project by accessing a range of resources to bring the public realm elements forward (Bernstock 2008; Fenton 2010).

2.11 Local schools

Primary schools with local catchment areas were found to be by far the most important off-site spaces where children and parents met through school-based child networks and formed friendships regardless of tenure. However, some studies showed that some new higher-income residents chose not to send their children to local schools, thereby reducing the opportunities for social interaction (Bailey and Manzi 2008; Tunstall and Lupton 2010; Kearns et al. 2013).

2.12 Effects on the local economy

Researchers found that tenure mix was often seen as an important ingredient of a comprehensive plan in regeneration areas to improve long-standing deprivation and bring new spending power into the local economy. For example in the Gorbals in Glasgow, the introduction of market housing to the existing community was seen to enhance the local economy and encourage new business investment such as a supermarket. However, as it was found that new homeowners tended to spend much of their time outside their communities, especially for shopping or recreational activities, the concept of introducing greater household spending power to improve the local economy was often found to be flawed (Markovich 2014).

2.13 Gentrification

When neighbourhoods become established, the danger in terms of mixed tenure is that they become over-popular and gentrified. Gentrification has been seen to drive out low-cost, small enterprises and existing community hubs, adversely affecting those on low incomes. In the neighbourhoods of Kensington and Islington in London, the influx of affluent households and subsequent area gentrification has been found to limit the life choices for poorer households for whom accommodation, facilities, shops and services consequently became unaffordable leaving social tenants feeling 'priced out' of the area and 'resulting in entrapment or outflow to peripheral outer-London neighbourhoods' (Arbaci and Rae 2013; Bates et al. 2013).

2.14 Management

'Management is a hugely important aspect of good design, if something isn't managed properly it can be a total failure.' Developer, Greenwich Millennium Village (Bernstock 2008)

Researchers were in agreement that the management of mixed-tenure developments has become more complex and challenging. With the move away from bi-tenure, multi-tenure developments have evolved to include a range of new tenures and ownership models including high-value sale units, mid-price sale, shared ownership,



Greenwich Millennium Village is described as 'a good place to raise families'



Cutteslowe wall in Oxford (1934), an infamous example of tenure segregation

intermediate rent, market rent, affordable rent and private rent, for example. Robust and preventative management strategies were seen as essential and, where possible, a single management system with clear lines of contact and services to residents should be introduced (Rowlands et al. 2006; Bernstock 2008).

Although integrated spatial configurations were considered best for encouraging social interaction across tenures, with regard to the management of mixed-tenure developments, it was shown that developers and RSLs preferred the segmented approach, where social rented and market properties were divided by blocks or clusters (of short terraces, for example). This was largely due to their experience of associated management and service charge issues following the completion of a project. The avoidance of ‘pepper-potting’, particularly within the same block of apartments, was considered important, in terms of simplifying management processes (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Clarke 2012).

But although the separation of tenures by cores or blocks was seen by both developers and RSLs to facilitate easier management systems, this was also found in some cases to be contentious and could lead to enforced social segregation. Some research referred to tensions arising between residents, developers and RSLs from these different expectations for the level of services required and their associated costs, with management vehicles or partnerships often developed to resolve these differences (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Clarke 2012).

In London particularly there have been a number of recent developments of apartments with tenures separated by cores, floors or entrances with a clear distinction of services and associated charges between the private and affordable properties. The communal entrances for social tenants can be rudimentary, whereas those for private residents can be luxurious (One Commercial Street, London, for example, where the bespoke entrance lobby for the sales units has the ambience of a stylish hotel reception area, and the affordable housing has its own name, the Houblon Apartments, and functional separate entrance at the side of the building). This visible separation by wealth is seen by some to be socially divisive, and the term ‘poor door’, recently introduced to the UK from New York, is increasingly used to describe this arrangement. However, the contention surrounding such obvious segregation of tenures is not new, there have been numerous examples including

the infamous Cutteslowe wall, built by a private housing company in 1934 in north Oxford to create a physical boundary between the private houses and a council estate (later it was pulled down by the council), and the introduction of gated communities, providing protection for high-value developments and retirement villages.

2.15 Service charges

A key challenge in the management of mixed-tenure developments is keeping service charges to an equitable and affordable level for residents of all tenures. While the service charges for affordable and intermediate tenures are required to be kept as low as possible, those in market-sale properties may be prepared to pay higher costs and 'discretionary' charges to meet their particular service expectations, such as expensively finished common areas and 24-hour concierge services (Clarke 2012).

Researchers suggested that greater clarity was needed around the responsibilities for common repairs, maintenance and service charges. This could lessen the confusion about how service charges were allocated between tenures, and also help to reduce the frequent assumptions among developers and owner-occupiers that damage to the common parts was always caused by tenants and should therefore not be treated as a 'common repair': 'developers will always take the view that (any inherent) [building defects] are down to tenant abuse' (Bailey and Manzi 2008; Manzi 2009).

On more complex developments, different levels of management standards and associated charges tend to emerge, in some cases causing confusion and tension among residents from different tenures about who should pay for what in terms of specific services or repairs. For example, social housing tenants on one of the Thames Gateway schemes complained that 'both the quality of housing and ongoing maintenance were inferior for those living in the affordable housing' (Bernstock 2008).

However, very few residents were aware of the detail of the management arrangements and were often confused about how service charges were constituted. On new mixed-tenure developments, when residents were asked if the estate was managed by a specific management company, almost a third were 'not sure' and some responses were incorrect (Rowlands et al. 2006).

2.16 Absentee landlords

'Most problems are from the private rented sector...there will be a higher percentage of that kind of population that's likely to act in an anti-social manner than there would be from either the rented sector or from the owned sector who have bought into it and have a stake in it.' A senior representative from the New Gorbals Housing Association (Markovich 2014)

The increase of the PRS has created various difficulties for those managing new developments. Research has revealed that the impact of the PRS is rarely thought through at the planning stage in terms of future management arrangements, and there is often a connection between high levels of private renting and a lack of investment and care in the neighbourhood. When a problem arose relating to the PRS, managers and residents were frequently left frustrated by the seeming unwillingness of absent landlords to cooperate in estate management issues. It was often difficult for management to know who to contact or how to track down a private landlord (Bernstock 2008; Kearns et al. 2013).

This issue was seen to be one of escalating importance as the private rented sector continues to grow in the UK. Estate agency Carter Jonas suggests that the sector would benefit from some controls such as design guidelines and landlord licensing, pointing out that only 1% of London landlords manage more than 10 units. Such controls have been tried on some schemes, for example, on some Mixed Communities Initiative demonstration projects, local councils have tried to minimise the amount of buy-to-let housing: in North Huyton in Knowsley, Merseyside, the number of buy-to-lets for sale was initially restricted, but developers complained saying that it was 20% of the market, eventually it was stipulated that one individual could buy no more than

three units; in Canning Town in east London a code of practice was established to avoid selling to buy-to-let landlords; and on some mixed-tenure schemes in London, there was reference to large-scale buying by private landlords who then entered into contracts with local authorities to house homeless families (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Burgess et al. 2009; Carter Jonas 2015).

2.17 Resident involvement

It was widely recognised that involving residents in the planning, design and management of neighbourhoods led to better outcomes for residents and their management teams. Involvement in the governance and the running of a new development was also found to help to build neighbourhood ownership and responsibility and to encourage social networks (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Bernstock 2008).



At Poundbury, in Dorset, residents were encouraged to be proactive in their community

The success of the Bournville estate in Birmingham was partly due to the positive involvement of the community in the management of the neighbourhood; and in Poundbury in Dorset, active participation in the Residents' Association was engineered, ie, residents were expected to conform to the 'terms of integration' and be proactive in their community including attending regular meetings. Lack of active participation was interpreted as problematic and compromising 'successful integration' (Groves et al. 2003; Markovich 2014).

2.18 Management challenges for RSLs

Manzi (2009) referred to the new management challenges for RSLs, reminding us that beyond providing affordable homes, historically their role has been to manage empty properties, carry out repairs and collect rents. This role has since evolved to include 'tenancy' and 'neighbourhood' management, which can be challenging and requires a significant new skills set from their staff. The 'introductory' and 'probationary'

tenancies brought in to encourage conformity and social order required new diplomacy skills and tact. And when complex neighbourhood partnerships and governance structures were established, covering a range of issues from estate-based maintenance to schemes tackling anti-poverty and unemployment, this again required a further skills set for housing managers.

2.19 Allocation policies

RSLs found 'that you get better management if you actually plan who you house' (RSL interviewee) (Manzi 2009). However, they were found to have little say in the allocation of their properties as they were usually bound by local authority nominations, although some RSLs, particularly in Scotland, have been known to adapt their allocation policies on mixed-tenure developments. RSLs were therefore keen to see changes to the allocation systems, advocating for 'local lettings' policies, where they could specify percentages of unemployed/employed households, in place of the 'choice-based' lettings system which effectively sees new properties go to those in greatest need, typically homeless households (Manzi 2009).

RSL interviewees discussed the risks of introducing large numbers of homeless households to a new development, particularly those with high support needs such as young single mothers or individuals suffering from substance abuse. They stressed the importance of 'pepper-potting' these households in order to spread the load, as a sizeable cluster of this group could push a neighbourhood to 'tipping point' creating 'a socially unbalanced space which could adversely affect the people who lived there...' (Bretherton and Pleace 2011).

Private developers would also prefer to see the allocation of properties to social tenants strictly limited and intensively managed. When social integration was seen to fail, it was usually the stigmatised social renters who were blamed and this was seen to have a detrimental impact on the management of estates (Clarke 2012).

2.20 Post-occupancy support for residents

Bernstock (2008) emphasised the importance of ongoing social support for new households after they had moved in. Other studies of new estates have also shown that providing support to individual households and encouragement to meet neighbours could have lasting benefits. Good practice examples included welcome visits from managers or resident representatives; information about local services; and 'get to know your neighbour' events.

2.21 Socio-economic benefits

'To date the evidence is limited that neighbourhood has a large effect on individual outcomes, over and above individual and household factors. Nor is there robust evidence that neighbourhood mix per se or changes to mix (over and above other neighbourhood characteristics) is influential. On this basis, it is not evident that mixing communities will be a more effective strategy than traditional neighbourhood renewal approaches.' (Tunstall and Lupton 2010)

Perhaps the most significant finding from some researchers was the suggestion that greater socio-economic benefits would be achieved if policies and resources were targeted at individuals rather than making changes to the areas in which they live (van Ham and Manley 2010; Sautkina et al. 2012; Markovich 2014).

Tenure integration has been considered by many UK policymakers as a relatively easy mechanism to positively address issues of disadvantage and social exclusion – issues commonly associated with deprived mono-tenure communities. However, the research showed that tenure mix alone is highly unlikely to improve disadvantage

(although it still has a role to play in neighbourhood development). Researchers agreed that measuring the effects of mixed-tenure interventions on socio-economic factors was not straightforward and the evidence remained weak or limited (Tunstall and Lupton 2010; Sautkina et al. 2012; Markovich 2014).

Evidence was found to be weakest and most mixed regarding the effects of tenure mix on school attainment, job opportunities and local spending, partly due to the inherent limitation of statistics and the difficulty of capturing changes in population and users of local services, such as schools (van Ham and Manley 2010; Arbaci and Rae 2013; Livingston et al. 2013, 2014).

The difficulty of isolating social benefits and linking these to the introduction of mixed tenure was acknowledged, especially when neighbourhood regeneration schemes included a number of initiatives to improve socio-economic factors such as the New Deal for Communities (NDC) and Estate Renewal Challenge Fund programmes. For example, although significant reductions in deprivation scores in London's Southwark between 2004 and 2007 were attributed to the substantial rehousing programme – making 'a huge impact on the quality of life of the residents' (Arbaci and Rae 2013) – the programme was complemented by a range of employment and training initiatives funded mainly through the NDC. It was seen as highly probable that the socio-economic benefits were more a result of these initiatives than the introduction of owner-occupiers to the existing community (Arbaci and Rae 2013; Cox et al. 2013).

Researchers found that social tenants experience different levels of opportunity in relation to jobs and life-opportunities but these are not related to the level of tenure mix within the neighbourhood. Some suggested that better outcomes were more likely to occur when the balance between social renting and private housing is roughly 20:80, but others disagreed, suggesting that a concentration of social housing could facilitate access to services and opportunities. Deprivation was seen to have a 'complex and inconsistent relationship' with residential tenure and that 'the alleged relationship between ethnicity, tenure and deprivation is not straightforward and warrants further investigation' (Arbaci and Rae 2013).

2.22 Crime

Although a tenure-blind approach is repeatedly cited as important in contributing to a reduced incidence of local crime, measuring the effects of tenure integration on crime did not appear to be easy. The evidence was not clear cut, with some researchers relying heavily on surveys of residents' perceptions of crime, and others referring to wider neighbourhood data, relating these to annual crime rates. The findings were therefore inconclusive (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Livingston et al. 2014).

However, Livingston et al. observed in their Glasgow study, carried out between 2001 and 2008, that changing mono-tenure social housing areas to more mixed-tenure housing areas could have a positive impact on local crime rates by reducing areas of concentrated poverty, encouraging more stable communities with less residential turnover and by decreasing the number of outlets selling alcohol. Also, Kearns et al. (2013) found some evidence of a reduction in local crime (particularly youth involvement in violent crime) and an increased sense of safety after relocation to more mixed neighbourhoods. Girls were found to benefit more than boys in terms of their reduced involvement in low-level crime and associated behavioural problems (Kearns et al. 2013; Livingston et al. 2014).

However, other evidence showed that although violent crime statistics were seen to fall among movers from poorer to more affluent areas, arrests relating to theft from property were likely to increase, linked to the fact that boys were doing less well educationally, compared with their new more affluent peer group, and also from the simple premise that 'they had relatively more opportunities for crime in their new affluent neighbourhoods' (Cheshire 2007). Supporting the perception that there is more crime in poorer areas, residents being squeezed out of living in the gentrified areas of Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster in London were concerned about the potential of being forced to move to lower-cost areas 'because they think there would be more crime, or that homes would be on "rough estates"' (Bates et al. 2013).

2.23 Education

There was little evidence uncovered of the specific effect of tenure integration on school attainment. However, there was some evidence that movers to more affluent areas were more likely to enrol in schools with better academic performance and raise their aspirations. This was also true of adults who were more likely to enrol in adult education than those who stayed in less affluent areas. Counter-intuitively though, it appeared that children who moved into more tenure-diverse areas tended to do less well in relation to their new academically stronger peers, than those who remained in their less affluent communities.

Although researchers established that people living in deprived areas were more likely to receive poorer educational services and that the socio-economic composition of an area could have a strong influence on local school attainment, it was not so clear what threshold or 'critical mass' of better-off children in schools was required to produce measurable improvements (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Cheshire 2007; Livingston et al. 2013).

2.24 Employment

'We found no evidence that it is beneficial for individual labour market outcomes to mix home owners and social renters within neighbourhoods.'
(van Ham and Manley 2010)

Researchers were generally in agreement that there was insufficient evidence to suggest that mixing social housing with homeowners would facilitate the local labour market by introducing new job opportunities and therefore help the long-term unemployed into employment. Instead, they suggested that anti-poverty policies should target individuals (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; van Ham and Manley 2010).

3 Conclusions and suggestions for further research



Conclusions

The initial aim of the review was to research the role of tenure integration in new housing developments, but much of the literature uncovered focused on the impact of the complex web of government policies relating to existing neighbourhood housing mixed communities, which included mixed tenure. In addition, some researchers concluded that much of the evidence base in relation to the benefits of mixed tenure was of poor quality and devalued by the lack of measurable non-mixed tenure control groups or long-term evaluation.

However, despite this, the literature review has revealed useful findings relating to the role of tenure integration within new developments. The conclusions are set out below, and where relevant, suggested potential areas for additional research are highlighted in bold text.

Perhaps the most fundamental conclusion to this review is that the researchers appeared to be unanimous in their belief that the building of mono-tenure developments was considered a thing of the past and no longer had a role in the strategic objectives of many developers or RSLs. This was despite the fact that the financing of mixed-tenure developments, with its increasing reliance on cross-subsidy, was seen to be challenging for both developers and social landlords, and was considered to be the main barrier to mixed tenure in the future (Clarke 2012).

It was acknowledged that in the present environment it is almost impossible to engineer a precise tenure mix, but nearly all the researchers agreed that rather than concentrating on the correct spatial configuration of tenures, the focus should be on place-making and maximising the quality of the design and layout (Rowlands et al. 2006).

Future research on tenure integration

1. In terms of 'social mix' – often a proxy for tenure mix – although Sautkina et al. (2012) suggested that 20:80 (social housing to private) was about right, they also warned that there was little firm evidence regarding the social or economic impact of spatial or built-form configurations, or the crossover between the two.

In fact, considerable research gaps were discovered concerning the optimum percentages of social, tenure or household mix within developments that would help to build strong lasting neighbourhoods, encourage socio-economic benefits and maintain property values.

2. In one brownfield development 10 miles outside Southampton, only two of the 300 properties for sale were sold to families with children; this was seen to create a real divide between the affordable housing where families with children were relatively prominent and the market housing (which included a strong private rented presence) where there were hardly any families with children (Rowlands et al. 2006; Sautkina et al. 2012).

Developing a good mix of typologies and unit sizes to accommodate a range of household sizes would, it was suggested, help to generate a better mix across age groups, and consequently encourage the long-term investment and stability of the residents. On many new developments the smaller properties (mainly apartments) are aimed at first-time buyers and market renters, with the larger properties (mainly houses) allocated to social housing. More options, through the provision of a range of typologies and prices, may encourage market residents who are thinking of moving to stay in the neighbourhood, thereby encouraging long-term investment, stability and social cohesion.

Rowlands et al. (2006) found that of the 70% of respondents in their case-study developments who were aged 35 or under (with private rental tenants tending to be younger than homeowners), 61% suggested that they were likely to move within two years for reasons relating to the size of property, wanting to buy their own property and employment mobility.

There is little research considering the aspirations of the first-time buyer and private rented market, in terms of whether they would stay in the same neighbourhood if given a greater choice of typologies and prices.

3. What really encourages social interaction between tenures is still unclear, but again it seems that an emphasis on good design is the best strategy. Attractive neighbourhoods that people want to stay in encourage the development of 'organic' social relationships across income groups and tenures and ultimately neighbourhood stability.

Long-term research around residents' evolving experience of mixed-tenure developments and social interaction between tenures is particularly under-researched.

4. The escalation of the PRS has been mentioned a number of times in this report. Yet, although private renting has been found to have a considerable stake in many new developments, particularly in the South East, bringing with it both advantages (greater income-related integration between tenures) and disadvantages (greater turnover of properties and lack of management accountability), the impact of private renting seems to be ignored at the planning stage of mixed-tenure developments. Planning for the inclusion of the PRS should be encouraged, and the responsibilities of private landlords should be reviewed with a view to them entering into agreements related to standards for long-term management and maintenance of their properties (Rowlands et al. 2006).

No studies were found relating to the impact of PRS on mixed-tenure developments in terms of management challenges and social cohesion.

5. In terms of tenure implications for housing management, getting the management and maintenance structures right in new developments was highlighted as one of the key factors to their success, with the split of service charges apportioned fairly and appropriately between the tenures.

Little research has been identified that explores the challenges of managing modern mixed-tenure developments, particularly apartments and high-rise developments, in terms of an equitable provision of services and charges.

6. Finally, in terms of socio-economic benefits, the overall sense of the findings is that there is little evidence that mixed tenure supports the role of positive 'neighbourhood effects', and that policies and resources would be more effective if they were targeted at people rather than places (Tunstall and Lupton 2010; Cox et al. 2013).

A number of researchers recommended that further research is required to illustrate a clear link between improved life outcomes for individuals and mixed-tenure neighbourhoods.

References

- Allen C, Camina M, Casey R, Coward S, Wood M (2005) Mixed tenure, twenty years on – nothing out of the ordinary. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Arbaci S, Rae I (2013) Mixed-tenure neighbourhoods in London: Policy myth or effective device to alleviate deprivation? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37, pp. 451–479.
- Bailey N, Manzi T (2008) Developing and sustaining mixed tenure housing developments. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Bates K, Lane L, Power A, Serle N (2013) Divided city? The value of mixed communities in expensive neighbourhoods (Case Report 77). LSE Housing and Communities.
- Bernstock P (2008) Neighbourhood watch: Building new communities: learning lessons from the Thames Gateway. Shelter, London.
- Bretherton J, Pleace N (2011) A difficult mix: Issues in achieving socioeconomic diversity in deprived UK neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies* 48, pp. 3433–3447.
- Burgess G, Monk S, Fenton A, Clarke A (2009) Negotiating mix: Processes for, and constraints upon, negotiations on the affordability mix in new developments, and on how capital receipts are used. Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research.
- Carter Jonas (2015) The future of London's private rented sector (PRS). Spring 2015.
- Cheshire P (2007) Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities: A critical analysis. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Clarke N (2012) The challenges of developing and managing mixed tenure housing. Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Cox E, Turley A, Davies B, Harrison M (2013) Love thy neighbourhood: People and place in social reform. Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Fenton A (2010) The contribution of housing, planning and regeneration policies to mixed communities in Scotland. Scottish Government Social Research.
- Groves R, Middleton A, Murie A, Broughton K (2003) Neighbourhoods that work: A study of the Bournville estate, Birmingham. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Kearns A, McKee M, Sautkina E, Cox J, Bond L (2013) How to mix? Spatial configurations, modes of production and resident perceptions of mixed tenure neighbourhoods. *Cities* 35, pp. 397–408.
- Livingston M, Kearns A, Bailey N (2013) Delivering mixed communities: The relationship between housing tenure mix and social mix in England's neighbourhoods. *Housing Studies* 28, pp. 1056–1080.
- Livingston M, Kearns A, Bannister J (2014) Neighbourhood structures and crime: The influence of tenure mix and other structural factors upon local crime rates. *Housing Studies* 29, pp. 1–25.
- Manzi T (2009) Promoting responsibility, shaping behaviour: Housing management, mixed communities and the construction of citizenship. *Housing Studies* 25, pp. 5–19.
- Markovich J (2014) 'They seem to divide us': Social mix and inclusion in two traditional urbanist communities. *Housing Studies* 30, pp. 139–168.
- ODPM (2005) Planning for mixed communities: A consultation paper on a proposed change to Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing. London, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister/HM Stationery Office.

-
- Rowlands R, Murie A, Tice A (2006) More than tenure mix: Developer and purchaser attitudes to new housing estates. Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry.
- Sautkina E, Bond L, Kearns A (2012) Mixed evidence on mixed tenure effects: Findings from a systematic review of UK studies, 1995-2009. *Housing Studies* 27, pp. 748–782.
- Savills Research (2013) Additionality of affordable housing. Savills.
- Silverman E, Lupton R, Fenton A (2005) A good place for children? Attracting and retaining families in inner urban mixed income communities. Coventry, Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Tunstall R, Fenton A (2006) In the mix: A review of mixed income, mixed tenure and mixed communities. English Partnerships, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Housing Corporation.
- Tunstall R, Lupton R (2010) Mixed communities: Evidence review. Department for Communities and Local Government.
- van Ham M, Manley D (2010) The effect of neighbourhood housing tenure mix on labour market outcomes: A longitudinal investigation of neighbourhood effects. *Journal of Economic Geography* 10, pp. 257–282.


Bibliography

- Berube A (2005) Mixed communities in England: A US perspective on evidence and policy prospects. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Bond L, Sautkina E, Kearns A (2011) Mixed messages about mixed tenure: Do reviews tell the real story? *Housing Studies* 26, pp. 69–94.
- Fordham G, Cole I (2009) Delivering mixed communities – learning the lessons from existing programmes. Department for Communities and Local Government.
- Graham E, Manley D, Hiscock R, Boyle P, Doherty J (2009) Mixing housing tenures: Is it good for social well-being? *Urban Studies* 46, pp. 139–165.
- Jupp B (1999) Living together: Community life on mixed tenure estates. London, Demos.
- Kilburn D (2012) Conflicting rationalities in the politics of design for 'mixed communities'. The politics of design – a collection of working papers by doctoral researchers in the LSE's Cities Programme. *citiesLAB Volume 2*, pp. 9-28.
- Lupton R, Fitzgerald A (2015) The Coalition's record on area regeneration and neighbourhood renewal 2010-2015, *Social Policy in a Cold Climate*, Summary Working Paper 19.
- Monk S, Clarke A, Tang CPY (2011) Mixed communities: Literature review. The Scottish Government.
- St George Research (2012) Living at Beaufort Park. St George.
- van Ham M, Manley D (2012) Neighbourhood effects research at a crossroads. Ten challenges for future research. *Environment and Planning A* 44(12) pp. 2787–2793.
- Young IM (1999) Residential segregation and differentiated citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 3(2), pp. 237–252.
- Young IM (2000) *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Tenure integration in housing developments

A literature review

Tenure integration in new housing developments has been the subject of much research over the past 30 years, much of it focusing on the perceived social benefits of mixed communities. This literature review considers the success of various approaches to locating and distributing social housing in mixed tenure developments, and answers research questions on issues including spatial configuration, quality of the design and layout of neighbourhoods, the mix of typologies and unit sizes, consideration of tenure mix in the planning process, and getting the management and maintenance strategies right.



The NHBC Foundation, established in 2006, provides high-quality research and practical guidance to support the house-building industry as it addresses the challenges of delivering 21st-century new homes. To date, the NHBC Foundation has published more than 65 reports on a wide variety of topics, including the sustainability agenda, homeowner issues and risk management. Visit www.nhbcfoundation.org to find out more about the NHBC Foundation research programme.

