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Affordable housing  This is housing falling into one of the following categories: social rented; shared ownership; shared equity; discounted low cost sale; or housing without subsidy.

Architecture and Design Scotland  This is a non-departmental public body, established by the Scottish Executive in April 2005 as the national champion for good architecture, design and planning in the built environment.


Better Neighbourhood Services Fund (BNSF)  Funding established from 2001–05 to deliver £121 million to 12 ‘Pathfinder’ local authority areas. These have included projects aimed at tackling crime and vandalism and introducing training, education and employment opportunities. A key element of the BNSF was the sharing of good practice. The Community Regeneration Fund replaced it in 2005.

BREEAM  This refers to the Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method to determine the environmental performance of both new and existing buildings. It is regarded by the UK’s construction and property sectors as the measure of best practice in environmental design and management. Performance is assessed in relation to: management, energy use, health and wellbeing, pollution, land use, ecology, materials and water.

Brownfield land  This is ‘previously developed land that is unused or may be available for development’. It includes both vacant and derelict land and land currently in use with known potential for redevelopment.

Community Planning  This is the process where public services in the area of the local authority are planned and provided after consultation and ongoing cooperation among all public bodies and with community bodies. It aims to ensure people and communities are genuinely engaged in the decisions made on public services that affect them, allied to a commitment from organisations to work together in providing better public services. Community Planning was given a statutory basis in the Local Government (Scotland) Act 2003.

Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs)  Under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 2003, Community Planning Partnerships (CPP) have been set up in all 32 local authority areas, with a range of partners. Local authorities have a duty to initiate, facilitate and maintain Community Planning; core partners (Enterprise Networks, National Health Service, Police, Fire and Regional Transport Partnerships) have a duty to participate in Community Planning; and ministers to promote and encourage Community Planning (including Communities Scotland’s participation in Community Planning at local level).

Community Regeneration Fund  A fund established by the Scottish Executive in 2004 and managed by Communities Scotland. It aims to deliver £318 million over three years to help neighbourhoods escape from poverty. It replaces Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) and Better Neighbourhood Services (BNS) funding and drew on good practice examples from these previous initiatives. Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) are required to specify how their regeneration objectives would be delivered through the establishment of Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs).

Communities Scotland  Communities Scotland is the Scottish Executive’s housing and regeneration agency and was established by the Housing...
(Scotland) Act 2001. Its role is to help deliver the policy objectives and partnership agreement commitments of Scottish ministers. It reports to the Communities Ministers and works closely with them, along with the Scottish Executive Development Department. Its objectives include increasing the supply of affordable housing; improving the quality of existing houses and ensuring a high quality of new build; improving the quality of housing and homelessness services; improving the opportunities for people living in disadvantaged communities; supporting the social economy to deliver key services and create job opportunities; and using its experience of delivering housing and regeneration programmes to inform and support the development of ministerial policies. It has also set up the Scottish Centre for Regeneration to identify and promote best practice in community regeneration.

Discounted low cost sale A dwelling sold at a percentage discount of its open market value to households in the priority client group. Discounted serviced plots for self-build can also contribute, particularly in rural areas. A legal agreement can be used to ensure that subsequent buyers are also eligible buyers. In rural areas this may be achieved through a rural housing burden.

EcoHomes environmental assessment An environmental assessment method for homes. EcoHomes considers the broad environmental concerns of climate change, resource use and impact on wildlife and balances these against the needs for a high quality, safe and healthy internal environment. It is proposed that all social housing providers meet the EcoHomes ‘excellent’ rating in their developments by 2010.

English Partnerships The national regeneration agency for England that is charged with promoting sustainable communities and the re-use of brownfield sites. It is currently being merged with The Housing Corporation and will become England’s housing and regeneration agency, Communities England, from 2009.

Homestake A scheme designed to enable those on low incomes to become owner-occupiers. It is designed for first-time buyers or those whose circumstances have changed, for example through domestic separation. Applicants can choose to purchase up to 80% of the equity of their property, while the remainder is owned by a registered social landlord (RSL).

Housing Association Grant Housing Association Grant makes up the largest part of the Affordable Housing Investment Programme managed by Communities Scotland. Housing Association Grant is available to registered social landlords (RSLs) to acquire land or buildings and to build, convert or improve housing for rent or low cost home ownership.

Housing needs assessment Under the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 all local authorities are required to undertake an assessment of housing needs and conditions in their area and to produce a Local Housing Strategy (LHS). Guidance from Communities Scotland suggested the LHS should cover a five-year period, address all tenures, including affordable housing and be prepared in consultation with stakeholders.

Housing without subsidy Non-subsidised affordable housing is likely to take the form of entry level housing for sale, some built at higher densities and with conditions attached to the missives designed to maintain the houses as affordable units to subsequent purchasers. Homes delivered without subsidy may be considered to fulfil part of the overall affordable housing requirement where it can be clearly demonstrated that they will meet the needs of, and be affordable to, groups of households identified through the housing needs assessment.

Lifetime Homes standards The Lifetime Homes concept was developed by a group of housing experts under the auspices of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Lifetime Homes Group. Lifetime Homes have 16 design features that increase the flexibility and adaptability of a house or flat. Many of these features were subsequently covered by Part M of the English Building Regulations. The Scottish equivalent is Housing for Varying Needs.

Millennium Communities New developments mixing homes, shops, workspaces and community facilities
in England. They incorporate good public transport links, innovation in building technology, energy efficiency and ecological and environmental strategies. They aim to create good, sustainable jobs as well as education and training opportunities and are worked up in close consultation with the communities they relate to.

**MINC** Mixed income new community.

**Mixed development** A well-integrated mix of land uses with decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes.

**New Housing Partnerships** A funding mechanism designed to target additional resources to address the modernisation of Scotland’s council housing stock, as well as to assist regeneration areas and for housing development in growth areas.

**Regeneration Outcome Agreements (ROAs)** These local agreements are a key instrument in delivering better services. They are designed to specify intended service improvements and the anticipated measurable impacts of these improvements. They are intended to establish a strategic framework to integrate local and national priorities for tackling disadvantage.

**Registered social landlord (RSL)** In Scotland a registered social landlord (RSL) is a landlord registered with Communities Scotland. The criteria for registration are set out in the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001. They are organisations that provide housing to let, and other associated services, but they do not trade for profit. The commonest form of RSL in Scotland is a housing association.

**Right to buy (RTB)** Under the Tenants Rights etc (Scotland) Act 1980 local authority tenants were given a number of rights, including security of tenure, and the right to buy (RTB) their properties. The Housing (Scotland) Act 1987 consolidated the 1980 Act and extended the RTB to non-charitable housing associations with more than 100 dwellings. By 2002 over 400,000 public sector dwellings had been sold under the RTB. In 2001 a ‘modernised RTB’ was introduced that reduced the RTB incentives and suspended certain rights in ‘pressured’ areas. The modernised RTB only applies to new tenants.

**Section 75 Agreement** A legal agreement signed between the developer and local authority under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. It ensures that local planning authorities can require developers to make a contribution towards social housing or public facilities such as schools, open spaces or other infrastructure improvements.

**Scottish Housing Quality Standard (SHQS)** Introduced in 2004, the Scottish Housing Quality Standard (SHQS) is an agreed standard of good quality housing that all local authorities and social landlords must meet by 2015. SHQS delivery plans had to be submitted to Scottish ministers during 2005 and they are now assessed by Communities Scotland.

**Scottish Secure Tenancy (SST)** The Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 establishes the Scottish Secure Tenancy (SST) as the tenancy for all tenancies of social landlords in Scotland.

**Short Scottish Secure Tenancy (SSST)** Section 34 and Schedule 6 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 establish the basic conditions when a Short Scottish Secure Tenancy (SSST) can apply to some tenants of social landlords in Scotland in place of a full SST.

**Shared equity** Housing where the owner purchases part of the dwelling, with the remaining stake purchased usually by a registered social landlord (RSL) using a Communities Scotland grant. Unlike shared ownership, the owner pays no rent for the equity stake that is retained by the RSL. While the RSL does not receive any rental income in respect of their stake, it benefits from any equity gain when the house is sold.

**Shared ownership** Housing where the owner purchases part of the dwelling and rents the remainder usually from a registered social landlord (RSL). The owner can buy tranches of 25%, 50% or 75% of the property.

**Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs)** Forty-eight Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) were allocated £60 million by Communities Scotland in 2003. These partnerships were designed to meet the Scottish Executive’s social justice agenda; 34 comprised area-based...
initiatives and 14 were thematic, including young adults and health. The partnerships were designed to be broadly based, community-orientated and involved the local authority and other public services, alongside the voluntary and private sectors. The Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) subsequently superseded SIPs and from 2005 funding has been allocated through the Community Regeneration Fund.

**Social rented housing**  Housing provided at an affordable rent and usually managed locally by a registered social landlord (RSL) such as a housing association, housing cooperative or other housing body regulated by Communities Scotland. Social rented stock is also owned and managed by local authorities at a rent lower than market rent.

**Stock transfer**  Process under which a local authority transfers some or all of its housing to a housing association.

**Sustainable Communities Plan**  A programme of action, published in February 2003, relating to England to tackle the shortage of housing in London and the South East and low demand in the North and Midlands.

**Urban Regeneration Company (URC)**  An Urban Regeneration Company (URC) is a formal partnership of representatives of the public and private sectors, operating at arm’s length to deliver physical and economic regeneration in a specific area. They offer a strategic overview of an area that guides investment decisions by both the public and private sector towards an agreed set of objectives and outcomes. Membership is made up of key stakeholders and community representatives. Three Pathfinder URCs have been established with funding of £20 million in Clydebank; Craigmillar in Edinburgh; and Raploch in Stirling. In February 2006, start-up funding was announced for the establishment of two further Pathfinder URCs in Irvine Bay and Riverside Inverclyde. The Scottish Executive is also working with Glasgow City Council, South Lanarkshire Council and their partners to establish a URC to drive forward and deliver the regeneration of the Clyde Gateway.

**Whole Life Costing**  This is a method of evaluating or comparing building materials and components by looking at installation costs, life span, running and maintenance costs.
Introduction
The Scottish Executive has made a clear commitment to supporting the development and management of mixed income communities in Scotland. Its recent regeneration policy statement confirms that “A key focus of both our housing and regeneration policies is the creation of mixed communities – communities where among other things, there is a mix of incomes and sufficient range, diversity, affordability and accessibility of housing within a balanced housing market. Evidence demonstrates that these communities are more likely to be sustainable in the longer term” (Scottish Executive, 2006a).

The overriding objective of mixed communities is to enable people of different ages, lifestyles and incomes to share the benefits of well-designed housing and the external environment, which meet their needs now and in the future. In particular, this means that careful attention needs to be paid to the initiation and planning of new housing to ensure that local needs and housing market conditions are fully assessed and delivered on the basis of a clear vision. This is no easy task since the creation of sustainable communities requires the long-term collaboration of a number of public and private agencies, the establishment of integrated systems of management and a delivery process that fully engages with existing and future residents. If successful, the outcome will be places to live that offer genuine choice and opportunity for families and individuals from a variety of income groups, backgrounds and lifestyles.

**Purpose of this guide**

A central aim of this guide is to show the extent to which achieving mixed income developments is an important prerequisite for sustainable communities. Because of the limited data available on household incomes, tenure is often used as an alternative. We are aware that all tenures are occupied by people with varying incomes and that these change over time as they move through different stages of the life cycle. While tenure can be determined, at least in the early stages, through the planning process, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to ‘manage’ income levels in any particular development in the long term.

As privately owned property is increasingly seen as a commodity with a commercial value, factors such as location, size, amenities and condition become of increased importance and will rise or fall in value according to demand. For instance, high value one- or two-bedroom units in a central location may well transfer from owner-occupation to being traded in the ‘buy to let’ market; inferior properties in a less favourable location may well be let at market rates en bloc to the local authority.

---

**What makes a sustainable community?**

- A flourishing local economy to provide jobs and wealth.
- Strong leadership to respond positively to change.
- Appropriate size, scale and density, and the right layout to support basic amenities in the neighbourhood and minimise the use of resources (including land).
- A well-integrated mix of decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes.
- A safe and healthy local environment with well-designed public and green space.
- Housing and other buildings which, both individually and collectively, meet different needs over time, and which minimise the use of resources.
- Good quality local public services for all age groups, including education and training opportunities, health care and community facilities, especially for leisure.
- A diverse, vibrant and creative local culture, encouraging pride in the community and cohesion within it.
- A sense of place but well connected to its surroundings.
- The right links with the wider regional, national and international communities.
- A network of safe, well-designed streets and public spaces.
- Good public transport and other transport infrastructure both within the community and linking to urban, rural and regional centres.
- Effective engagement and participation by local people, groups and businesses, especially in the planning, design and long-term stewardship of their community, and an active voluntary and community sector.

*(Adapted from ODPM, 2003a)*
In setting out the good practice guidance we argue therefore that achieving successful and attractive places to live (sometimes called ‘liveability’) should be the primary objective. This requires a clear vision that builds in the highest quality to all aspects of the development process from inception to long-term management processes, but which also reflects the needs and aspirations of the people to be housed. This important strategic role is sometimes called ‘place-shaping’.

Our intention is not to suggest a model approach that works in all situations, but to identify good practice where this has resulted from a full assessment of local circumstances. As each location varies socially, economically and environmentally, so the solutions will vary to meet differing sets of needs and aspirations. We argue, therefore, that key stakeholders should have as much autonomy as possible to devise local responses, within the broad policy context of achieving mixed and sustainable communities.

**Who should use this guide**

This guide will be of interest to anyone involved in the planning, design and management of housing and particularly those involved in creating sustainable communities. Users will include the Scottish Executive and agencies such as Communities Scotland, local organisations such as Urban Regeneration Companies (URCs) and Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs), local authorities, registered social landlords (RSLs) including community-based housing associations, the design professions and private housebuilders.

It is hoped that the guide will develop a better understanding between the professions involved of the complex interrelationships of factors that contribute towards achieving successful communities. In our view, successful outcomes depend on getting a wide variety of factors ‘right’ from the beginning and ensuring that these are sustained throughout the development process and beyond. What is right in any particular context requires a careful assessment of local circumstances in relation to local, regional and national policy. The sustainable communities agenda challenges all professionals to think holistically and to draw on the expertise of their own profession and others.

**Preparing this guide**

The guide is informed by detailed research based on published sources and from a series of case studies carried out especially for this publication.

Our research coincided with the publication of a series of reports on aspects of mixed income and tenure also commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF). These and other sources are summarised in Appendix I.

A number of case studies were selected from a variety of locations in Scotland and England and each was researched through interviews with officers of the key agencies involved and residents. The case studies are summarised in Appendix II.

This guide is specifically designed to meet the needs of those working in Scotland. A companion volume focusing on England was published by the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) and JRF in 2006 (Bailey et al., 2006).

**Structure**

Chapter 1: discusses the arguments for mixed communities and the rationale underpinning them. It goes on to review key aspects of central government policy in planning and housing documents and concludes by identifying themes, issues and challenges for the future.

Chapter 2: explores good practice in assembling a strategy (vision) through a discussion of: clarity of aims and objectives, understanding the neighbourhood profile, strong leadership, investment partnering arrangements, the procurement process and achieving integrated neighbourhoods and a sustainable vision.

Chapter 3: examines good practice in delivering strategy by discussing development and design tools, different types of tenure mixing, social and environmental sustainability, viability and risk management.

Chapter 4: investigates good practice in delivering partnership and participation through partnership arrangements, community involvement, management approaches and wider structures for partnership and participation.

Chapter 5: concludes with a discussion of the main challenges that need to be overcome if genuinely mixed developments are to become the norm in all areas where new development is taking place or where interventions are occurring in mono-tenure neighbourhoods.
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Residents seek neighbourhoods of choice represented by a range of well-designed housing to meet the needs of different income groups, household sizes, ethnic backgrounds and age groups in a pleasant environment and with the full range of facilities.

An aspiration

The creation of socially mixed communities has been a policy aspiration sought by many governments of different political persuasions and can be traced back at least as far as the post-war New Towns programme. In the post-war period government policy in the UK was primarily focused on increasing the supply of housing, and in recent decades dealing with problems of overspill, overcrowding, concentrations of deprivation and poor housing conditions in some of the larger council estates. While current Scottish Executive policy favours the creation of mixed communities, there is little detailed guidance on what constitutes mix and affordability and how these can be sustained in the longer term. These are issues that are normally resolved at the local level through detailed negotiation between local authorities, registered social landlords (RSLs) and private housebuilders with varying degrees of success.

Evidence from our case studies, and from other JRF-sponsored research, suggests that achieving a mix of incomes and tenures is one of several important components of a successful development. The primary objectives in most new developments and in the diversification of existing estates is to engage experienced developers and RSLs in a collaborative effort to deliver a high quality residential environment, together with appropriate infrastructure, services and facilities. Linked to these objectives is the need to set up an effective management system that will sustain the area in the longer term.

Developing mixed communities is increasingly being seen as an important contribution to sustainable development in its own right. A major challenge in new-build developments is to devise ways of funding the infrastructure and services so that they can be provided at the same time as the housing is built. HM Treasury is currently reviewing the potential contribution of planning-gain supplement (PGS) to funding infrastructure as part of the government’s response to the Barker Review and it intends to introduce a new PGS throughout the UK in 2008. Consultations about the nature of the supplement are continuing in England and Scotland (HM Treasury, 2005).

Evidence from other countries, such as the Hope VI program in the US (Berube, 2005), suggests that wider issues such as the quality of schools, the provision of facilities and the availability of employment also need to be addressed when planning housing development. Joseph et al. (2007) review the research evidence on the social and economic benefits of mixed developments in the US.

Design and planning

The following guidance argues that the design and planning of new housing developments is a crucial consideration because it is at the planning stage that key decisions are made about density, mix, the design of individual houses and the layout of the neighbourhood as a whole. Many of these early decisions will determine the future viability of the development and the quality of life it will sustain. The design process will also determine

“We want to increase the pace and ensure that our housing policies and programmes support the creation of mixed communities. And we are keen to do more to explore new approaches and new mechanisms with the specific aim of creating mixed, stable and sustainable communities.”

(Communities Scotland, 2006)
a variety of factors such as the size of units, mix and appearance of different housing tenures, the extent to which the development is integrated in the wider urban context and other aspects such as community safety and the extent to which residents from different tenures integrate or live separate lifestyles.

Evidence from other studies has suggested that design and layout have only a limited impact on whether the development becomes a strong, socially integrated community. This guide contends that well-designed housing in a pleasant environment, designed to meet the needs of the whole community now and in the future, will tend to attract residents for the long term, who may also wish to move within the development when their household size expands or contracts.

It is also important to ensure that the housing needs of all sections of the community are included, in terms of size, numbers of bedrooms, disabled access and a mix of densities. This should apply to all tenures. Evidence suggests that households with children interact more effectively with their neighbours and help support local schools, health facilities and other services. Overall, the masterplanning and design process are crucial because these aspects are the most difficult to change at a later date.

What are the advantages of creating mixed communities?

**Income and tenure**

An important issue to be addressed at the beginning is the relationship between income and tenure. Much central and local government policy tends to conflate income and tenure and assumes that by achieving mixed tenure, a range of incomes will also be represented in any particular development. Because detailed statistics on household income are not available, mixed tenure is often used as a proxy since data on tenure is much more easily obtainable, for example from the census.

A further issue for consideration is the extent to which the quality of a particular development, or its location, for example near a city centre, makes it attractive to particular sectors of the market and therefore forces up prices in the longer term. This may have the effect of widening income differentials and attracting more transient tenure groups, such as those renting on the open market. Likewise, local lettings policies may result in particular income groups predominating in the rented homes. Thus the effect of recent and proposed national policy to make it easier for residents to move between tenures may increase social mobility but make it more difficult to manage the mix of tenures in the future.
This report argues that achieving a mix of tenures in an existing or new housing development is an important element of a broader policy designed to produce higher quality housing with appropriate provision for all sections of the community. Deciding on what mix of incomes is appropriate in a particular location is much more difficult to achieve and then sustain in the longer term because of fluctuations in the national and local housing markets. While there is some evidence that a relatively narrow range of income groups are more likely to interact as members of a local community, it is also argued that different lifestyles may only produce relatively weak ties between neighbours.

Evidence suggests that both owner-occupied and social housing have distinct income profiles but that in certain areas there can be significant differences, for example in household size and income, which are contrary to the national averages (CIHS, 2006). Unemployment rates tend to be higher among black and minority ethnic groups and there are strong arguments to say that these groups should not be segregated into particular areas of relative deprivation. Trends suggest that these disparities between wealth and tenure are becoming more polarised (Stephens et al., 2005).
**Tackling deprivation**

Much research has been carried out into the impact of area effects – the extent to which individuals and households are adversely affected by negative social, economic and environmental aspects of the area in which they live (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2002, 2004). While area effects are hard to define there is considerable evidence that high concentrations of deprivation reduce the quality of life of all residents of an area. Unemployment rates and ill health tend to be higher, crime and vandalism more prevalent and the quality of schools and educational attainment are lower. In addition, the most deprived areas often lack access to employment opportunities, a broad range of shops, health facilities and entertainment, which the better-off areas take for granted. The quality of the local environment and the provision of environmental services is also often well below standards taken for granted in more affluent areas.

Atkinson and Kintrea (2002) argue that the policy emphasis has tended towards increasing community involvement and opening up new opportunities within neighbourhoods, whereas the real challenge is the spatial segregation of the poorest communities, for example on peripheral estates. They argue that:

> To accept the area effects thesis is to recognise that spatial segregation of the poorest groups in society is undesirable, therefore the most straightforward prescription is to find ways to deconcentrate poverty.  
> (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2002: 162)

International comparisons appear to suggest similar solutions. Kleinhans (2004) compares the UK evidence with that from the Netherlands and argues that closer integration of tenures is desirable although the evidence is not conclusive that it creates stronger communities per se. In reviewing both the UK and US experience, Berube (2005) concludes that the government should address both individual disadvantage and adverse area effects and that interventions must produce improvements in neighbourhood conditions to significantly improve residents’ life chances. Area effects, he argues, may have a greater impact on young children than on older children and adults. He concludes with three main recommendations:

- Strategies to achieve mixed communities must apply to both new developments and existing neighbourhoods. In closing the gap between areas of affluence and poverty, greater economic diversity and the delivery of improved public services should receive as much attention as the quality of housing.
- The achievement of mixed communities requires a careful assessment of local market conditions.
- A strategy towards mixed communities must be sustained in the long term, it should apply to all areas and must be fully embedded in all aspects of housing, planning and regeneration policy.

---

**Benefits of mixed income developments**

The potential benefits of mixed income developments can be summarised as:

- Residents of all ages, ethnic groups, household sizes and social classes have the opportunity to interact and to develop weak or strong ties.
- The potential for negative area affects, such as low aspirations, low educational attainment and low-level crime is reduced.
- Local schools can attract pupils from a wide range of backgrounds.
- Mixed income areas may be able to attract and support a higher level of local services, leisure activities, shops and related facilities.
- Residents have the possibility of moving within the development in order to accommodate changes in household size, income levels and space needs, and can also maintain social and family networks.
- Higher average levels of disposable income may create additional employment opportunities for local residents.
Neighbourhoods that work
In evaluating Bournville in Birmingham – a neighbourhood that ‘works’ – Groves et al. (2003) conclude that “It is a combination of a number of key factors, which are layered in time and interact over time and in particular locations, that determine how neighbourhoods work”:

- Providing a full range of house sizes and types, ensuring a high quality external environment and enabling households to move within the development, as well as attracting newcomers, are all important aspects of providing ‘housing of choice’.

What is the rationale for mixed communities?
Motivation
A variety of motives are advanced for achieving mixed communities and within this debate there is often a lack of clarity as to which apply in any one situation. Different justifications may also apply at different scales and according to the history of previous development on the site. Tunstall and Fenton (2006) identify three core objectives:

- The proposed mix may be a side effect of the short-term goal of getting new development built. Housebuilders and RSLs may be motivated by profit, the desire to attract subsidy or be committed to delivering social housing.
- The proposed mix may reflect the desire to prevent or reduce the concentration of social housing or low-income households as part of a strategy to achieve improved services and to reduce the need for more public investment in the future.
- The proposed mix may be an end in itself in order to increase social cohesion between income, age and ethnic groups.

In addition, there is a strong philosophical argument based on social equity that there are social and economic benefits arising from the intermixing of residents with different age, gender, ethnic origin, household size, lifestyle and employment status.

The different stakeholders and funding bodies engaged in housing provision will often hold, implicitly or explicitly, different views about the desirability and rationale for mixed communities. Thus it will often be in the detailed negotiations around development agreements that differences of opinion will be resolved.
How is the policy context changing?

The Scottish Executive Development Department’s Review of Scotland’s cities (2002a) was critical of the general quality of design and was strongly opposed to ‘low income only’ schemes:

There is ample evidence from the past remaking of places that, amongst others, there are two important prerequisites for places to thrive in the long term. These are that ‘quality’ is important and the other is that ‘low income only’ schemes don’t work. The market often fails in identifying demands for quality and has little incentive to promote mix. The earlier sections of this chapter recognise the mistakes in the past record of politicians, planners, architects and academics in reshaping our cities. We need to find new ways to give voice and shape to the designs for places that we would like for the long term.

Much of what has been produced in Scottish city regeneration in the last decade, whether social housing or home-ownership, whether in the centre or on the edge, is decent housing. Some streets have been well thought through, but there are too few examples of where the new neighbourhood has a coherence in terms of urban design. Crown Street, Homes for the Future and the like are the exceptions that make the point. And similar remarks could be made about the indifferent, often repetitive design of much new suburban housing. (Scottish Executive, 2002a)

The subsequent policy statement (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2002b) did not directly address the issue of mixed tenure housing or communities. However, a stronger commitment in this direction emerged in policy documents the following year.

Housing, planning and development

Scottish Planning Policy 3: Planning for housing (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003) encourages local authorities to create quality residential environments, guide development to the right places and to deliver an adequate supply of housing. It notes that not every site will be capable of satisfying the full range of housing requirements; each site must be assessed in terms of its location and market conditions. However, the Scottish Executive Development Department “encourages more diverse, attractive, mixed residential communities, both in terms of tenure and land use”:

To create mixed communities, a range of house types is needed, providing for the needs of all in the community, and all segments of the market, from affordable housing and starter homes to executive housing, and including homes for families, older people and people with special housing needs. (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003: 5)

Housing policy is implemented by the planning system through Structure Plans, which identify the overall housing and land requirements for a period of 12 years and a broad...
Key issues in creating and delivering mixed communities

- The selection of developers and housing associations that have a good track record and that are committed to the concept of mixed communities.
- Strong leadership from the local authority so that negotiations surrounding land assembly, planning permissions and legal agreements are resolved without unnecessary delay.
- A clear assessment of need in the LHS and appropriate guidance in the Local Plan in relation to the mix of tenure and range of size of homes to be constructed.
- High quality development briefs and masterplans that will deliver an appropriate form of development to meet defined housing needs and address additional services and facilities to be provided.
- Arrangements for phasing, marketing and letting the development.
- Provisions for managing the development so that as far as possible all tenures are treated equally and are also able to participate in management decisions.
- Monitoring long-term demographic trends and changes in tenure.

Indication of need up to year 20. For the period up to year 12, Structure Plans are required to include an action plan setting out 'how implementation will be achieved and addressing any critical issues of phasing, infrastructure provision, the removal of significant constraints, land acquisition and the preparation of development briefs. (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003: 12)

Local Plans should conform to the Structure Plan and “provide sufficient effective land to meet the housing requirement for at least 5 years from the date of adoption” (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003: 13). Housing and planning departments of local authorities are urged to work closely together in preparing Local Housing Strategies (LHS) and Local Plans.

Detailed guidance on affordable housing is set out in Planning Advice Note 74 (Scottish Executive 2005b). From 2005 a new benchmark was established that 25% of all new housing developments should be made up of affordable homes.

Affordable housing

In 2004 the Scottish Executive commissioned the Affordable housing review to consider the functioning of the housing market at the national and sub-national levels and to assess the implications for housing supply and affordability. The review discovered that the dominant geographical distinctions are:

- Urban areas under pressure, such as the wider Edinburgh housing market, characterised by housing supply shortages in both market and affordable housing.
- Urban areas dominated by regeneration requirements, such as the Greater Glasgow housing market, featuring problems of housing quality and type, with existing major drainage and water supply constraints.
- Rural areas, characterised by diverse and very localised housing markets. These include the hinterlands of major settlements with high demand for affordable housing and areas experiencing high levels of in-migration and second homes where house prices are pushed beyond the reach of local people. They also embrace remote areas, including a number of the Islands, which often experience depopulation through a mix of economic decline and limited housing options. (Scottish Executive, 2004)

The review concluded that:

- A broader view is needed of housing policy if the required range of housing types, prices and tenures is to be delivered in the right locations. A well functioning housing market will reduce pressure on the need for public investment in affordable housing, while the provision of low cost home ownership can reduce pressure on the social rented sector.
- The dominant issue in Scotland is the need to respond to the geographical imbalances in supply and demand at regional and local levels. Broadly, this means targeting new supply of affordable housing in those areas with a shortfall, placing the emphasis on regeneration in those areas which have a surplus and ensuring that affordable
housing provision is tailored to the sustainability needs of rural areas.

- There was a need to recognise and support the trend towards owner-occupation. The research indicated up to a third of affordable housing need could be met through forms of support for low cost home ownership. In a responsive housing system, tenure should reflect people’s requirements and preferences and respond to the nature and pace of economic and social change.

- There was a continuing need to build upon the assessments of housing requirements produced by the review. In particular, this means assessing housing needs and demand across the whole market, the implications of changing demography for the future shape and type of housing stock, and the impact of the commitment to ensure that by 2012 all homeless people are entitled [to rehousing].

(Scottish Executive, 2004)

How can access to different forms of housing tenure be increased?

In 2005 the Communities Minister published a Housing Policy Statement called *Homes for Scotland’s people* (Scottish Executive, 2005a). The Minister also launched Homestake to assist tenants into the owner-occupied sector. As well as investing £1.2 billion in constructing 21,500 affordable homes over a three-year period, the Scottish Executive announced a new scheme to encourage 1,000 homebuyers a year onto the property ladder. The Homestake scheme involves residents, often first-time buyers, acquiring part of the equity while the housing association retains the remainder.

Together with right to buy (RTB) provisions available to the majority of tenants in the public sector, the trend in Scotland is towards an increasing demand for owner-occupation for those who can afford it. While there is evidence of considerable unmet demand for owner-occupation, the trend towards tenure fluidity will make it increasingly difficult to control the tenure mix of developments in the future. Experience of 25 years of the RTB demonstrates that it tends to be the more desirable properties in more attractive areas that are bought. It is also these properties that gain in value most rapidly and are then often sold on as soon
as the RTB restrictions are lifted (Jones and Murie, 2006).

**Buy to let**

A more recent development has been the growth of the buy to let market where individuals or companies buy properties in order to benefit from the rise in property values and in the growth of the private rented market. Several of our case studies have experienced a rapid growth in this sector and respondents express concern about the adverse effects this can have on attempts to create a strong, integrated community. A related development is for companies to purchase a portfolio of properties in a new development and to lease them on to local authorities at market rents for those in greatest housing need. Over time this can substantially alter the tenure mix and can result in concentrations of deprivation in certain neighbourhoods.

**What policy changes are happening at the local level?**

**Partnership and leadership**

There is an increasing trend towards the collaborative provision of new housing developments involving local authorities, community-based and larger housing associations and private developers. In some cities, such as Glasgow, there are complex negotiations between stakeholders in order to agree the density, mix of tenures and masterplanning of new development. Local Housing Forums play an important role in agreeing area development frameworks. Existing tenants and residents are also actively involved in discussing future plans for their area. In these circumstances, the local authority, and by extension the CPPs, have a very important strategic and enabling role to play in order to ensure the best possible mix of housing provision is achieved.

**How should mixed communities be created and delivered?**

Creating successful mixed communities is a major challenge for the parties involved and the future sustainability of the development depends on many variables, which cannot easily be foreseen at the outset. Local housing market conditions, the quality of internal space standards and design, the location and access to schools, shops and other facilities can all have a bearing on whether a development prospers or falls into a cycle of decline.

**Attitudes**

Evidence suggests that developers tend to be either ‘enthusiastic’ or ‘reluctant’ in their commitment to mixed tenure; the vast majority now accept that this objective is a necessary part of national and local planning policy (Rowlands et al., 2006). Nevertheless:

> Mixed tenure is only one tool which can be employed in a range of measures to promote social mix. As seen elsewhere, meaningful social interaction is grown organically rather than planned and even this is insufficient to prevent concentrations of poverty and deprivation.  
> (Rowlands et al., 2006: 60)

Research carried out into the social effects of mixed tenure has found that residents are largely unaware of either the
problems or benefits of living in a mixed
development; indeed they often perceive
where they live as ‘nothing out of the
ordinary’ (Allen et al., 2005). A report from
the think tank Demos concludes:

The most important finding is probably
that the mixed or unmixed nature of
the estate is usually only a minor or
non-existent issue for most residents,
owners and tenants. More than half
of residents of mixed tenure estates
perceive no problems or benefits arising
from mix; they are agnostic.
(Jupp, 1999: 79)

The report advocates the mixing of tenures
at least within the same streets or blocks,
rather than in separate zones. Residents
living in mixed street developments
tended to be much more favourably
disposed towards the whole development.

**Family housing**

One of the major challenges facing mixed
income communities in central and inner-
city locations is a lack of provision in the
private sector for families with children.
Silverman et al. (2005) found that in four
schemes investigated there was a lower
proportion of families in the open market
housing than the city-wide average and
that over half intended to move because
of concern about wider issues such as the
quality of schools and the escalating cost
of family-sized units.

Mixed developments, particularly when
near city centres, tended to attract single
occupiers and childless couples and
developers tended to use this evidence as
a justification for building predominately
one- and two-bedroom units in similar
areas. In some of the case studies
investigated for this guide there were
growing disparities between the social
rented housing, with relatively large
numbers of families with children, and the
open market housing, which was under-
occupied or transferring gradually into
the investment, buy to let category. Where
this happened, there were suggestions
that households without children often
had different expectations about noise and
disturbance caused by children.

If mixed developments are to genuinely
reflect all parts of the community,
including families of all sizes, in social
renting and the open market sector,
policies need to be developed that require
agencies to provide medium-range,
well-designed houses and flats that
families on middle incomes can afford.

As Meen et al. (2005) note, “temporal and
group dynamics are important to help
understand neighbourhood processes.
Analysis needs to be sufficiently aware
of cohort effects, for instance of young
households, forming families requiring
schooling, empty-nesting and then ageing
and how the local community’s degree of
‘mixed-ness’ has to retain the flexibility
required to work for each of these different
life-cycle stages” (Meen et al., 2005: 62).

**The wider role of RSLs**

The Scottish Executive, through
Communities Scotland, encourages RSLs
to think as broadly as possible about
how they can help to regenerate their
communities. In doing this it has the
Wider Role Fund to encourage housing
associations to develop projects to help
make life better for people in their communities. The Fund can be used for a very wide range of projects dealing with issues such as improving health, helping people get training or jobs, improving community safety, helping people with their finances and increasing people’s skills and confidence.

Guidance on the Wider Role states that:

- RSLs have a number of key features which make them extremely attractive as organisations who can have a positive impact on community regeneration. These include:
  - RSLs’ own assets.
  - They have secure revenue streams.
  - They often have very strong links to communities, both of place and interest.
  - They have professional staff.
  - They are regulated.
  - They have an impressive track record as businesses.

(Communities Scotland, 2003)

Which kinds of areas should be the priority for mixed tenures?

While some advocates have argued that all areas should be subject to social and income mixing strategies, including the more affluent suburbs, we argue that the priority should be those areas currently undergoing change or development, whether in areas of social housing, brownfield sites or on the urban fringe. Scotland’s major cities have historically high levels of social housing and as the economy improves and levels of unemployment continue to fall, many aspire to owner-occupation. Evidence from the Affordable housing review suggests that in Scotland house prices have risen less steeply (on average 1.5% per year compared with 3.5% in England) and that a higher percentage of first-time buyers can afford to buy properties. The priority in Scotland should therefore be to encourage tenure diversification and social mix not only in areas where there are high levels of social housing but also in new developments on brownfield and greenfield sites.

There is considerable evidence from our case studies that ‘demonstration projects’ such as the New Gorbals development can have a dramatic impact on creating
new markets for private housing, which did not otherwise exist, and in setting new standards of design, layout and environmental quality that can be adopted elsewhere.

**How can tenure mix be maintained in the longer term?**

Much of what has been said so far suggests that there are significant challenges to be faced in initiating and delivering mixed tenure developments. The essential requirement is an effective, long-term system of management. It is important that the organisation and process of management is determined at an early stage and, indeed, should be part of the initial vision underpinning the development. As illustrated in our studies of Ardler and Craigmillar in particular, local communities should also play an active role in developing a safe and sustainable community.

### General principles for maintaining mixed tenure in the long term

- Early decisions need to be made between the local authority, the private developer and one or more housing associations about the structure and organisation of the management function, its terms of reference, and its powers to manage internal and external spaces.

- A lead organisation should be identified to avoid conflicts over roles and responsibilities.

- The management organisation should have a local presence in the form of a neighbourhood office that is easily accessible and well known to residents.

- Involving local people from all sectors in management processes can have real benefits (Knox and Alcock, 2002).

- Decision making needs to be robust to maintain the original vision, while also being flexible so that it can respond to changes in national and local policy, to local levels of need, and changes in the housing market.

- The lead organisation should carry out regular reviews of the development to assess changes in tenure and investigate ways of ensuring the original objectives are being adhered to. It may be possible to maintain the mix through the repurchasing of some properties that have moved into owner-occupation, or to increase intermediate tenures such as shared ownership.

- The management organisation should have responsibility for the housing as well as private and public amenity space to avoid dual standards of maintenance.

- Systems of governance should be established whereby issues relating to local schools and local services (such as health services) can be taken up at a high level with the relevant agency, particularly where these may impact adversely on housing quality.

- Residents should be made fully aware of covenants and tenancy agreements before they become tenants and/or owners. They should also be informed of the extent of tenure mixing (Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005).

- Lettings and nomination policies should be fully reviewed in order to assess whether they promote the broader vision of the development, for example giving people with local connections priority or enabling households to move to a larger or smaller property within the same development.

- Service charges should be affordable, transparent and evenly distributed between tenures.

- There should be a clear strategy for tackling anti-social behaviour and low-level crime.
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Introduction
A clear sense of what those involved would like to achieve in the long term (the vision) is a necessary precondition of any successful sustainable mixed income development. Shared aims and objectives, established in the context of local housing needs and conditions, local leadership to carry through those aims and objectives, and high quality design that integrates the development into the surrounding area and evenly distributes the different tenures throughout the development are key factors here.

Factors that are critical to success in the course of development are appropriate financial arrangements, including adequate levels of funding, the ability to procure the necessary land for the development on suitable terms and robust investment partnering that endures over the course of the development.

In assembling the strategy, a long-term view should be taken in the early stages of the development process, incorporating an assessment of the future needs of residents as well as their present needs, and the establishment of post-development management arrangements to ensure the longevity of the original aims and objectives of these developments.

A strategy for sustainable mixed communities should also incorporate objectives that will produce a good mix of housing in terms of size and tenure, where social housing is evenly distributed, indistinguishable from owned or privately rented housing, situated in a mixed use neighbourhood that is well integrated into its wider physical context, with facilities and services that will allow the community to be sustainable over time. Moreover, there must be a sense that neighbourhoods represent an effective long-term investment, and a commitment to managing an investment over the long term should underpin management approaches, regardless of tenure or the income profile of occupants. These ultimate goals need to be embraced by all stakeholders, whether public, private or voluntary agencies or residents.

The Scottish Executive “attaches high importance to the development of mixed, sustainable communities with a range of housing types and tenures which can share community and other facilities, to ensuring that the appropriate levels and mix of affordable housing to meet assessed requirements are provided and, and to achieving this with the most efficient use of public subsidy” (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 2).

To achieve these goals, the following factors are essential.

Shared aims and objectives
There should be a shared sense, between all the development partners, of the desirability of establishing a mixed income sustainable community, both in terms of the overall design that will facilitate such a community and in terms of the infrastructure and services that will allow the community to be sustainable. In a recent review of Scotland’s cities, the Scottish Executive reported that, “a variety of forward looking ‘vision’ statements existed. However, a comprehensive,
overarching ‘vision’ for each city and its surrounding area was absent” (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2002a: 208).

In terms of agencies contributing to the formulation of national aims and objectives, Communities Scotland leads on housing investment and the regeneration of Scotland’s most deprived communities, manages the Community Regeneration Fund and supports community engagement. The Scottish Centre for Regeneration, established by Communities Scotland, aims to identify and promote best practice in community regeneration, using lessons from Scotland, Great Britain and elsewhere.

A major challenge is to maintain a sense of vision over the lifetime of the development, while also engaging the major stakeholders and, in particular, local residents.

Understanding the neighbourhood profile

A precondition to developing sustainable mixed communities is a clear understanding of the local housing market and local conditions, including socio-economic profiling. Scottish Planning Policy 3: Planning for housing states that planning authorities should assess future land requirements for each housing market area and ensure that land is identified to fully meet requirements including affordable housing needs (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003: 1). In England, the Northern Way Sustainable Communities Team also notes that “it is vital to identify specific geographic areas of opportunity and change … based on their future economic potential as well as current needs” (NWSCT, 2006: 25), “bringing people [back] into inner-urban areas perhaps, or changing the residential profile and economic role of an area of housing market weakness … a transformational approach” (NWSCT, 2006: 25). In Ardler, Craigmillar and the New Gorbals economic development is a major policy objective in the wider area; in Craigmillar this is expressed as ‘getting people into work and revitalising the economic base’.

The Housing (Scotland) Act 2000 requires local authorities to undertake an assessment of housing needs and conditions in their area and to produce a LHS. Communities Scotland has indicated that the strategies should cover a five-year period, address all tenures and be prepared in consultation with stakeholders including RSLs and developers (www.lhs.scot-homes.gov.uk). The housing market assessment process is somewhat broader, encompassing a framework for a better understanding of housing demand issues and how housing markets operate at a sub-regional level, and requiring an understanding of changing housing demand and supply. The Structure Plan will include a calculation of the overall housing land requirement for a period of at least 12 years, and preferably indicate the scale and location of housing development for the period beyond year 12 (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 12). All these sources provide a context but often exclude detailed assessments of the needs of individual neighbourhoods in order to guide decision making on the matters of the proportions of affordable or private

Case study

Consultation in Ardler

In Ardler, tenants had been involved in discussions about the future of their estate (at the instigation of Dundee City Council [DCC]) for several years before the stock transfer and the appointment of a consortium to redevelop the estate. DCC provided training for tenants on regeneration and housing options, including stock transfer, and tenants’ committees had been involved in options appraisal, the initial masterplanning process and the appointment of the developer. Gordon Laurie, Director of Sanctuary, said, “following our appointment in 1998, we had a year when we worked on developing the masterplan with more detailed consultation with the Ardler community and other stakeholders … to come up with a masterplan that everyone signed up to … everyone clearly understood what was going to happen … our original plan was to keep two or three of the blocks and refurbish them but tenants argued for demolition…”.
housing, and the mix of house types. In England it has been suggested that, although the evidence base on housing needs is likely to be adequate at least, “there are deficiencies in the evidence base supporting regional strategies and the way evidence is applied to policy making … [and] there remains limited awareness of and understanding of housing-economy links” (NWSCT, 2006: 29). This report recommends a city region concept for planning in England and calls for “a stronger steer and clearer advice from the government on the need for a more effective and prominent approach to the integrated development of housing, planning and socio-economic policy at city region level” (NWSCT, 2006: 31).

Neighbourhood profiling raises issues of supply and demand and most of the case study developments in England were in relatively buoyant housing markets that guaranteed the sale of the private housing: this was the case in Northampton, Kent and Birmingham. In Scotland, metropolitan local authorities are often facing problems of over-supply of unpopular housing, as was the case in Dundee and Glasgow, but even in these locations, following redevelopment, a market can be created for properties for sale and areas can become destinations of choice despite former unpopularity. This has been clearly demonstrated in Ardler in Dundee and in the New Gorbals in Glasgow. The shortage of affordable housing in rural locations in Scotland presents different problems where owners of second homes and holiday let purchasers compete with those seeking cheaper housing in a desirable locality (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 2).

The challenge in relation to estimating need and demand is to anticipate likely changes in the local housing market, both in owned housing but also in the demand for affordable housing. Changes in demand for different kinds of housing – larger family units for example – should also be anticipated. The struggle to encourage the provision of private family housing on developments that are close to metropolitan centres was noted in Silverman et al. (2005), and remains a problem in some of the case study areas, where one- and two-bedroom flats are being developed for private owners alongside family housing for tenants and shared owners. Similarly, most new-build housing for shared ownership is made up of one- or two-bedroom flats. The issue of the identification of social housing units by size is one that might increase the difficulty of establishing a sustainable community.

The Scottish Executive argues that, “community planning partnerships, which bring together the public private and voluntary sectors at the local authority level, can and should take the lead strategic role in regeneration at this level …” (Scottish Executive, 2006a: 2). All schemes need to have effective structures in place to ensure that local leadership can be exercised. The context within which such leadership can be exercised should allow local autonomy because it is important that one agency can assume responsibility for the overall strategic direction, whether this is the local authority, an RSL or a private developer. Evidence from the best mixed developments suggests that ‘place-shaping’ powers need to be assumed and

**Case study**

**Leadership in Ardler**

Dundee City Council (DCC) provided leadership in guiding the future of the Ardler Estate by conducting an options appraisal and assisting in the process of partial stock transfer by persuading the Scottish Executive that Housing Partnership Funding was a feasible option. DCC remained closely involved in the redevelopment process through the personal involvement of high level officers, including the Director of Housing, for the first three years of the development process.
Case study

Leadership in Glasgow’s Crown Street Regeneration Project

The Crown Street Regeneration Project was formed in 1990 and was made up of a partnership between the Glasgow Development Agency, Glasgow City Council, Scottish Homes and the local community. The long-term aims of the project were to make the Gorbals an attractive area where people wanted to live in a balanced and sustainable community, to boost the local economy and to integrate the new development into the social, economic and physical fabric of the city.

From the beginning there was a strong commitment from the City Council and Glasgow Enterprise (GE) to make Crown Street a ‘demonstration project’ of how successful regeneration can be achieved in areas of deprivation. Having a powerful champion of the scheme in the director of the Crown Street Regeneration Project, meant that stakeholders and residents were brought together to ensure that the original objectives (and masterplan) were implemented in full. GE contributed GRO-grant to ‘gap fund’ private housing in the early phases (i.e. the site originally had a negative value).

Thus commitment to the original vision, an exceptional masterplan by a leading UK architect, extensive public consultation, and high quality housing in tune with Glasgow’s cultural history, have collectively established a development which produces quality housing which also works socially, economically, aesthetically and practically in terms of parking, access, open space and community safety. Perhaps the important factor is that the vision has been sustained despite changes in staffing and the replacement of the Crown Street Regeneration Project by the New Gorbals HA working closely with Glasgow Enterprise as lead agency.
Leadership also requires clarity about the level of service that will be provided and how different demands from owners and tenants can be reconciled. As leadership in developing mixed communities involves working with stakeholders who may be unaccustomed to working in a partnership role, relevant factors include:

- a leadership style that is strong and committed but also inclusive and participative, avoiding autocratic and inflexible approaches
- a business plan that clearly sets out the financial inputs for development and management and that identifies the risks and rewards to be borne by each party to the development agreement
- clarity of mutual expectations about roles and responsibilities: it is crucial to agree at the outset what these expectations are and to establish realistic objectives
- the extent to which other partners are prepared to invest resources and time in the partnership; it is important to establish the level of commitment to initiatives and the extent to which different partners must be willing to invest in particular schemes
- the pace of development; avoiding pushing partners too quickly but not being held back by the slowest

(adapted from Russell, 2001: 23)

Case study

Hulme, Manchester

Taking the lead in the redevelopment of Hulme, the city council generated the necessary funds for Phase 1 of the development through intensive lobbying of central government, and processing land sales and planning permission with great speed. High quality low rent housing was achieved through nil land valuations and maximising HAG (now Social Housing Grant), and the chairman of AMEC, the private developer in Hulme, provided the impetus for the adoption of urban design guidance.
capacity building: identifying other community leaders and providing suitable training schemes and skills development.

The advantage of strong leadership, either from one agency assuming responsibility for the overall strategic direction of the development, or from one individual taking that responsibility, was illustrated in several of our case studies, where the importance of public sector leverage was crucial.

The challenge here is to have flexibility and local autonomy within agreed working arrangements so that a leader or champion, working with a strongly committed steering group, can emerge.

**Robust investment partnering**

Clearly identified stakeholders, including carefully selected developers with a good track record of working in mixed developments, and good working relationships between them, are key factors in developing successful mixed communities. Scottish Executive guidance notes that, “planning applications are likely to progress most smoothly where the developer enters into early discussions with an RSL as a potential development partner” (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 7).

In Ardler, a competition was held to select a consortium to redevelop the estate. Sanctuary Housing Association, which
had recently set up a Scottish office, was selected partly on the basis of their previous experience of working in mixed communities in England.

Communities Scotland expects RSLs to be able to derive the full benefits of innovative approaches to procurement and to demonstrate that they are ‘expert’ or best practice clients by:
- providing leadership to improve the procurement process and allowing the supply side to develop and innovate,
- adopting partnership working using long term relationships for all suppliers,…

(Scottish Executive/Communities Scotland, 2006: 7)

The challenge here is to overcome the institutional barriers that may exist between different organisations, to have incentives in place to encourage the realisation of the agreed aims and objectives, and flexibility in terms of cost and working arrangements to avoid blockages in the development process.

An effective procurement process
The value of the site has a significant effect on the tenure and size mix of the final development. Planning Advice Note 74 states that local authorities may make available surplus land at less than full market value or may work with third parties to assemble sites for affordable housing including other public agencies such as the Forestry Commission or development trusts or may use compulsory purchase powers (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 5). Research carried out for the Scottish Executive recommended that, “a quota system must be the backbone of the affordable housing land supply in Scotland. Without it, it would be very difficult to secure the mixed communities which are an important and worthwhile objective of the Executive” (Scottish Executive, 2006b: 1).

The Scottish Executive through Communities Scotland, is encouraging RSLs to develop a new approach to procurement in order to deliver… better value for money … better value for users … in future procurement strategies…. [It] should be based on a more collaborative approach between clients and the construction team.

(Scottish Executive/Communities Scotland, 2006: 7)

Land ownership by one visionary public (or private) authority allows a far greater degree of control over the process in a buoyant development market. This is the case at Upton, in Northampton where the site owner, English Partnerships, has been able to act as ‘facilitator’ to guide the development framework, subsequent masterplan and detailed design code. The ownership of land in Ardler by Dundee City Council, which had a clear strategy for the estate and the area, allowed a long lead-in to the eventual redevelopment with time to raise the necessary funds and to involve tenants and residents in the process.

However, in a difficult housing market, land ownership does not necessarily confer greater control over the detail of development, but does enable development to be kick-started and the
overall framework for development to be determined.

- In Hulme, Manchester City Council was able to value the concrete pedestrian deck blocks (the Crescents), at nil land value, thereby enabling the chosen RSLs to demolish and redevelop them within the contemporary restrictions of the Housing Association Grant.

- Land is retained by English Partnerships at Upton and in the case of Attwood Green most of the city council-owned land and the housing has been transferred to Optima Community Association, giving greater control over future development.

In Ardler, Dundee City Council has retained the provision of services to the estate including maintenance, for a three-year period, and has committed to recycle revenue from the estate back into the provision of services on the estate.

Clearly, the ability to plan and control the development varies according to the ownership. Where land is released in small parcels on the larger developments, there are more favourable outcomes in terms of sustainability as these elements can be incorporated into each section of the site as it is developed, rather than taking the risk of having insufficient funds to insert facilities and services at the end.

The challenge in procurement is to achieve a balance of influence that takes into account the requirements of the affordable housing provider and the private developer without compromising the desirable outcome of establishing mixed communities with appropriate facilities and services, and to do this regardless of who owns the land.

**Integrated neighbourhoods**

Mixed use developments that link into the surrounding area and incorporate a broader programme of economic and social regeneration are most likely to lead to communities that are more sustainable over time. In the case studies, there was widespread recognition that simply changing tenure and improving design would not lead to longer-term regeneration. The interaction between residents from different income bands may be a desirable outcome of mixed tenure developments but the overall economic and social sustainability of a development is also dependent on the ease with which its inhabitants can gain access to the world beyond its boundaries, and the availability of facilities and services near their houses. The production of an attractive neighbourhood with open spaces, local services, leisure facilities and the quality of schools may be as important as the tenure mix. Figure 1 represents some of the key features necessary for the development of an effective, sustainable, mixed income community.

A mixed income community is more than a housing estate, and its impact will depend on its relationship to the wider area it is in. A longitudinal study of three mixed income neighbourhoods found that residents moved in not just for the housing but for the wider neighbourhood itself (Allen et al., 2005).

---

**Case study**

**Innovative approaches to housing finance**

In Craigmillar, an innovative financial arrangement involved funding provided through a joint venture company (EDI Group), an arm’s length company established by the City of Edinburgh Council, whose holdings generated a dividend for the council. The EDI Group and the Council share ownership of an URC – Promoting and Regeneration Craigmillar (PARC) – and this allows the company to access private capital funding that would otherwise not have been available and ensure that profits from the development are used to finance further regeneration work.
**Figure 1:** Essential elements for a sustainable, mixed income community

Good quality schools and children’s play spaces have been found to provide significant places in which residents from different tenures can mix (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006: 19). Other types of facilities and resources such as shops, community centres and sports facilities add quality to a neighbourhood. They are also social spaces where near neighbours and friends from different tenures and income bands can develop social ties (Jupp, 1999: 48), and also provide spaces in which different income groups come into contact with each other as part of a mixed use, as well as a mixed income, neighbourhood.

Evidence from our case studies has highlighted the following significant relationships between the development and its surrounding context:

- **Transport and pedestrian links**: these connect the development to its wider area and give lower-income residents access to employment, shops and other resources and facilities. Public transport links are particularly important for tenants without use of a car although cost is an important factor here and evidence of residents sharing taxis because it was cheaper than public transport was noted in one case study. Future mobility patterns need careful modelling though.

- **Integration not isolation**: this is particularly important in former council housing estates where high quality streets and transport links can help to reduce the stigma that the estate may have acquired.
**Provision of services and facilities in the case study areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Non-housing uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardler</td>
<td>Community centre, library, clinic, shops, two primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Village</td>
<td>Supermarket, nursing home, cricket pitch, health club, skate park, enterprise hub, restaurant, arts centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigmillar</td>
<td>New schools, public open space and reconfigured town centre with 300,000ft² of office, retail and leisure space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grahame Park</td>
<td>Library, community centre, nursery day centre, shops, new village green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulme</td>
<td>Hulme is part of a major regeneration initiative that covers two wards and has a wealth of social facilities; entertainment and employment uses remain an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Hill</td>
<td>Business park, supermarket, golf club, day nursery, community centre, pub, shops, hairdresser, beautician, estate agents, building society, restaurants, cafes, university campus, two primary schools, medical centre, local parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Gorbals (Crown Street)</td>
<td>Business centre, local shopping centre including supermarket, budget hotel, small local office accommodation, light industrial units, local park, library, resource centre, leisure centre, swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Estate</td>
<td>Shops, mosque, community centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Central (Attwood Green)</td>
<td>Fourteen commercial units, two supermarkets, hotel, community centre (existing primary school), new park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Quays</td>
<td>Shops, community centre, park and major leisure centre adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>Urban boulevard with flexible ground floor uses to incorporate retail and commercial uses, retail provision on the periphery of the site, primary school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Shops**: the nature of retailing is changing and while local shops are important to those with no cars and/or reduced mobility, they are becoming more difficult to sustain. Providing easy access to a supermarket is becoming increasingly important for all residents. Allen et al.’s longitudinal study of three mixed income neighbourhoods found that it was the district centres that were most vulnerable to change (Allen et al., 2005: 40). A masterplan that provides a realistic catchment area for a supermarket and makes flexible provision for local shops and services is most likely to be sustainable in the long term. The proponents of ‘traditional neighbourhood design’ recommend that shared facilities are no longer planned at the ‘heart’ of new neighbourhoods, but are rather dispersed around its edge, in order to ensure their viability.

- **Green spaces**: access to well-managed and maintained green space is most important to the overall quality of a development. Green spaces also provide opportunities for social interaction. Large parks and other facilities do not have to be provided within the mixed income community itself.

- **Community halls and centres**: although community halls and centres tend to be used by a minority of residents, they can act as important points of social interaction (Jupp, 1999). This is particularly true if they are supported by a community development officer. The community centre at Ardler, which the RSL supports, has provided an
important point of contact between different groups of residents and attracts people from outside the estate. It is vital that facilities should attract a variety of income groups if they are to function as an effective community resource.

The challenge to developing integrated neighbourhoods with appropriate services and facilities lies in the critical mass of population that can support them. Whereas neighbourhood planning in the 1940s and 1950s presupposed a level of self-sufficiency in terms of communal services and facilities, contemporary mixed income communities have to be realistic about the facilities that even large developments can support and services and facilities that will attract people from outside the immediate area will be an advantage.

The population required to support a supermarket varies according to its floor area and the average disposable income in the area. Economies of scale are also being gained in the health service as doctors’ surgeries are becoming part of group practices. The local pub is also vulnerable to decisions made by corporate owners, as are local coffee shops when the major chains take over. This creates a challenge for urban designers and spatial planners, since there are few facilities that are not part of a larger corporate network whose future is determined outside the local community. Whereas other studies of mixed communities have pointed out that shared facilities do not provide a point of first contact for residents from different income bands or tenure groups, they nevertheless play an important role in providing places where previously formed relationships may be cemented. The box opposite sets out examples of the services and facilities provided in each of our case study areas.

A further challenge here is to be found in the provision of facilities and services that meet the changing needs of the residents. For example, good secondary schools as well as primary schools in the neighbourhood, youth facilities, facilities and services for the elderly and continuing employment opportunities.

A commitment to the long term

Sustaining the original vision will only occur if there is continuing commitment to the original aims and intentions, and a strategy for the management of the area after it has been built.

In terms of management, the need to take a long-term view in order to protect the effective long-term investment represented by these neighbourhoods was acknowledged by several interviewees but the problems were not understated and one private developer confirmed that “the biggest headache with mixed income communities is post-occupational management” (Interview). However, an RSL manager commented:

One of our strengths is that [our organisation] has been around for 110 years, so we are not going to walk away from developments. So we say to our residents ‘We are not going anywhere, we will be here for the long term, that is important to us’.
Of course, taking responsibility for managing their investment over the long term is what has always underpinned the management approach of social housing providers, and it is interesting that private sector developers in some of our case studies have adopted this approach. The use of covenants to control behaviour on Kings Hill, the management company proposed on Upton, and the use of management agreements on other developments are examples here. In Ardler, the Village Trust was established to bring together residents and community organisations with the local council and the managing housing association. The Trust was established for a period of seven years from the inception of the development with funding from the RSL and now receives some European funding.

It is critical to these schemes that, post-completion, there are proper management schemes in place to ensure the upkeep of the development. And to ensure that the changing needs of residents are accommodated. (Interview, RSL manager)

The requirement for affordable housing to comply with Housing for Varying Needs design guidance and the possibility of promoting Lifetime Homes may help ensure that homes meet long-term needs (Scottish Executive, 2005a: 14). Further, the use of planning agreements to regulate the future sale of discounted sale dwellings (Scottish Executive, 2005a: 14) may allow the retention of affordable housing. The use of masterplans and design codes might ensure the longevity of the original intentions. There are currently seven pilot schemes sponsored by the government in England to “see how codes can provide greater certainty, speed and high quality development” (HM Treasury/ODPM, 2005: 8; see p.37 for a discussion of the impact of design codes). The Scottish Executive notes that, “well designed projects which function well and are adaptable to changing circumstances are valued, respected and liked by the communities they serve. They can have long, effective lives and relatively low life-cycle costs to the owner, users and communities” (Scottish Executive, 2006a: 45).

Critical success factors in planning mixed tenure developments

- A range of stakeholders, including the local authority, private developers and housing association with experience of providing mixed tenure housing and previous experience of working in collaboration.

- Early agreement among stakeholders on the range of housing units required and the extent to which different tenures should be integrated in the masterplan.

- A clear ‘vision’ developed and agreed between the key stakeholders. This should go beyond the provision of new housing and address the wider community needs, such as social inclusion, social cohesion, health, education, leisure and training opportunities.

- Delivery structures such as New Housing Partnerships, CPPs and URCs should be fully consulted and engaged.

- A development brief, planning and urban design guidelines for the area that encourage a range of attractively designed homes to meet the needs of different household sizes, age groups, lifestyles and income groups.

- An integrated business plan that takes advantage of opportunities to cross-subsidise between social, affordable and open market housing.

- Planned provision of all the facilities and services required for an active and sustainable community.

- A long-term commitment from all stakeholders that they will work together in developing and managing the development in the long term and fully consult and engage local residents.
3 Good practice in delivering strategy

Introduction 48
Development and design tools 49
Mixing tenures 54
Integrated housing layouts 56
Segmented housing layouts 56
A segregated housing layout 57
Social sustainability 63
Environmental sustainability 64
Viability 66
Conclusions 68
Introduction

Once the vision for the mixed income community has been agreed between the development partners, attention then needs to be given to delivery ‘on the ground’. The overall quality of the development produced is critical to its success, both at the point of sale and letting and into the future.

*Among the most important elements for the sustainability of estates are their design qualities. The design of an estate is one of its lasting advertisements for a developer. Furthermore, design plays an important role in exacerbating or reducing noticeable tenure differences.* (Rowland et al., 2006:64)

Design quality is not an add-on but needs to be embedded in the scheme from its inception. It is produced through a chain of decisions that result from the interactions between the development context, the specific objectives that have been identified for the particular scheme, the policy context, the market, the financial arrangements and the aspirations of the neighbouring communities and the end users, if such can be identified. In addition the standards used by the different development partners, public and private, have to be reconciled.

A strategy needs to be adopted in order to achieve the vision. This strategy, particularly if the development is large scale, may be in place for a number of
years. It will need sufficient flexibility to accommodate changing market conditions and needs on the one hand, and to incorporate a set of clear principles that will guide the development beyond its physical completion and first occupation on the other. The strategy should cover all aspects of delivery that are necessary for the production of a successful mixed income scheme. Depending on the scale of the development, this will include a business plan, a clear and transparent partnership policy and arrangements for governance, and may also include a social and economic programme. The discussion in this section focuses on the physical aspects of development.

Development and design tools

There are different ways of guiding development and contemporary practice is constantly refining these. Furthermore the terminology used to describe each type of document varies locally. Those set out below are derived from our investigation of our best practice case studies. A hierarchy of documents is suggested, but the exact form and remit of these may obviously vary from scheme to scheme and is dependent on the scale of the proposed development. The hierarchy is unlikely to be produced sequentially and there may be several rounds of negotiation before a scheme is both financially viable and meets all the required policy objectives. In several of our case studies, masterplans were produced and then substantially changed, for example in the case of Craigmillar.

The Craigmillar Urban Design Framework covers the following:

- Context (policy, physical, heritage)
- Vision and process
- Consultation
- Housing and design
- Movement
- Centres and services
- Community facilities
- Parks, open spaces and environment
- Business and employment
- Infrastructure and drainage
- Implementation

It was adopted by the City of Edinburgh Council on 29 September 2005.
Development framework

Where a site is large the use of a development framework or strategy provides a guide for the development as a whole. The adoption of a framework can be used to provide a measure of certainty for the future partners or developers who may be involved in smaller sites or parcels of land within the development. The production of a development framework provides an opportunity for community involvement in the initial stages of the process, without the need to negotiate in detail. Similarly the framework can be used as one of the documents to support an application for outline planning permission. At Craigmillar, where the local authority was a partner in the development company, the City of Edinburgh Council adopted the development framework as supplementary planning guidance.

The development framework will be supported by proposals regarding the social, economic and financial underpinning for the scheme as a whole. These will draw on the research carried out for the planning process. The development framework, particularly if it is adopted as a formal document in the planning process, would also form a lasting record to refer back to as key personnel and development partners change.

For larger-scale mixed income communities such a permanent record of intentions would provide an important point of reference as the community matures and tenures change. Chapter 1 suggests that tenures become more ‘fluid’ over time. Chapter 2 recommends the use of neighbourhood profiling in order to sustain the mixed nature of the community.

Care needs to be taken to ensure the even phasing of all tenures throughout the development. Evidence from the case studies suggests that it is important that social housing is incorporated into each phase of the development. In developer-led schemes, developers may be keen to sell their owner-occupied units quickly in order recoup some of their costs. This carries the danger that the social housing may be concentrated in the latter phases.

There is also a need to ensure that services and facilities are provided as the development progresses and it will fall to the local planning authority to monitor
this and to enforce the mix of tenures through Section 75 agreements throughout what may be a lengthy process spanning two decades. Much social housing is concentrated in metropolitan areas, but housing need is just as urgent in rural areas. The Albyn Housing Society’s development at Dalfaber, Aviemore North, provides much needed social housing in a rural area within the context of a mixed development.

**Masterplans**

The term ‘masterplan’ is often used to describe drawings setting out different scales of development, from small sites of a hectare or more to completely new settlements. For large sites, such as new settlements or those covering several individual housing estates, a development framework or strategy is a more practical document, simply because it is less prescriptive. The development may then be divided into phases and the individual parcels of land put out to tender or competition for their individual masterplan. The masterplan itself may undergo further sub-divisions, with different RSLs, design teams and developers taking responsibility for individual sites.

The Urban Task Force defined a spatial masterplan as a set of proposals for a movement strategy, buildings, spaces and land use in three dimensions. These proposals need to be supported by financial, economic and social policy

The re-establishment of Crown Street in Glasgow creates opportunities for chance encounters between residents.
Case study

*Hulme design guidance*

A masterplan and a design code were produced for Hulme. Both documents set out the urban character of the development and introduced a medium density urban block layout that was innovative for the UK. Initially RSLs and developers were opposed to a layout that challenged conventional low density cul-de-sac arrangements. The local highway engineers also demanded that each junction be provided with visibility splays and junctions suitable for double-decker bus routes. Eventually these problems were resolved through negotiation and consultation, with the support of tenants. The design code encouraged architectural variety within the rubric of the perimeter block. The resulting RSL development has been to a quality that continues to inspire passers-by to call in to the local RSL offices to ask if the individual units are for sale.
documents and by a delivery mechanism. Guidance on how to produce a masterplan is set out clearly and comprehensively by CABE (2004) in *Creating a successful masterplan: A guide for clients*. This sets out the parameters for a masterplan and the processes necessary for its production.

**Design codes**

Design codes have a long and venerable history. They were used in Italian Renaissance towns such as Siena. A design code:

> … is an illustrated compendium of the necessary and optional design components of a particular development with instructions and advice about how these relate together in order to deliver a masterplan or other site-based vision.  
> (Bartlett School of Planning and Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design, 2006: 7)

Recent research carried out in England has found that where codes are used, in most cases the investment in resources involved in producing them has been more than off-set by enhanced sale and land values (Carmona and Dann, 2006).

**Briefs**

In most developments one or all of these stages in the design and development process may be put out to tender or limited competition. This places importance on the quality of the brief at each stage. The lead partner has a responsibility to ensure that the brief meets the requirements and aspirations of all stakeholders. It needs to set out principles, the ‘vision’, but also allow for creativity and imagination on the part of the development and design teams.

The brief also sets out financial requirements and phasing. Other demands can be made too. For example, the brief for Upton’s different masterplans requires each consortium to meet a minimum requirement in terms of accredited core skills for design and built environment professionals.

**Mixed income and quality**

The use of the documents discussed above is not a guarantee of urban design quality, but is a pre-condition for it. The production of each document requires partners to clarify the most essential parts of their objectives and to define what may or may not be compromised. The Scottish Executive defines good design as

> a key to achieving social, economic and environmental goals of public policy, as laid down by central and local government. It can bridge the gap between aspirations and reality.  
> (Scottish Executive, 2001: 18).

The definition of urban design quality is especially important in two ways for mixed income communities:

- the overall urban design quality of a neighbourhood is one of the factors essential to its future sustainability as an attractive area to live in
- consistency of a high quality public realm and external architectural treatment across tenures ensures ‘tenure blindness’. This will be discussed in more detail later.
Mixing tenures

The proportions of the mix of tenures across the layout have hitherto been regarded as important determinants of the success or failure of particular developments. The evidence gathered so far for this report suggests that the precise proportion of different tenures within a development is of little importance to the future social and economic sustainability of a mixed income neighbourhood. More evidence is available with regard to the issue of spatial dispersal.

A clear finding that has emerged from research studies is that it is vital that the social rented units should not be stigmatised in any way. If they are dispersed throughout the development, this is far less likely to happen. Different authors have described various classifications of dispersal. Perhaps the most useful is the following simple set of categories:

- **integrated**: different tenures are side by side in the same street, for example, in New Gorbals
- **segmented**: different tenures are in separate blocks, for example, in Hulme
- **segregated**: different tenures are in concentrations, for example in Ardler Village.

**Integrated**

Contemporary advice is that the greatest integration between tenures is achieved when the social rented or shared housing units are dispersed evenly throughout the development. This has been described as ‘pepper-potting’ that implies that the units should be dispersed singly. Upton provides an example of this approach and its development brief imposed a standard of no more than three social housing houses together and no more than four social housing flats together. In practice there has been a tendency to provide houses in pairs.

However, such dispersal need not be in single units, but can be in small clusters, as in the New Gorbals development, where one side of each perimeter block is social housing and the remainder of the block is privately owned. While it is accepted good practice that properties should be indistinguishable, the Scottish Executive recommend that “concentrating affordable housing in small groups rather than ‘pepper-potting’ individual houses will ease the subsequent management of homes by an RSL” (Scottish Executive, 2005b: 10).

**Segmented**

Wauchope Square offers an example of a segmented development where the social rented housing is arranged around a separate courtyard within the development. Here it is regarded as being ‘very important’ that the housing for sale looks the same as the housing for rent. As with New Gorbals, there is no visual separation between the two housing tenures. Where the situation is reversed, the RSL housing can be the subject of stigma. One RSL director commented in relation to what he felt was an unsuccessful scheme:

> At the other extreme you have got places like […] where it is very clear
that the developer is working with the RSL under duress. The design is such that the social part of the scheme is very much in the way; the entrance to our block which is 55 units of rented housing (as well as shared ownership housing) feels like servants quarters round the back.

There are factors that promote a segmented solution. At Wauchope Square, the RSL preferred to manage a back court in its entirety. By contrast, in the New Gorbals development the community-based housing association took over the management of the semi-public and public spaces, thereby blurring the boundaries between tenures.

**Segregated**

Although concentrations of different tenures are generally to be avoided, in difficult housing markets this may prove the only way in which a scheme will be viable. This was the case at Ardler Village. In the Royal Quays development in Newcastle, which followed a similar development pattern, mixing between tenures was found to occur in one post-occupancy study (Jupp, 1999). The masterplan ensured that residents from different tenures shared streets and public spaces. Indeed, the author of the study found this factor to be of greater significance than the tenure distribution. Ardler Village also has several streets that are shared and a careful distribution of public space.

**Shared streets**

Social mixing cannot be determined by physical means within the context of a residential development. It can, however, be facilitated. The sharing of streets, cycleways and footpaths provides situations where near neighbours can, almost literally, ‘bump into each other’. This observation implies both that identifiable streets and spaces are available and that they are sufficiently safe and attractive to encourage residents to use them.

Past experience in housing design, where streets have been removed and confused movement systems have been substituted, have led to winding footpaths that appear to be unsafe at night and paths that serve only a few front doors. Many housing schemes in the past failed to distinguish sufficiently between the fronts and backs of houses to the extent that some blocks appeared to be surrounded by a species of anonymous no-man’s land. This observation applied to all of our case studies, prior to demolition and redevelopment.
Integrated housing layout
Each street block contains one side of social rented housing, as in New Gorbals (below).

Segmented housing layout
This permits RSLs and developers to separate the management of shared private space such as back courts.
Segregated housing layout

The tenures will be mixed on the sites left blank (in the north-east and south-west corners of development).
Ten characteristics of public spaces that facilitate social housing

1 Clearly identifiable streets and public spaces.

2 Streets designed to encourage pedestrians.

3 Connected streets with short, direct routes.

4 Streets that are attractive and safe to use day and night.
5 Continuous frontages with few blank walls.

6 Fronts of buildings facing the street/public spaces, backs of buildings facing courtyards/private areas.

7 Buildings that provide a sense of enclosure to the street.

8 Well-defined entrances onto the street at frequent intervals.

9 Streets that encourage safe vehicle use.

10 A clear differentiation of fronts and backs of buildings.
High quality children’s play areas

Chapters 1 and 2 mentioned the importance of schools in encouraging different tenures to mix. This is also true of children’s play areas and providing well-designed, accessible play areas is therefore important for mixed income developments.

In the medium to high density context of Glasgow informal play areas were provided in the shared courtyards of the blocks in the New Gorbals development. The courtyards were formed from the rear of the perimeter blocks. These were found to be effective in terms of mixing and it was the larger of the courtyards that were most successful. Providing either supervision or configurations that meant that parents could supervise play was
found to be significant too. It is important that parents can supervise play where possible. Small courtyards that included car parking, as in the smaller blocks in Hulme, did not work so well (Silverman et al., 2005).

**Consistency of external architectural treatment**

Potential stigma for RSL and shared housing units can be avoided through treating their external appearance absolutely consistently with the standards applied to private housing for sale. Although developers and RSLs may complain about the financial pressures that this demand imposes, our case studies demonstrate that such consistency can be achieved.

Housing associations may experience difficulties in providing external features such as porches, or may need to vary their standard provision. Developers may have to provide higher space standards at the lower end of their price range, in order to ‘stack’ social rented and for sale flats on top of each other.

Care also needs to be taken with ‘personalisation’. In low density housing developments, where it is commonplace to establish a small strip of garden between the footway and the front elevation of the dwelling, many RSL tenants may lack the resources to personalise their property. This is in contrast to owner-occupiers who frequently establish pot plants, hanging baskets and floral displays. Such markers of personal identity can act as a distinguishing feature of tenure, as strongly as any architectural feature.

**Integration of different types of dwellings**

One of the keys to the successful visual integration of tenures appears to be the blending of different types of dwelling, be they houses or flats. In our case studies, houses and flats of different tenures have been mixed skilfully across the development. This provides a stark contrast.

### Case study

**New Gorbals, Glasgow**

Perhaps the most striking example comes from one of the earliest mixed income developments, the Crown Street phase of the New Gorbals development. Here each perimeter block accommodates one side of RSL dwellings. The development draws on the tradition of the Glasgow tenement block, with the block being composed of a maisonette on the lower ground and first floors and the top two floors comprising flats of different sizes. Visual inspection of the different sides of each block do not yield any clues as to tenure and even tell-tale details, such as types of letter box or door bell, do not provide any means of differentiation.
contrast in approach to housing estates in the immediate post-war period, where houses and flats tended to be positioned in groups across the site, with no visual relationship between them other than stark contrast, often heightened by a different choice of materials.

The local authority requirements for a particular proportion of units that are disability aware or wheelchair accessible should be accommodated. Again, skill and care is required to prevent these units from becoming isolated. Problems can also arise where family houses are grouped together, producing high child densities in one part of the development that can lead to friction with childless residents.

Nevertheless, a certain level of difference in building footprint, scale and massing is desirable in terms of creating an attractive townscape. The production of an urban design framework or masterplan, with separate architectural practices designing different parts of the development can help to produce variety. The design coding should be sufficiently flexible to permit this.

Another problem that can arise is where small units of housing for sale, for example blocks of one- and two-bedroom flats, are sold to either small or institutional landlords who then let them out, sometimes leasing them back to local authorities or housing associations for homeless families. This can equally lead to stigmatisation. On an inner-city site it may be tempting to introduce high-rise blocks of one- and two-bedroom flats to ensure the financial viability of the development overall. As has been discussed, this solution may lead to management problems in the long run, such as concentrations of families with children.
in the social housing and one- and two-person households in the private units.

**Social sustainability**

A mixed income community needs to move from being a ‘development’ or an ‘estate’ to a ‘place’ or a ‘neighbourhood’ in the wider area. As one RSL worker said of the redeveloped Hulme:

> Hulme has therefore succeeded in becoming another part of the city, but is special in its own way. One of the ways in which this has been achieved is through its integration into its neighbouring context.

> I have been here only 18 months. Hulme to me is just like any other part of Manchester, but it has got a special character.

**Integration into the wider context**

The movement system that is provided within the mixed income community provides one of the keys to successful integration into the wider area. In two of our case studies, Hulme and the New Gorbals, the new community replaced a formerly stigmatised area of predominately council housing. The achievement of the masterplans for each of the new neighbourhoods was to re-instate the Victorian main streets that connected the developments back into the city (Stretford Road and Crown Street).

Establishing links between new neighbourhoods and the existing area can also be facilitated through the sharing of shops and other commercial and community facilities. Chapter 2 discussed the importance of providing mixed uses for the social sustainability of a neighbourhood. Given the changing nature of retail, and of many other services and facilities, it seems prudent to avoid redundancy by locating them at the periphery of new developments, rather

---

**Case study**

**Shared streets in Greendykes North**

The design guide for Greendykes North sets out a hierarchy of streets, boulevards, avenues, shared streets and mews. The shared streets are designed for traffic speeds of 10 mph, in accordance with *Planning Advice Note 76* (Scottish Executive, 2005b). They encourage pedestrians and children to dominate the space and drivers to understand that they are in a residential area and not on a highway. The guide states: “The spatial enclosure, the proximity of front doors and activity, parking, the informal seating and play areas and planting work together to reduce the speed of vehicles” (Scottish Executive, 2005b, p.29). The guidance was agreed following extensive negotiation with City of Edinburgh Council and drew on expert advice. This method of traffic calming is at the forefront of highway and urban design.
than, as was previously fashionable, at the centre. At Craigmillar, the re-establishment of the shopping centre adjacent to the major through route, Niddrie Mains, is an important feature of the urban design framework. In addition, two smaller district centres will be provided.

Park Central in Attwood Green and Upton provide good examples of flexible masterplans set within strong development frameworks, where different services and new facilities have been planned, but will be located on streets where they can share catchments with neighbouring developments. Flexibility is being demanded within the masterplanning process, so that uses can change over time. For larger developments, such as Craigmillar, the adoption of an urban design framework that sets the parameters for subsequent masterplans of different quarters and centres allows for flexibility.

Environmental sustainability

Environmental sustainability should be a component of all new housing developments. This encompasses many issues, from vehicular and pedestrian movement, to car parking, to the provision of green spaces and landscaping to energy efficiency and ‘green building’. The aspects that are discussed below are those that have been raised, either in research studies or in our case studies, as having a particular relevance to mixed income communities.

Encouraging walking and cycling

As discussed above, the possibilities of spontaneous chance encounters are increased through movement in public areas. Walking and cycling, in contrast to travelling by car, permits residents to greet and otherwise engage with each other. Careful design of footways and cycle paths can tick two policy boxes simultaneously:

High quality green space is critical to successful mixed developments. In Ardler Village a sustainable urban drainage system is provided and the creation of two new ponds creates two attractive environmental features. Excess water, which was a problem before redevelopment, has now been transformed into an attractive feature providing benefits for all residents.
those of encouraging social interaction and of pursuing environmental sustainability. Evidence from established mixed tenure developments demonstrates the popularity of cycle routes for both adults and children, with the proviso that they also need to be overlooked by adjacent houses and be safe (Allen et al., 2005). Good traffic management also makes it easier for children to cycle and to play in streets and public spaces.

**High quality green spaces and landscaping**

The higher densities demanded by *Scottish Planning Policy 3* (Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003) places a pressure on project providers to create more meaningful public space. The quality of green space and landscaping generally are critical to the success of mixed income developments. This is not only because parks provide some opportunities for children’s play and residents’ interaction but also because well-designed green spaces and landscaping form part of a high quality residential environment that residents can ‘buy into’.

Maintenance obviously also plays an important part in retaining this perception and ensuring the sustainability of the overall development as a social entity. The urban design framework for Craigmillar makes the most of its location with its views of Arthur’s Seat and green vistas. The developers for the Greendykes neighbourhood within Craigmillar are using the ‘green’ qualities of Craigmillar in the marketing of their development.

In our case studies that are located in areas of economic stress, regeneration funds have supported the provision of major new parks. Hulme Park in Hulme and Redburn Dene Park in Royal Quays are particularly enjoyed by residents.

**Car ownership**

In addition to providing a means for movement, car ownership provides a marker of wealth and status and a double garage provides an immediate clue as to the tenure of an occupant. At Royal Quays, for example, the double garages in one street provide a clear indicator of privately owned housing.

In rural areas car ownership may be vital, for both RSL tenants and owner-occupiers. Access from a motorway is also an important feature in attracting higher income residents. Furthermore, the rigid application of sustainable development principles in terms of limiting car parking provision may deter higher income residents from buying into mixed income schemes. Clearly these considerations pose challenges to local planners and designers. In the more recent of our case studies car parking has skilfully been made less visually intrusive through the use of semi-enclosed rear courtyards. Where the courtyards are also used as play areas, this may not be an ideal solution. On-street parking not only provides parking spaces that can be subject to informal surveillance, but when combined with skilful employment of the principles of ‘shared space’ street design, may actually contribute to pedestrian safety (Hamilton-Baillie and Jones 2005). Clearly the provision of garage space and suitable car parking arrangements will continue to be an issue for design and management.
Viability

Finance

The development of a mixed income community will require additional sources of money over and above Housing Association Grant. Partners cannot assume that monies provided by government will be sufficient, or that past funding levels will be matched in the future.

Mixed income schemes will need to ensure that they have effective procedures for managing risk and for ensuring that effective safeguards are built into financial arrangements. Realistic business plans have to be put forward at the start, with development in achievable phases.

“The object should be to create land values, not simply to capture them” (NRU, 2006). Good urban design is part of this process, as a strong framework of streets and external spaces, combined with a high quality first phase, builds confidence among private investors. This was the process at Hulme, New Gorbals, Royal Quays and Ardler Village, each constructed in areas of nil or low land values.

Costs can be kept low and design quality maintained as the scheme proceeds, through the enforcement of masterplanning and/or design codes and by letting the development in small parcels. This procedure makes the most of developers’ inclination for competition and allows for flexibility in delivery.

The wider powers of public authorities may allow significant extra funding to be attracted through other programmes, such as European funds. The first Crown Street phase of the New Gorbals development was underpinned by extra funds supplied by the Scottish Enterprise (Glasgow). This ensured that a high quality public realm could be provided, with both hard landscaping and a new park and indirectly supplied funds for the masterplan. Confidence and land values have since accelerated to the extent that the Queen
Elizabeth Square phase no longer needs a subsidy from public funds.

The early injection of public funding is important in terms of ensuring a mix of housing types. In inner-city areas, where land values are high and public subsidies are insufficient, it may be difficult to provide family-sized homes. For developers, when land values rise, their margins may restrict the construction of family-sized homes. In these circumstances local authorities may have to be flexible in their application of Section 75 Agreements, trading in the proportion of social housing in return for the inclusion of three-bedroom-plus dwellings.

Profit sharing was an approach adopted in one of the case studies. In Attwood Green, land was transferred to the housing association and licensed to the developers. In return the development agreement stipulated that a share of any profit made over a stipulated amount should be returned by the developer to a fund that is then spent in the area. This is called a virtuous investment cycle and is likely to generate £30 million over the lifetime of the project.

Without adequate financial arrangements, the masterplan cannot proceed. Financial arrangements will need to acknowledge the following:

- high quality design is initially more expensive
- compulsory purchase order (CPO) powers should be used early on in the process to ensure that land is bought at the lowest possible value
- where demolition of existing estates forms part of the development, allowance should be made for the loss of rent
- resources should be allocated to the establishment and development of community groups to ensure their engagement in the process
- proposals for mixed communities need to take advantage of regeneration funds where available, and should be fully integrated in community strategies and local area agreements
- community development trusts can help to attract inward investment opportunities
- long-term investment requires a strategic view about short-term costs
- there needs to be the right balance between capital and revenue funding.

The challenge in the area of finance and funding is to achieve high quality developments without the levels of public funding that have been available in the past.

Uncertainty

For mixed income communities that are based on existing council housing estates, balancing refurbishment with redevelopment is also an issue, about which the existing tenants and residents are likely to have strong views. In each of our case studies that included council estates the final proposals were the results of years of negotiation, business planning, community consultation, design...
and redesign. This produces uncertainty for the stakeholders involved. Where a transfer ballot is carried out in a relatively small area which involves demolition of properties, there is a risk that the proposals will be rejected. Experience suggests that a high quality and visionary design, that covers a large area, is more likely to be accepted (NRU, 2006). It is easier for tenants to unite over proposals that can provide a better estate, village or new town and to bury their personal differences.

There were also complaints from developers and RSLs about the uncertainty in the planning process. They commented on long delays in getting approvals and lack of clarity about the proportions of social rented and affordable housing to be provided. These uncertainties add to the overall costs of development and hence have an impact on the ability to achieve mixed income new communities.

Conclusions

There is no rubric or pattern book for producing a strategy for successful mixed income new communities. A list of factors that do and do not encourage integration is given here. It should be used with caution, as the presence of one negative factor may be overcome, such as introducing high quality design features in the RSL-managed housing.

### Good practice in delivering a strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that discourage integration</th>
<th>Factors that encourage integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• segregation of scheme from wider neighbourhood</td>
<td>• mix of uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social rented housing grouped together</td>
<td>• integration of scheme into wider neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social housing segregated from private for sale</td>
<td>• an even mix of housing types and sizes between tenures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• separation of housing types and sizes into different tenures</td>
<td>• social rented housing evenly dispersed through development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• separate route system for different tenures</td>
<td>• careful integration of different densities, for example, flats and houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• separated children's play areas</td>
<td>• shared streets and public spaces for near neighbours from different tenures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• separated public parking areas between tenures</td>
<td>• high quality public realm with continuous building frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• confusion between public, semi-public and private space</td>
<td>• attractive landscape and green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poorly designed and maintained public realm</td>
<td>• walking and cycling encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• car use dominant</td>
<td>• shared children's play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social rented housing stigmatised through visual markers</td>
<td>• shared public parking areas between tenures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• no design controls</td>
<td>• consistent external architectural treatment across tenures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• no resident empowerment.</td>
<td>• use of design guidance, for example, masterplans and design codes to ensure uniformly high standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inclusive consultation with residents and neighbours and empowerment of existing residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Challenges

One challenge with mixed income schemes is that a wide range of social landlords and developers may be used. For example, there are multi-landlord consortium developments where lines of responsibility are unclear. In such circumstances it is important to ensure a streamlining of management arrangements with clear lines of accountability that are transparent to owners and renters with consistent and fully integrated procedures (Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005).

One way that different partners have evolved is to use common management arrangements and to provide services through a single agency (often a private management company for landscaping and cleaning common parts). It is important that there are not differential arrangements, resulting in different standards of service delivery for different tenure groups.

Based on what was said in Chapter 2 about the importance of vision, partners ‘need a common understanding of their collective role’. This role is based on a mix of formal and informal expectations, understanding and relationships. While it is not possible to formalise everything, it may be useful to articulate shared values and understandings, symbolically and practically (Russell, 2001).

Partnership

The importance of developing trust, understanding and shared values is central to a successful mixed income scheme. This can be difficult with very different institutional actors, with competing cultures and different lines of accountability: for example, a private developer accountable to their shareholders; a statutory sector accountable to the local community; and voluntary agencies accountable to their board.

While lines of accountability may be disparate, it is important to reach a common understanding about shared objectives for the area: ensuring that schemes can become a destination of choice; meeting housing need; and raising the profile and status of the neighbourhood.

It is also important to consider the overall leadership roles discussed in Chapter 2. Effective partnership arrangements are dependent on a champion who can hold all the different agencies together and drive the vision for a scheme. This is a necessary but not sufficient condition for partnership working to function effectively. It should also be noted that leadership may not be invested in one individual but there should be clear lines of accountability and responsibility. In some respects this leadership can become invisible over time.

The main principles of partnership working in mixed income communities can be stated as follows:

- Organisations need to be clear about the challenges of working with new agencies: mixed income schemes will inevitably involve a variety of different agencies, most of which will not be familiar to one another. An effective partnership needs to have mechanisms...
to bring groups together and to resolve inevitable disputes.

- **Partners need to establish shared objectives:** while different positions will be inevitable in the short term, there needs to be recognition that all are working to the same ends, that is, the development of flourishing and integrated, cohesive neighbourhoods. There needs to be acknowledgement of specific aims, such as providing equal access to services, a fair distribution of resources, a well-maintained environment and minimising neighbour nuisance.

- **Involving service users:** there needs to be an explicit recognition that service provision is dependent on the desires and needs of local residents and that services will be provided on an equitable basis regardless of income.

There is a need to change attitudes towards the longer-term investment potential of neighbourhoods and a cultural change on the part of both private developers and social landlords. While the legacy of the past continued to generate suspicion, there was some evidence that attitudes were changing. For example one manager commented:

... whereas in the past it was traditionally almost a contractor/client relationship between housebuilder and housing association; you are now starting to see joint venture partnerships coming through, the sharing of risk, complementary skills being brought to the procurement process. It’s early days; you are putting together two quite different cultures.

---

**Case study**

**Ardler Village Trust**

Ardler Village Trust (AVT) incorporates a partnership between the Ardler community, Dundee City Council, Communities Scotland and Sanctuary (Scotland) Housing Association. AVT is an independent charity and was established to support non-housing community projects. It operates through three sub-groups, developing projects addressing the needs of the area and managing partnership activity. The sub-groups are:

- **Social and community:** aiming to develop and coordinate activities that build the capacity of local people, improving community spirit and tackling social exclusion.

- **Physical regeneration:** overseeing and implementing physical regeneration projects.

- **Economic:** aiming to develop and coordinate activities that enhance the economic status of residents through employment, training and personal development.

Membership of the AVT is open to all Ardler Village residents over the age of 16 and six community members act as directors on AVT’s board. AVT organises job fairs, developing sports provision, organising social and community events and supporting local business. AVT is committed to community capacity building and it has created 50 apprenticeships, 100 additional jobs and developed commercial and retail space. It has delivered environmental improvements and provided care and support to vulnerable members of the community.
But you are starting to see some differences in the way that developers are thinking and the way that housing associations are thinking.

(Interview)

**Community involvement**

Resident involvement and community consultation have now become essential parts of the planning and regeneration processes and it is striking how important community consultation was to all but one of our case study developments, three of which were started in the early 1990s. This applied whether they were led by local authorities, developers or by development corporations. In each case the consultation process assisted in gaining support from stakeholders for the mixed income community as a concept, in addition to providing an input to the design itself.

It is of particular note that overall the consultation process tended to support innovation in design and encouraged developers and RSLs to experiment. Community involvement and capacity building will help to determine effective and responsive management arrangements. Effective partnership arrangements will provide strong evidence of ‘added value’ to mixed income schemes:

A successful renewal strategy is not a set of compromises but is built on a solid understanding of the differing values and priorities of the community. Putting the community at the heart of the process provides a wealth of knowledge and insight. But difficult decisions require strong leadership.

(CABE, 2004: 3)

Case study

**Community involvement in Craigmillar**

The Craigmillar Housing Area Board was established in 2004. Including representatives from resident organisations, local councillors, officers from service groupings, it is seen as an essential part of the overall strategy for the area. One benefit for residents was the ability to hold pre-meetings at which officers and councillors were excluded. “Then we can prepare and go in properly informed. We have a good understanding of what we want to get out of the meeting. I don’t think there has ever been a vote and priorities are agreed amicably” (Interview, resident representative).

Case study

**Tenants and Residents of Ardler (TARA)**

The Ardler Steering Group was made up solely of tenants and residents who were actively involved in the masterplan process. Resident involvement has continued with the Ardler Village Trust (see above), which is involved in non-housing aspects and TARA, which is the sole resident and tenant organisation (RTO) and has regular liaison with Sanctuary (Scotland) Housing Association (SSHA). TARA is an active tenants group that works on behalf of all Ardler Village residents in tackling local issues; meetings are open to all Ardler Village residents. It runs regular fundraising Bingo nights and activities for pensioners. There is also involvement in community networks and structures, such as the Community Safety Panel, and it has been involved in seeking funding to convert a redundant building into a village hall. A key objective for the association is the integration of new residents regardless of tenure.

Resident involvement should incorporate all residents and schemes should incorporate a collective association, creating opportunities to act as a pressure group with a common interest in service improvements and facilities.

However, consultation processes may vary and again it is important to be flexible about the kind of approaches offered. For example, large public meetings may not always be appropriate where they are likely to be dominated by vociferous individuals and narrow interests. It may be preferable to talk to small groups of
tenants and residents individually to gain a sense of their wishes and aspirations. Those responsible for managing schemes should be encouraged to support residents’ associations in a variety of forms.

One clear finding from the research is that community involvement is crucial at the outset. The earlier the consultation mechanisms are in place and decision making is devolved the greater opportunities there are to develop trust and loyalty among the different participants. As one resident commented: “Consultation cannot come soon enough” (Interview).

Further guidance can be obtained from Communities Scotland, which has published ten national standards for community engagement that can be used to develop and support better working relationships between communities and agencies (www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk). The Scottish Centre for Regeneration has also published an online ‘how to’ ‘Guide to community engagement’, which sets out a range of techniques that can be used to work with communities (www.scr.comunitiesscotland.gov.uk).

**Partnership in management arrangements**

One of the main components of management effectiveness in mixed income neighbourhoods is that there are robust partnership arrangements with commonly agreed and understood arrangements. These should include principles for: determining a balance in the resident profile; common standards in maintenance, repair, and improvement services; service charges; managing anti-social behaviour; and in establishing neighbourhood agreements.

**Nomination agreements and allocation policies**

The allocations policies of social landlords may have a key role to play in determining the sustainability of local areas. The policy of creating mixed income communities is designed precisely to avoid concentrations of deprivation and this objective will be undermined if the policy of the social landlord is simply to provide accommodation on the basis of the greatest need. “Local housing professionals should reject strategies that explicitly concentrate the most economically deprived households on certain estates in order to ‘cluster the problem’” (Berube, 2005: 51). At the same time, there may be

---

**Case study**

**Local housing management in Crown Street**

New Gorbals Housing Association (NGHA) is a community-based housing association formed in 1989 by a group of local residents. Key to its success was its local profile in the Gorbals area, allied to a strong focus on regeneration and design quality. “NGHA is only interested in New Gorbals – no one else is in that position, other partners are just passing through” (Interview). This local profile was central to its management approach: “where the local housing association is well known and integrated, the likelihood of success is that much greater”. Local management was strengthened by a committee with a majority of residents on the board with assets owned by the local community. The board was described as:

… raising the bar in terms of standards. They [the board] hold things very dear and have experience of what went wrong in the past. The committee embraced regeneration and there were strong expectations that things would be managed properly. You will notice how little graffiti there is….
conflicts between social landlords, who are interested in the longer-term sustainability of neighbourhoods and local authorities with statutory duties to house homeless families, whose priority is to reduce numbers on their housing register. These conflicts should be accepted as inevitable dilemmas that do not have easy answers. Nevertheless, a number of mechanisms can be used in order to minimise difficulties.

One of the main tensions may be between the local authority statutory duty to meet housing need through homelessness provision and the landlord’s desire to manage a stable community. As Holmes (2006) maintains, the fact that landlords are housing vulnerable tenants should not in itself be seen as a sign of failure. “The opening up of council housing to more of the poorest households was a desirable and overdue change” (Holmes, 2006: 197).

However:

The housing of more low income tenants would not have been a problem if council homes had been integrated within neighbourhoods of owner occupied and privately rented housing. It became a serious problem because single tenure estates housed only low income, predominantly non owning tenants, and so created neighbourhoods of concentrated poverty.
(Holmes, 2006: 197)

Given this situation, how can the tension between allocation according to need and the requirement to develop sustainable communities be resolved?

A first step may be to reach mutual nomination agreements between local authorities and partner RSLs (see below); there should therefore be “a clear protocol about new developments in particular” (Interview, RSL manager). Thus in order to avoid negative stereotyping, social landlords need to provide accommodation for a wide range of age groups, avoiding concentrations of young children in one tenure. Agreements will vary according to local need, demand and conditions, but it is important that all parties are represented in the process of drawing up the nomination agreement and that this is clearly understood.

A second step may be for landlords to establish local lettings plans and to establish targets for neighbourhoods: for example, the number of single-parent families and child densities. “Our view is that you get better management if you actually plan who you house”, as one RSL manager commented.

One of the key difficulties in mixed neighbourhoods is when social housing is occupied to the maximum by families with children and by home owners who under-occupy their property. While there are resource considerations, particularly in high-demand areas, social landlords could consider under-occupation of certain properties, for example, by making offers of properties with spare rooms and allowing for adult-only households in some circumstances (Andrews and Reardon Smith, 2005: 7). These local lettings policies may appear problematic in areas of severe housing need and in such circumstances landlords will need to consider other alternatives, such
as the provision of ‘keyworker’ and ‘intermediate’ housing to increase social mix or projects to boost local employment.

In particular, lettings policies should not discriminate against particular individuals on the basis of their past behaviour, for example, including broad categories of applicant that will be excluded (Scott et al., 2000; Somerville, 2000).

Landlords should pay attention not simply to the first letting but also to subsequent allocations. Therefore a third step may be that landlords should regularly conduct *neighbourhood profiling schemes*. They need to be aware of differing needs and desires of communities and should be able to collect accurate information about their neighbourhoods.

---

**Case study**

*Craigmillar Allocations Agreement*

The Allocations Agreement was signed by the Craigmillar Regeneration Forum, the Craigmillar Neighbourhood Alliance, City of Edinburgh Council, Manor Estates Housing Association and the Kintry Partnership. The Agreement contained a wish list of ten items, identifying problems and recommending solutions and action points. The following items were identified as priorities:

- highly trained staff
- plain language information
- up-to-date information
- lettings plans
- involvement in allocations
- local information
- vetting and probationary tenancies
- voids standards
- monitoring allocations
- anti-social behaviour.

The result was a ‘sensitive lettings’ policy avoiding inappropriate lettings (for example, people with conflicting lifestyles). Although residents have been involved in discussions about vetting of new residents and probationary tenancies, it was recognised that these would only be used in very limited circumstances. Residents expressed positive views on their involvement; one maintained that “the process was as important as the outcome” and another commented on a “fantastic process”. The main benefit was that residents came to see that “the aims and objectives of the community and the council are identical; we both want this to be a better place”. The process offered regular and relevant dialogue and “an insight into council staff and how difficult their job was”. Work on the neighbourhood agreements had helped to foster a better relationship between the local authority, landlords and residents, one “where people did not feel intimidated”.

The process offered regular and relevant dialogue and “an insight into council staff and how difficult their job was”. Work on the neighbourhood agreements had helped to foster a better relationship between the local authority, landlords and residents, one “where people did not feel intimidated”.

4 GOOD PRACTICE IN DELIVERING PARTNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION
It is essential to understand the social and economic fabric of neighbourhoods, in order to determine and tackle the root causes of problems and not just the symptoms. 
(CABE, 2004: 3)

Landlords should collect information at an early stage. “Housing agencies should consider using estate profiles that map the characteristics of tenant applications against potential destination neighbourhoods to maintain a more balanced estate character” (Berube, 2005: 52). Lettings policies should not just be limited to single estates but “across the housing and neighbourhood spectrum” (Berube, 2005: 52).

Communities are dynamic and income profiles are likely to fluctuate; housing professionals therefore need to see neighbourhoods as long-term investments: “We have taken a long-term approach; these people have got to live on our estates for the next ten or twenty years. So we will fight our corner” (Interview).

These principles should equally apply to private developers and they should be encouraged to view their developments as long-term investments.

Common standards for factoring services
It is important that landlords are able to address factoring, maintenance and repair problems quickly to avoid stigma becoming associated with socially rented properties. As one local authority officer commented: “Generally the local authority does things to the minimum standard and the challenge is to raise the game”

Case study
Maintenance in New Gorbals
New Gorbals Housing Association (NGHA) has developed a strong reputation for providing high quality factoring services with responsibility for common areas, staircases, back courts, grass cutting, cleaning, cyclical maintenance and common repairs. In providing a management service that was “locally-based, accessible and accountable … you see people out and about on the street” (Interview), and contrasting with traditional private sector factoring services based in the city centre. Factoring was provided to social and private residents with NGHA acting as property managers of public and common land. The organisation benefited from what was referred to as the ‘synergy of mixed tenure’; for example, undertaking landscaping contracts where work was carried out in both rented and owner-occupied properties and generating what were described as “massive economies of scale”. In practical terms this allowed a community-based housing association to employ someone five days a week, rather than one or two days as with most private sector organisations. Savings were then passed on to tenants. In addition this allowed ‘joint walk-arounds with residents and block representatives’, where problems could be identified and effective action taken to resolve repair and maintenance issues swiftly.
An effective factoring policy is essential across developments to ensure that there is no distinction between public and privately owned properties.

Landlords may employ private management companies to assume responsibility for common parts within properties and external communal areas. These arrangements can help to generate more uniformity of service rather than having many different management arrangements carried out by a range of service providers. Maintenance responsibilities should include:

- effective procedures for reporting repairs (both major and minor)
- commitment to the swift maintenance of amenities and facilities, for example children’s play areas
- a decision on whether to outsource maintenance responsibilities
- effective and uniform arrangement for landscaping and gardening
- common procedures for refuse disposal and recycling facilities.

**Case study**

*Kids in the Street (KITS): street football for all*

The City of Edinburgh Council initiated a scheme to provide mobile sports facilities to young people in the Craigmillar area. The scheme includes a mobile four-a-side football pitch that is dismantled and put in a trailer. It is used during the summer every day in ‘hot-spot areas’. The scheme is seen as very successful in engaging young people and providing a well-structured environment to engage in team sports. Local police reported a significant decrease in youth disturbance when the football pitches were being used. Other projects have included a youth cinema, funding for a project worker for youth inclusion and a designated bonfire zone on the 5th November.

**Partnerships in managing anti-social behaviour**

As mentioned above, one of the central challenges in managing a mixed income community is the need to avoid negative stereotyping about the behaviour of residents and the management of the socially rented properties. The management of anti-social behaviour represents one of the key challenges in mixed income communities. There may be mutual suspicion between tenures and a view that owner-occupiers will perceive the majority of anti-social behaviour from residents of affordable housing properties. However, evidence from our case studies suggests that complaints can arise from the behaviour of residents of all tenures.

In order to avoid negative stereotyping, landlords need to adopt a flexible response, including appointing a named contact person from the outset of a scheme, with the ability to resolve conflicts
between residents. An important principle is to ensure that landlords create places “where people might report anti-social behaviour and where people feel they can report anti-social behaviour” (Interview).

While landlords have the opportunity to offer Short Scottish Secure Tenancies (SSSTs) to applicants with a history of anti-social behaviour and to grant SSSTs on satisfactory behaviour, it is recommended that such powers are only used in exceptional cases.

In guidance produced on tackling anti-social behaviour on mixed tenure estates in England (ODPM, 2003b), the use of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships is advocated to: ascertain the nature of the problem; to develop multi-agency partnerships; and to engage residents to build community capacity.

Within mixed income communities it is important that interventions should not be limited to particular forms of tenure and landlords should review their use of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) and Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) to ensure they are utilised effectively.

Partnership arrangements and service charges

Service charges represent a particular difficulty for mixed income schemes. Private households have tended to consume services based on their desire and ability to pay, whereas social residents have been limited by the constraints of the Housing Benefit system as well as by the issue of affordability and discouraging dependency on benefits. A number of problems and challenges can be identified that have a particular bearing on mixed tenure, high density schemes. These challenges include:

- a differential quality of service provision between owners and tenants
- the affordability of costs and charges
- tenure segregation
- resentment between owners and renters, particularly where owners perceive themselves to be subsidising services for affordable housing.

What practical steps can be taken to resolve these difficulties? Possible solutions include:

- Ground rents that are payable by all residents and collected by a charitable trust. These can be used to subsidise certain services for social rented tenants. The advantage of this arrangement is that it creates a freeholder dedicated to the sustainable management of the site.
- Developers can subsidise service costs for social rented tenants through the planning gain system. The imposition of service charge limits may encourage tenure segregation or unsustainable approaches to apportioning charges between market and affordable housing residents; development proposals should be “underpinned by sustainable arrangements for delivering affordable charges” (HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004: 58).

Case study

Community safety concierges in Craigmillar

The City of Edinburgh Council has piloted community safety concierge schemes to assist with a range of landlord duties, including: noting breaches of tenancy conditions; carrying out estate inspections; monitoring empty properties; and undertaking minor repairs. In addition the concierges have a role in patrolling estates, assisting with crime prevention measures and observing and reporting low-level anti-social behaviour. They also help with organising the Christmas ‘drop’. Concierges are able to identify who properties belong to and can find out quickly who the housing officer is.

They play a valuable role in community development and in managing common areas as their responsibilities are not limited by tenure or ownership. Seen as ‘the eyes and ears of the council’ the concierges work closely with the police, other landlords and the local community on crime prevention programmes. In developing a relationship of trust within local communities, the concierges are trained to collect concrete information and to act as professional witnesses. They have attended masterclasses in acting as witnesses and have checklists for evidence gathering. The scheme has been described by officers as “imaginative and proactive”, “not another kind of traffic warden” and “far from a council snitch”.

Concierges are able to identify who properties belong to and can find out quickly who the housing officer is. They play a valuable role in community development and in managing common areas as their responsibilities are not limited by tenure or ownership. Seen as ‘the eyes and ears of the council’ the concierges work closely with the police, other landlords and the local community on crime prevention programmes. In developing a relationship of trust within local communities, the concierges are trained to collect concrete information and to act as professional witnesses. They have attended masterclasses in acting as witnesses and have checklists for evidence gathering. The scheme has been described by officers as “imaginative and proactive”, “not another kind of traffic warden” and “far from a council snitch”.

Ground rents that are payable by all residents and collected by a charitable trust. These can be used to subsidise certain services for social rented tenants. The advantage of this arrangement is that it creates a freeholder dedicated to the sustainable management of the site.

Developers can subsidise service costs for social rented tenants through the planning gain system. The imposition of service charge limits may encourage tenure segregation or unsustainable approaches to apportioning charges between market and affordable housing residents; development proposals should be “underpinned by sustainable arrangements for delivering affordable charges” (HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004: 58).

Case study

Community safety concierges in Craigmillar

The City of Edinburgh Council has piloted community safety concierge schemes to assist with a range of landlord duties, including: noting breaches of tenancy conditions; carrying out estate inspections; monitoring empty properties; and undertaking minor repairs. In addition the concierges have a role in patrolling estates, assisting with crime prevention measures and observing and reporting low-level anti-social behaviour. They also help with organising the Christmas ‘drop’. Concierges are able to identify who properties belong to and can find out quickly who the housing officer is.

They play a valuable role in community development and in managing common areas as their responsibilities are not limited by tenure or ownership. Seen as ‘the eyes and ears of the council’ the concierges work closely with the police, other landlords and the local community on crime prevention programmes. In developing a relationship of trust within local communities, the concierges are trained to collect concrete information and to act as professional witnesses. They have attended masterclasses in acting as witnesses and have checklists for evidence gathering. The scheme has been described by officers as “imaginative and proactive”, “not another kind of traffic warden” and “far from a council snitch”.

Ground rents that are payable by all residents and collected by a charitable trust. These can be used to subsidise certain services for social rented tenants. The advantage of this arrangement is that it creates a freeholder dedicated to the sustainable management of the site.

Developers can subsidise service costs for social rented tenants through the planning gain system. The imposition of service charge limits may encourage tenure segregation or unsustainable approaches to apportioning charges between market and affordable housing residents; development proposals should be “underpinned by sustainable arrangements for delivering affordable charges” (HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004: 58).
- RSLs can contribute from within their margins or by offsetting subsidy against identified savings/efficiencies; there may be scope for allowing housing providers to use Housing Association Grant to offset costs of services; RSLs should be involved in scheme development at the earliest stages in order to consider the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of management arrangements proposed for new developments.

- Providing higher levels of Housing Association Grant above subsidy levels typically required to support planning gain to reflect the costs of essential high density amenities.

- Local authorities can use subsidy to limit charges (using powers to provide financial assistance) or through adoption of public areas such as parks, roads and play areas, “where local authorities insist on the provision of public realm within new schemes (such as parkland) but will not consider adoption they may be undermining the scope for delivering affordable housing” (HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004: 48).

Planning authorities, developers and housing associations therefore need to work together to examine the range of mechanisms available to control service charges. As discussed above consistency in management for residents of all tenures is crucial; there should be effective joint management solutions ‘tailored to the demands of high density living’ (Source: HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004, p.6).

In broader terms the Barker Review in England (2004) included a proposal to encourage local authorities to use planning contributions for affordable housing and direct impact mitigation. Further issues for government policy include:

- Service costs should be considered as part of overall scheme costs and not as a separate, self-financing revenue cost; “current approaches to financing service charges undermine rent policy and compromise the affordability of gross rents” (HACAS Chapman Hendy, 2004: 45).

- Policy should encourage local authorities to ensure planning contributions are used effectively to support the whole costs of affordable housing provision, taking account of the costs of servicing high density communities.

**Neighbourhood agreements**

Neighbourhood or estate agreements can be used to combine a mixture of formal resident involvement and informal arrangements (Steele et al., 1996; Cole et al., 2000). A central principle should be to ensure a sense of uniformity across service areas:

> We are looking at how we are going to unify our estate management in the future…. What we want to achieve is a single service across all tenures; we don’t want to be bowing down to the needs of shared ownership, assuming they are more important people. We want to agree a common set of service standards; the same people responsible for services so everyone on the estate is aware of whom to contact and to deliver a single level of service. (Interview)
Neighbourhood agreements are dependent on an understanding of the wider housing market, including the private rented market (an often neglected aspect of managing mixed income communities):

There needs to be a more direct engagement with the management of the private rented sector, and the impact of a large amount of privately rented housing on new estates. Private landlords along with other owners, should be required to enter into long term agreements related to standards of management and maintenance of property, and these compacts can form part of a wider neighbourhood management arrangement.

(Rowlands et al., 2006: 62)

While there may be some scepticism about the ability to enforce agreements, it is acknowledged that formal agreements are required to ensure high quality estate management.

Case study

The Craigmillar Bon Accord Project

This project was intended for residents to identify key areas of service improvements and for these to be formally negotiated between residents and local service providers. The Kintry Partnership took an ‘open’ approach to issues that should be included that eventually involved housing, street cleansing, education, policing, youth work and advice services. The agreements outline responsibilities in a written document involving a voluntary contract, which, although it has no legal status, is regularly monitored by a working group. Formal neighbourhood agreements have included: housing allocations (see above); community safety and anti-social behaviour; estates; and open space management.

Estate agreements provide a basis for these and should apply to residents and property owners in all tenures. In particular there is a need to incorporate private landlords within this to insure against potential problems of absentee landlordism which may undermine the sustainability of estates.

Wider structures for partnership and participation

In order to sustain more successful and balanced communities, mixed income schemes need to pay close attention to broader social and economic features of neighbourhoods. This need will be particularly applicable to newly developed large schemes. The sustainability of an area is on not only contingent existing housing provision but also depends on wider amenities and facilities. A number of ‘golden rules’ for mixed income communities have been formulated. These include:

- area policies need to go hand in hand with labour market policies
- incentives should be targeted on those most likely to move into the area, that is, the young and highly skilled without children
- the quality of schools is critical to location.

(Meen et al. 2005: 64)

A successful scheme will have the ability to “provide links between public agencies to deliver effective schools, childcare, play facilities, public spaces, community work and neighbourhood management” (Silverman et al., 2005: 74). The factors needed for longer-term sustainability include partnership and participation arrangements for training, education and employment initiatives.

Training opportunities represent a particular challenge and are essential to capacity building within mixed income schemes. Landlords may wish to consider partnership opportunities that offer added value activities or Wider Role services such as providing amenities and facilities and ensuring effective education, health, security and other community support services.

Education initiatives should be given priority as the importance of high quality local schools is an essential feature of sustainable community. Schools are seen as a crucial indicator of confidence in a community and are particularly important to ‘newcomer’ families. Confidence building can be undertaken through community outreach and involvement in pre-school childcare.

Where new schools are needed, they require careful inter-agency planning, including consideration of pupil composition, and links between school and housing allocations.

(Silverman et al., 2005: 73)

In areas of high unemployment an effective partnership to generate employment opportunities should follow from training schemes. Partnerships with local businesses and voluntary agencies to provide employment opportunities can assist in avoiding a situation where a distinction in economic activity occurs between owner-occupiers and social rented tenants.

Partnerships in health care are also vital to ensuring sustainability. These might include the establishment of local health clinics and participation in decisions about health care provision from health workers, including community nurses, GP services and psychiatric services.
In addition, landlords should consider environmental improvements to their area and develop projects that can assist residents to engender a sense of ownership and local pride in their area.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that some of the expectations relating to social cohesion may be unrealistic. As one resident commented:

*I don’t think there is a huge amount of mixing between the two [groups] … it’s very difficult because it’s how you dispel the resentments of those who don’t have quite as much as someone else who is living near them … that’s always a problem.*

(Interview)

Despite the difficulty of ensuring social cohesion and mixing between groups, an effective arrangement for partnership and participation will be a key factor in assisting the sustainability of a mixed income scheme.

**Conclusions**

This chapter has shown how effective partnership and participation arrangements can build on the principles of effective design, a clear vision and robust strategies for success. The crucial point is that these approaches must go hand-in-hand; the neglect of one will have a serious impact on the others. The key issues to consider are:

- negotiating and agreeing decisions about neighbourhoods in a spirit of shared understanding
- clarification of responsibilities and lines of communication from the outset

---

**Case study**

**Ardler urban ranger scheme**

The urban ranger scheme is designed to support the regeneration process by engaging the community in local projects. The work of the ranger is coordinated by a steering group of local residents. The aim of the ranger is to enable the community to realise its natural heritage, involving care for wildlife and supporting projects that enhance the local environment. The urban ranger promotes understanding and awareness of the local environment. The urban ranger initiative supports environmental projects but also involves broader issues such as litter, vandalism, safety and sustainability.

The urban ranger provides support for the Ardler in Bloom horticultural project, supported by Greenspaces Scotland established in 2004. It involves running a local gardening competition encouraging residents to take pride in their environment and to grow plants. The project emerged from a group of local residents and was seen as a way of encouraging residents to take pride in their environment, many of whom had gardens for the first time. The aim was to promote gardening as an enjoyable activity as well as emphasising the benefits of health, fresh food, wildlife and the environment. It aims to provide green spaces as places to enjoy and to promote communal activity, creating a sense of pride and local ownership among residents. Ardler won the ‘Beautiful Scotland in Bloom’ award for the best urban regeneration scheme in 2005 and 2006.
acknowledging the importance of a local management presence in the long term

recognising the added value offered by resident participation and community involvement

ensuring that decision making is equitable, robust, transparent and flexible

demonstrating a commitment to tenure neutrality and commonality of standards

joint agreement and regular review of allocation policies; neighbourhood profiling to take place on a regular basis to ensure mix targets are maintained

attention to the affordability of service charges and their distribution between tenures

a clearly understood and jointly agreed strategy for tackling low-level crime and anti-social behaviour.

---

**Case study**

*Gorbals Arts Project*

Gorbals Arts Project is a locally based scheme that is committed to producing local artwork in the field of arts-led community-led regeneration. It provides tuition and a workshop for local people and works with other local agencies to produce artwork that gives a sense of pride and ownership in their local area. Projects have included children involved in pebble mosaic murals and designing entrance gates for new-build apartments.
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Introduction
This guide has addressed the issue of how to develop mixed income sustainable communities, drawing on both case studies and recently published research on mixed income communities.

All the evidence suggests that, while there are many similar policy, financial, design and management considerations that need to be addressed, very different market conditions, housing needs and factors relating to scale and location will affect the approach that should be adopted in individual cases.

While there are many mixed income communities in Britain, particularly in cities, most have developed organically as a result of past housing policies (for example, through municipalisation), small in-fill developments, or the introduction of owner-occupied housing into existing estates.

The difference in the recent attempt to develop mixed income sustainable communities is that it requires a strategic and integrated approach that engages all stakeholders in what is now called ‘place-shaping’. It is propelled by national housing and planning guidelines with the specific aims of reducing concentrations of poverty and unemployment, and giving lower-income households access to higher quality services found in mixed areas.

Through inserting public housing into private developments or by developing private sector housing on existing housing estates, the intention is to achieve socially cohesive communities that, by virtue of being mixed, will not experience the levels of deprivation seen within some neighbourhoods where unemployment and poverty, poor educational outcomes and poor health have combined to reduce life chances.

Evidence from our case studies in Scotland and England, as well as from Bournville (Groves et al., 2003) and the estates discussed by Allen et al. (2005), suggest that clear objectives and careful management can produce successful outcomes. It is also clear that there is enormous variation in practice, in terms of developing these communities, and some variation in the extent to which developers and public bodies have embraced the notion of sustainable mixed communities. On the other hand, a clear strategy, the pooling of resources and a well-integrated partnership approach demonstrate what can be achieved.

New mixed developments should not only create housing of choice that people from all income groups actively choose to live in, but should also include the full range of facilities and services as well as becoming assets that increase in value to both the occupants and to the wider community. New housing development also has an important role to play in integrating employment opportunities, including training opportunities and attracting creative and innovative people.

There is a recognition that mistakes have been made in the past, both in private and in public sector housing, and many of these lessons have been taken into consideration in developing these new communities. It is generally accepted that
the rapid development of council housing in the 1950s and 1960s led to the building of some estates that were isolated from city centres, lacking services and facilities and with poor transport provision – places that were difficult to let and difficult to live in, and had an adverse effect on the lives of their inhabitants (Power, 1987; Morris and Winn, 1990). Page (1993) argues that the development of housing association estates in the 1980s replicated similar mistakes to those made by local authority landlords. For example, poor design and inadequate attention to management, maintenance and allocation policies resulted in high child densities and concentrations of low income and vulnerable groups. At the same time, private sector developments of relatively low cost housing for sale have been built without adequate services or facilities nearby.

In the following section we discuss a number of challenges that remain to be addressed if high quality mixed development is to become the norm rather than the exception.

**Developing national policy guidance**

The starting point should be clear policy guidance from central government on the broad policy objectives. This should provide clear answers to these questions: what are the benefits of socially and economically mixed developments? What good practice exists in different locations and in different contexts? Which financial, planning and development tools offer the best prospects for success? How and in which ways should planning briefs, housing needs assessments, development agreements and other mechanisms be applied? How can high quality design of housing, other services and the external environment be incorporated through the masterplanning and commissioning process?

National policy needs to provide clear objectives to all stakeholders without appearing to be over-prescriptive, while enabling innovative, locally relevant proposals to be carried out. There should also be greater convergence between the objectives of the Scottish Executive, Communities Scotland, local authorities and housing associations so that all are using their various powers and financial resources to achieve an agreed set of objectives in conjunction with local...
Recommendation 2
National guidance setting out the arguments for mixed developments needs to be clearly stated, relevant to all locations and agreed between leading agencies. If demonstration projects are to be selected, special attention should be paid to the dissemination of best practice. This would be enhanced by sponsoring teams of experts to advise others in the early stages of planning on finance, delivery structures and masterplanning. ‘Place-shaping’ implies a joined-up approach to planning, delivery, the integration of facilities, services and management.

Recommendation 3
As part of the national review of policy, consider how effective and integrated delivery vehicles can be established in each area undergoing development in order to encourage maximum integration of funding streams, partnership working and management practices. Also, consider which delivery vehicles are most appropriate in different contexts.

Recommendation 4
The housebuilding industry and developers should be encouraged to see themselves as part of a wider partnership with the common goal of successful place-shaping. They should be encouraged to take a longer-term perspective towards the creation and enhancement of attractive places where values are maximised for all residents and the wider community.

Integrating funding mechanisms to achieve high quality mixed development
There are currently many public funding streams that contribute towards the delivery of integrated housing developments. At present, responsibilities are spread between a number of national agencies, local authorities and city-wide housing associations, and local delivery vehicles such as community-based housing associations, CPPs and URCs.

The successful management of mixed developments also requires the integration of powers and working practices of a large number of agencies. All the evidence from Scotland suggests that an holistic approach brings real benefits to residents and quite possibly cost savings and economies of scale.

An important issue to be reviewed is whether different types of area and location require different solutions and funding mechanisms. Clearly the processes of intervention and development are very different in the diversification of a large, inner-city council estate compared with constructing a new development on a greenfield site. It is essential that each area has as much autonomy as possible to devise the best approach to suit local circumstances.

Engaging the private sector
There are many examples of innovative approaches being developed by the major housebuilders, and many have demonstrated a willingness to work closely with local authorities, housing associations and other agencies in order to deliver successful mixed developments. Others have proved more resistant to change and are less willing to work with local authorities and RSLs and to apply innovative solutions to the planning, design and financing of their developments. A clearer national policy framework and a more positive planning response to high quality developments may encourage more private sector developers to adopt the standards of the best. Housebuilders and developers should also be encouraged to see their role not so much as short-term capital investment but as a major contributor to the development and enhancement of value in the long term. This might be achieved through land ownership and profit-sharing arrangements.

Setting up collaborative arrangements between stakeholders
Evidence from our case studies suggests that, increasingly, new development on both brownfield and greenfield sites is being provided by a broad range of
agencies and stakeholders. Very often it is the local authority that provides strategic guidance through the preparation of local housing needs assessments and local development strategies. RSLs and private developers are then selected and a complex negotiation process is entered into about the financing, mix, phasing and allocation and sales of the housing, infrastructure and other uses. Increasingly, the provision of health, community, shopping and other facilities are being integrated into development plans.

This process often takes many months, and in many cases several business and masterplans have to be produced before a viable solution is finally agreed that is acceptable to all parties. There is a strong argument for encouraging greater dialogue between stakeholders around fundamental issues of land assembly, tenure mix, density, layout and integration into the wider urban context in a particular locality or local authority area so that the broad strategic context is agreed before sites come forward for development. It is also essential that a lead agency is identified early on that is able to coordinate the others by agreement. The lead agency might well vary in different situations according to which has the resources to provide leadership and which has a long-term commitment to delivering a scheme of the highest quality. Innovative financial arrangements, as demonstrated by Promoting and Regenerating Craigmillar (PARC) in Edinburgh, could be applied more widely.

These partnerships should also engage with other service providers such as local schools and colleges (and education authorities where relevant), health authorities and other providers, the police authority and local retailers and employers to ensure that all services are capable of delivering quality services when new residents move into the area.

There also needs to be more emphasis on the delivery structures whereby stakeholders agree at an early stage the financial arrangements, performance criteria, distribution of risk and reward over time and longer-term management arrangements. We argue that these considerations are as important as the masterplanning process but this is not always fully appreciated by housing associations and local government.

Specialist advisers offer this service at risk (this incurring no cost until the development is approved) and also provide advice on the tax implications of particular collaborative arrangements. The margins saved from effective financial planning can often be used to improve facilities on the development or to increase the proportion of affordable housing.

**Ensuring development strategies are robust but flexible**

It is inevitable that over time local housing market conditions, and levels of need, will change. Once development is under way it is essential that the consortium of stakeholders is able to remain committed to the original vision underlying the development, but is also able to make adjustments to the mix, density, range of house sizes and other factors in order to ensure that the development remains attractive to all categories of resident.
The viability of a development is a crucial factor. Viability is a concern to the private developer that will be primarily concerned with the costs and potential saleability of a development. Thus in inner-city and central area developments, developers tend to favour one- and two-person units which, they argue, are more commercially attractive and produce a higher rate of return.

Developers will be particularly committed to smaller units if they are also asked to provide a considerable proportion of affordable units as part of a Section 75 Agreement. Viability is also an important issue for housing associations that are constrained by limitations of the Housing Association Grant. Increased flexibilities in the ways in which public funding can be used, for example, in terms of room sizes, the provision of facilities and energy-saving adaptations, can significantly increase the long-term sustainability of a development.

Thus if national policy is to encourage greater provision of family-sized units in inner and central area developments, there will need to be adjustments in the provision of affordable housing and contributions to infrastructure. This raises wider issues such as the extent to which lower to middle-income families can be persuaded to move back into inner and central locations (Silverman et al., 2005).

**Recommendation 6**

The range of sizes of housing units and the tenure mix may be influenced by a number of factors relating to assumptions about the commercial viability of the development and existing commitments to re-house former residents. Wherever possible developers should be encouraged to include the full range of housing types, including family housing. Public sector funding should also be used as flexibly as possible to ensure all housing needs are provided for.
Setting up strategic management systems

The case studies demonstrate the importance of ensuring flexible and robust management systems that effectively incorporate inclusive partnerships (regardless of tenure). The principle of tenure neutrality must underpin the approach to a sustainable mixed income community. On this basis schemes should adopt a uniformity of approach to management, to avoid stigmatisation and to ensure that common areas, facilities and amenities are maintained to a high quality. This neutrality should also apply to the administration of service charges. The case studies in Chapter 4 illustrate a number of successful management arrangements between stakeholders and local residents.

While considerable attention has been devoted to the affordability of rent levels in new schemes, this debate about affordability has to date tended to ignore the impact of service charges (particularly within high density schemes). This issue requires attention at a government level through the Treasury’s proposals for a PGS, at the planning stage (for example, in considering local authority adoption of public space) and in negotiations between service providers (whether public, private or voluntary sector).

The focus on effective partnership arrangements must not only include service providers but increasingly service users. The most effective schemes in the case studies were those that were able to incorporate a range of views, demonstrating not only a leadership role but also the capacity to include those most affected by decisions taken (that is, the residents themselves). Support for community development trusts, as in Ardler, and arrangements for effective participation, must be a prerequisite in the planning of any mixed income community.

Developing fair and equitable allocations priorities

In any development it is important to establish an effective balance between management imperatives and a commitment to meeting a wide spectrum of need, particularly in high demand areas. However, it is essential that households in the greatest need (including vulnerable groups) are not disadvantaged by the demands of

---

**Recommendation 7**

Proposals for establishing responsive local management systems need to be devised at the beginning of the planning process and should cover both public and private housing and external spaces, where appropriate. The level of service charges for all tenures should be carefully considered.

**Recommendation 8**

Existing residents should play a full part in the planning of developments and also have an important role to play in contributing to management systems on completion. Agencies should work closely with local forums and neighbourhood councils, funding should be identified for special projects to promote active involvement in training, sport and leisure to reduce anti-social behaviour, and the role of community-based trusts should be considered. Concierges have an important role to play as contacts between residents and statutory bodies.

**Recommendation 9**

Sensitive allocations agreements and resident and tenancy agreements need to be established at an early stage so that all residents are aware of their rights and responsibilities towards creating a successful community. Powers to control anti-social behaviour should be used only with the consent of residents and as a last resort.
sustainability. This will require a sensitive approach to local lettings policies, and flexible arrangements to ensure there is not an over-concentration of children or a disproportionate number of people with special care and support needs where resources to meet these needs may be limited.

There is evidence from many developments that, despite the commitment to creating fully mixed communities (by age, gender, ethnic origin, disability, income level and family size), there are a number of formal and informal selection processes in operation for social tenants, intermediate tenures and owner-occupiers. These may relate to a tenant’s rent paying record, criminal record or other personal circumstances. In the case of owner-occupiers factors taken into account could include previous place of residence and local family or other connections. These methods of allocation and selection need to be reviewed to ensure that the broad principle of social and income mix is being adhered to and that they are non-discriminatory.

**Sustainability**

Considerations regarding the sustainability of housing development are rapidly emerging as a new and important priority for housing development. Communities Scotland’s draft sustainable development policy (2006) has substantially advanced this process. Sustainable development relates not only to the physical fabric of housing but also to the location, travel patterns, accessibility to jobs and facilities, and viability in social terms as a community. Therefore, all the arguments in favour of creating mixed income communities become of even greater importance.

**Conclusions**

All the evidence suggests that successful mixed tenure and income developments can be achieved as part of a wider commitment to creating attractive, serviced and well-connected places to live. This guide has focused on drawing out the best practice from both the case studies and written sources. A great deal of evidence exists for ‘what works’ but this is not always immediately accessible to the practitioner and best practice is not always widely disseminated. Our perspective has been that the housing development process is extremely complex, involves many stakeholders over long periods of time, and that successful outcomes require vision, imagination and a sound understanding of local conditions.

While the principles of mixed income and tenure developments are becoming more firmly established in national and local policies, our final plea is that these should not be taken for granted or treated as national standards to be applied uniformly and without detailed consideration. If there is one message to arise from this report it is that the ‘right’ decisions need to be made at each stage of the process – planning; designing; agreeing the distribution of risk, responsibility and reward; development and long-term management. All have implications for each other and fundamental decisions made early on are very difficult, and expensive, to change at a later date.

**Recommendation 10**

All agencies engaged in housing provision should adopt the place-shaping approach that takes full account of the physical, environmental, economic and social aspects of achieving sustainability.
Appendix I: The evidence base for mixed income developments

A good place for children? Attracting and retaining families in inner urban mixed income communities
E. Silverman, R. Lupton, and A. Fenton (CIH and JRF, 2006)
Evaluates four new, inner-city housing developments to find out how far families with children occupy the private housing and what motivates them to live there.

Approaches to community governance: Models for mixed tenure communities
Considers governance mechanisms in various neighbourhoods, to identify models of local involvement that could be applied to mixed tenure areas.

Allocation of land for affordable housing through the planning system – Research findings
Scottish Executive (Scottish Executive, 2006)
Reviews alternative approaches and suggests good practice in allocating land for affordable housing in Scotland.

Challenging perceptions: Case studies of dispersed and mixed tenure new build housing
C.L. Andrews and W. Reardon Smith (Sovereign Housing/The Housing Corporation, 2005)
Evaluates in depth four recent mixed tenure developments that are developer-led. Concludes with recommendations on tenure mix for key stakeholders.

Economic segregation in England: Causes, consequences and policy
G. Meen, K. Gibb, J. Goody, T. McGrath, and J. Mackinnon (JRF, 2005)
Examines the social and economic trends on three mixed tenure estates to determine what the key drivers are and whether tenure changes are sustainable. Concludes with eight policy recommendations for achieving tenure mix.

Factors in common: How local authorities manage properties in mixed ownership in Scotland
F. Russell and J. Welsh (Scottish Consumer Council, 1998)
Looks at ways local authorities can most effectively manage properties of different tenure types that share common parts.

Good practice in housing management: Case studies, conclusions and recommendations
S. Scott, H. Currie, S. Fitzpatrick, M. Keoghan, K. Kintrea, H. Pawson and J. Tate (Central Research Unit, Scottish Executive, 2000)

Housing management practice in Scotland: Review of progress
S. Scott, H. Currie, J. Dean and K. Kintrea (Central Research Unit, Scottish Executive, 2000)
Two reports that provide comprehensive coverage of the major issues relating to housing management practice and consider examples of good practice among Scottish social landlords.

Homes for Scotland’s people: A Scottish housing policy statement
Scottish Executive (Scottish Executive, 2005)
Sets out the housing strategy for Scotland with a strong commitment to addressing disadvantaged neighbourhoods and creating mixed communities.

Hulme ten years on: Draft final report to Manchester City Council
Centre for Sustainable Urban and Regional Futures (SURF) (University of Salford, 2002)
An evaluation of the redevelopment of Hulme from the 1990s onwards.

Improving the understanding of the influence of owner occupiers in mixed tenure neighbourhoods
T. Beekman, F. Lyons, and J. Scott (Scottish Homes, 2001)
A review of mixed developments in Scotland that finds generally positive outcomes of mixing in terms of local
services, educational performance, skills and employment and perceptions of the area.

**In the mix: A review of mixed income, mixed tenure and mixed communities**
R. Tunstall and A. Fenton
(The Housing Corporation/English Partnerships/JRF, 2006)
Reviews the evidence base for achieving social, economic and environmental objectives through mixed communities.

**Living together: Community life on mixed tenure estates**
B. Jupp
(Demos, 1999)
Explores the social aspects of mixed tenure housing and concludes that social inter-mixing is more likely to take place in schools and streets. Tenure mix is not a particularly important issue for most residents.

**Managing housing voids**
Audit Scotland and Communities Scotland
(Audit Scotland and Communities Scotland, 2004)
Considers good practice in ensuring that social landlords keep empty properties to a minimum.

**Mixed communities in England: A US perspective on evidence and policy prospects**
A. Berube
(JRF, 2005)
A comparative study of mixed communities in the US and UK that demonstrates that the reduction of neighbourhood effects of mono-tenure estates is an important objective.

**Mixed tenure twenty years on – Nothing out of the ordinary**
C. Allen, M. Camina, R. Casey, S. Coward and M. Wood
(CIH and JRF, 2005)
Examines the experiences of professionals, adults and children in three neighbourhoods that were created as mixed tenure communities over 20 years ago. These have produced what residents see as ‘ordinary’ communities with very little tenure prejudice.

**More than tenure mix: Developer and purchaser attitudes to new housing estates**
R. Rowlands, A. Murie and A. Tice
(CIH and JRF, 2006)
Explores the arguments that mixed tenure developments are difficult to deliver, developers are unenthusiastic about them and that people buying new homes do not want to live on mixed estates.

**Neighbourhood agreements in action: A case study of Foxwood, York**
I. Cole, E. McCoulough and J. Southworth
(JRF, 2000)
Examines the use of ‘estate contracts’ or neighbourhood agreements as a way of promoting resident involvement in management. Such agreements can offer greater transparency, accountability and more effective resource allocation.

**Neighbourhoods that work: A study of the Bournville estate, Birmingham**
R. Groves, A. Middleton, A. Murie and K. Broughton
(The Policy Press and JRF, 2003)
Demonstrates that tenure mix is just one aspect that promotes attractive, well-designed places to live. Schools, the internal design of homes, and the quality of the external environment are also important.

**Neighbourhoods and communities strategy**
The Housing Corporation
(The Housing Corporation, 2006)
Encourages housing associations in England to consider their wider role in fostering neighbourhoods and promoting mixed communities in the areas in which they operate.

**People and place: Regeneration policy statement**
Scottish Executive
(Scottish Executive, 2006)
Describes Scotland’s strategy for successful regeneration – the lasting transformation for the better of places and communities.

**Performance management in local authority housing services: An empirical view**
H. Pawson, H. Currie, A. Currie, W. Hayhurst and J. Holmes
(Communities Scotland, 2004)
Considers the evidence for ways in which local authorities are attempting to improve their managerial performance.

**Planning Advice Note 74: Affordable housing**
Scottish Executive
(Scottish Executive, 2005)
Sets out guidance to local authorities and others on how the planning system can increase the supply of affordable housing.
Rebalancing communities: Introducing mixed incomes into existing rented housing estates
G. Martin and J. Watkinson
(JRF, 2003)
Reviews the experience of registered social landlords (RSLs) that have taken some initiative to rebalance tenures on single-tenure estates. Also evaluates the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust’s SAVE Programme in York.

Safer places: The planning system and crime prevention
Llewelyn-Davies
(ODPM/Home Office, 2004)
Sets out good practice in designing out crime as part of the broader aim of achieving housing quality and sustainable communities.

Scottish Planning Policy 3: Planning for housing
Scottish Executive Development Department
(Scottish Executive Development Department, 2003)
Sets out guidance to local authorities on housing in relation to the statutory planning system.

Sustainable communities: Building for the future
ODPM
(ODPM, 2003)
Sets out the government’s strategy for improving the quality and the supply of housing in England.

Sustainable development policy: Draft for consultation
Communities Scotland
(Communities Scotland, 2006)
Sets out a draft strategy and action plan for promoting the sustainability in all aspects of housing, community development and other policy areas within its remit.

The effectiveness of estate agreements: A new arrangement for tenant participation
A. Steele, P. Somerville and G. Galvin
(University of Salford, 1995)
Advocates the use of estate agreements to increase resident involvement in housing management. Involving both formal and informal arrangements the agreements are flexible and jointly negotiated covering standards of service and future priorities.

The urban design compendium
Llewelyn-Davies
(English Partnerships/The Housing Corporation, 2000)
One of the best good practice guides to improving the quality of design in a variety of urban contexts. A major section deals with improving the layout and integration of new housing into its wider context.

The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development
M.L. Joseph, R.J. Chaskin and H.S. Webber
(Urban Affairs Review, 47 (3), 2007)
Examines the theoretical foundations and evidence on which is built the rationale for mixed income development as a strategy to confront urban poverty, drawing on mainly US sources.

Towards a strong urban renaissance
Urban Task Force
(Urban Task Force, 2005)
Sets out the Task Force’s current assessment of urban policy and makes recommendations on ways to promote the quality of design in growth areas such as the Thames Gateway.

Towards an urban renaissance
Urban Task Force
(E. and F.N. Spon, 1999)
Detailed investigation into all aspects of urban policy together with over 100 recommendations. Well designed, high density mixed communities are strongly advocated.

Visionary leadership in housing
M. Simpson, R. Lucas, B. Blackaby and S. Davis
(CIH/LGA, 2005)
Argues that a renaissance of the local authority’s strategic housing role is needed that is different from the past and makes recommendations for a new national framework to deliver this enhanced role.

What price sustainability? Keeping service charges affordable in mixed tenure high density developments
HACAS Chapman Hendy
(Moat Housing Group et al., 2004)
Explores ways of limiting service charge costs for affordable housing residents in mixed tenure developments.
Appendix II: Case studies

Ardler Village, Dundee

Ardler is located on the outskirts of Dundee. It was built between 1965–74 as an estate of 3,000 dwellings incorporating six high rise blocks of one- and two-bedroom flats and several four-storey blocks and inter-linked maisonettes. The estate was built to a courtyard design, with flat roofs, and uninsulated cavity wall construction contributing to condensation problems. The core of the estate was the Ardler complex that included a community centre, a library, a clinic, a small shopping centre and two primary schools (one Roman Catholic, one non-denominational). In 1996, the complex was described as “an intimidating and negative focal point in the centre of this estate” (Dundee Partnership, 1996: 4).

In the mid-1990s, Dundee City Council (DCC) determined to improve the estate that was suffering from high turnover, unpopularity, high levels of social deprivation, rising levels of unemployment (as a result of the closure of local factories in 1970s) and a continuing population decline. Local authority-led housing and social strategies have been assisted by the funding provided through Priority Partnership Areas, the Social Inclusion Partnership (SIP) and a New Housing Partnership. The community has played an integral role with the Ardler Steering Group, now Ardler Village Trust, the main focus for community involvement.

A demolition programme carried out between 1995 and 1997 left 1,500 dwellings and just two of the six high-rise blocks remaining, together with the four-storey blocks, and a failing shopping centre. The very high cost of refurbishment and the rising demand for better quality housing (in part, propelled by developments being carried out by local housing associations) meant that wholesale or partial stock transfer was considered but DCC was aware of the need for economic and social change as well as physical improvements.

However, the estate was well looked after and received favourable ratings in surveys done prior to the redevelopment. An area profile of the estate in 2000 stated that, “the Ardler estate is dormitory in character, comprising mostly high-rise and deck access housing built in the sixties, with associated educational, community and commercial facilities. There is considerable provision of parking areas in the estate which, given the low level of car ownership, lies unused and desolate” (Geddes Centre for Planning Research, 2000: 2).

Between 1991 and 2001, the population of the core area decreased by 65%, compared to a decline of 2.7% in Dundee and an increase of 1.3% in Scotland (the former was mainly explained by the demolition programme).

A range of methods for engaging with communities was deployed including structured interviews, Planning for Real, Group Priority Search, and large-scale household surveys. DCC recognised the need to enhance the capacity of local people, to build strong community networks, and for “a range of opportunities to accommodate different levels of involvement” (Dundee Partnership, 1996: 14).

A project coordinating committee was established that invited expressions of interest in January 1998. Seven expressions of interest were received. These were presented to the residents at daytime and evening meetings, and development officers knocked on doors to engender interest.

In May 1998, detailed submissions were invited from the four short-listed consortia, and the assessment was carried out by DCC, Communities Scotland and the Ardler community. In September 1998, Sanctuary Scotland (SSHA), Wimpey and Hunt Thomson Associates (now HTA) were selected as the preferred developers. The year 1999 was a year of negotiation and SSHA used it to engage with the local community. The original plan had been to keep one or two of the four-storey blocks
but tenants opposed this. It was finally agreed that there would be wholesale demolition, excluding 73 low-rise properties on the edge of the estate, mostly because it was better quality housing but also because 50% had been sold under the right to buy (RTB) and owners wished to remain at that time.

In December 2000, a stock transfer ballot took place and had a turnout of 87.5%, with a 'yes' vote of 95.5%. The stock transfer (1,467 units) was completed in December 2001.

The building work on phase 1 began in 2002; 147 new homes for rent were completed by 2003, together with 40 sheltered flats, the refurbishment of 48 properties, and landscaping. Works on phase 2 began in 2003.

These homes were allocated during April 2003, and tenants who received an allocation were invited to attend a tenant choices surgery to choose their colour schemes, kitchens and bathrooms for their new homes. Tenants who were allocated homes in this phase moved into their new homes during November and December 2003.

By November 2006, 693 houses for rent were completed, and 47 new houses for rent were on site. The final phase, predominantly housing for sale but including 50 houses for rent, is to follow the demolition of the last multi-storey block in early 2007.

In 2003 the Ardler Village Housing Committee was established with tenants/residents in the majority. Also in 2003, the Ardler Village Trust was set up with the aim to promote social, economic and community regeneration alongside physical regeneration. The Trust is a company limited by guarantee with charitable status and has six directors representing the local community. Core funding comes from Sanctuary (Scotland) Housing Association (£25,000 per annum for seven years from 2003), European Regional Development Fund (£15,000), and Communities Scotland (£30,000 for three years).

**Attwood Green, Birmingham**

Attwood Green is the new name for Lee Bank, Benmore, Woodview, Cleveland, Clydesdale Towers and the Five Ways Estate lying to the south of Birmingham city centre. The estates were almost entirely in council ownership and were uniformly residential, apart from three local shopping centres, a health centre and three schools. A large proportion of people were benefit-dependent, car ownership was low and at least 65% of school children were eligible for free school meals. Although many of the flats were in high-rise blocks, they were set in a ‘parkland’ setting with large amounts of open space.

In December 1997 the council submitted a bid for Estates Renewal Challenge Fund (ERCF), based on the assumption that it would be transferred to an RSL. In 1998 the government approved the bid and offered a grant of £46.6 million conditional on a ballot of tenants held in 1998. Tenants voted in favour of the transfer to a newly formed RSL, Optima Community Association. At the time it was estimated that the ERCF grant would access a further £30 million from the RSL and £30 million of private investment for housing and commercial uses. The £46.6 million from the ERCF was to be used to demolish at least 900 substandard properties and included £4.48 million to go towards open space and community projects.

The assumptions underlying the development strategy were that densities would be increased, mixed uses would be introduced and private housing would be constructed to balance the already high levels of social housing (in excess of 80%). The housing department carried out a feasibility study that recommended that at least 1,200 units could be built in the area. The better quality housing would be retained and refurbished and the worst would be demolished. Crest Nicholson Residential (Midlands) was the developer and they signed an agreement with Optima and the council. Most of the site has been transferred from the council to Optima and a profit-sharing arrangement is in operation with Crest Nicholson. Proceeds go into the local infrastructure and services.

The main focus of the redevelopment is the former Lee Bank Estate, which is being marketed as Park Central. TM2 architects were commissioned to prepare a revised masterplan and, after a split in TM2, Gardner Stewart is the sole architectural practice for the scheme. From the proposed seven stages of development, the first three completed are at an average density of 155 housing units per hectare. The proposed uses on the 24-hectare Park Central site are:
14 commercial units, two supermarkets, one hotel and a multipurpose community centre

1,596 one-, two- and three-bedroom private apartments, 622 with parking spaces

78 affordable apartments, 31 with parking spaces

250 social rented houses with gardens

77 two-, three- and four-bedroom private town houses

147 affordable town houses

eight live/work units.

Attwood Green is a mixed development in terms of uses and tenures. Much of the better quality housing has been retained with new development facing onto the main roads and a newly landscaped park in the centre of the development. Attwood Green was the overall winner of the Deputy Prime Minister’s Award for Sustainable Communities in 2005.

Caterham Village, Caterham, Surrey

The development is close to Caterham on the Hill, 20 miles south of London, close to the M25. It is seven miles from Croydon and 15 miles from Gatwick airport. Caterham Village was originally developed as an army barracks at the end of the 19th century. Two-thirds of the 57-acre site was designated as a Conservation Area in 1996 and the site was bought from the Ministry of Defence in 1997 by Linden Homes. John Thompson and Partners were commissioned in January 1998 to instigate a community participation process and to prepare a masterplan for the site. Guinness Trust was selected as the RSL. Tandridge District Council granted outline planning approval in June 1999 with the proposals delivered through a six-phase programme for completion in 2006.

The 57-acre site was purchased on the basis of a draft development brief that proposed employment and recreation uses and only a small amount of housing. The developer (Linden Homes) considered this was too restrictive and the planners and developers took the decision to consult the public again, “with the intention of involving the community much more fully in the decision making process, and of securing council support for a broader scheme”.

The masterplan for the site had two main aims: first, to apply the principles of an urban village to create a balanced community with a mix of uses. Second, to create a sense of place through high quality design, incentives for new business, the provision of low cost housing and community facilities, and the preservation of historic buildings and heritage. The scheme was substantially completed in 2003. The site comprised a total of 366 housing units (70% of which were two- and three-bedroom properties) plus 24 sheltered housing units and 60 units provided from the conversion of the original buildings. A total of 102 units were affordable housing properties (27.5% of the total). The Guinness Trust was also closely involved in the initial planning decisions and in the agreement that 27.5% of the properties should be social housing.

These affordable properties comprised:

- 75 social rented flats and houses
- 19 shared ownership flats
- eight single person units for ‘move on’ accommodation
- a 60-bed nursing home for Anchor Trust
- a single dwelling for five disabled persons.

Many of the original buildings have been re-used. There are open spaces, mature trees and extensive landscaping. There are numerous facilities and amenities, including: a Tesco supermarket, a nursing home, a cricket pitch, health club, skate park, a GP, a vet, a small business centre (enterprise hub), a restaurant and proposals for a separate arts centre and further sports and leisure facilities.

Craigmillar, Edinburgh

Craigmillar is a large peripheral estate to the South East of Edinburgh and is made up of four main neighbourhoods:

- Niddrie Mains and Niddrie Mill (North)
- Niddrie Marischal and Niddrie House (South East)
- Craigmillar Castle and town centre (West)
- Greendykes (South)

The area has a good range of shopping, health and community facilities but in the late 1970s and early 1980s the area experienced a steep decline,
with depopulation, high levels of unemployment, low demand, physical decline and a range of social problems. The area was heavily dependent on mining and brewing, both of which closed in the 1960s and 1970s. The area is the fourth most deprived in Scotland.

The regeneration proposals are designed to address development over a 10 to 15-year period. Mixed tenure and integrated neighbourhoods were seen as a key strand of the proposed regeneration programme. A key feature of the proposals was that existing residents would have a ‘right of return’; up to 60% are expected to take advantage of this. There is a strong community in the area, described as a key ‘infrastructure of support’, with extended family networks based on four to five previous generations. The major areas of redevelopment and new building will be in Niddrie Mains and Greendykes. The aim is to increase the population from around 7,500 in 2004, to approximately 15,000.

The proposals are designed to ensure compliance with the Craigmillar Urban Design Framework and the council wanted to avoid large concentrations of deprivation. The council is keen to mix aspirations and the business plan. One objective is to avoid urban sprawl and have medium density housing.

The target is to develop 33% family housing; this is to be a mix of houses/flats of varying heights. There is an overall target for affordable housing of 20–25% (including rented and low cost home ownership).

The physical outputs include: 3,200 new homes (including 2,600 for sale). These homes will incorporate a mix of houses and flats. Thirty-three per cent will be family housing; one new community high school; three new primary schools, with a fourth if needed; a new library; a new public park and public realm; internal parks and play areas; and a new reconfigured town centre with 300,000ft² office, retail and leisure space.

Other outcomes include improved access to employment and education. There are six key regeneration themes: a regenerated town centre; economic development including job and local business opportunities; education and lifelong learning; opportunities and facilities for young people; improving access and movement; and the area a destination of choice.

The regeneration strategy is being promoted by PARC (Promoting and Regenerating Craigmillar); one of three Pathfinder Urban Regeneration Companies (URCs) in Scotland. The City of Edinburgh Council established an arm’s-length property company (EDI) and both bodies jointly own PARC. This allows access to private capital funding that would not otherwise be available. Of the total budget of £400 million, PARC has raised £160 million, the Scottish Executive £18 million and a further £200 million is anticipated from housing associations and commercial developers.

Grahame Park, North London

Situated in Colindale in the London Borough of Barnet, the Grahame Park Estate was originally developed in 1910 as an airfield and aircraft factory. The first housing was built in 1968. The estate comprises 1,777 properties – of which 1,365 are council owned and 412 are privately owned – together with 13 retail units, in a site containing over 18 hectares of open space.

Grahame Park is part of a larger regeneration programme in the Colindale area. The estate adjoins a vacant hospital site and a metropolitan police centre, both of which are due for redevelopment. The neighbourhood also forms part of four comprehensive regeneration schemes in the borough. The other estates are Cricklewood (5,000 homes), West Hendon (which will increase from 600 to 2,100 homes), and Stonegrove Spur Road at Edgware (which will increase from 600 to 1,375 homes).

The regeneration scheme originated in 1999 with an acknowledgement by the local authority that the estate was failing and an estimate that repair and maintenance work would cost around £80 million. This development of 2,800 homes is an exclusively private-led scheme, comprising 42% affordable housing, of which 16% is for social renting, 8% for shared ownership and the remainder comprises what is termed a ‘discount market’ (for example, entry point workers’ studios). The developer, St George, is constructing properties within the price range of £190,000 for one-bedroom flats
to £370,000 for two-bedroom penthouse apartments.

In 2001 architects Levitt Bernstein were commissioned to produce a masterplan with the intention of providing around 3,000 properties and to reverse the tenure mix, so that the proportion would be approximately one-third social rented to two-thirds privately owned. A consortium, called Choices for Grahame Park, was set up in 2002. Two housing associations are involved (Genesis and Notting Hill Housing Trust). An interim partnership board was established in 2003 comprising: Choices for Grahame Park, Countryside Properties plc, residents’ representatives and local authority members and officers.

Outline planning approval was gained in September 2004; local authority approval of the terms of the regeneration and the first demolitions took place in 2005. Building work is due to continue until 2015. The scheme involves the following:

- phased demolition of 1,300 homes and community buildings and the construction of 3,000 new mixed tenure homes in a traditional street lay-out
- replacement of old concourse with new village green and shops
- reprovision of major community facilities including library, community centre and nursery day centre
- new civic and retail centre complementing a private sector development at RAF East Camp
- 5,000 new homes to be constructed by 2012.

Finance for the regeneration of Grahame Park was primarily to be achieved through surpluses raised by the sale of over 2,000 properties. A key feature of the development is that no government grant is available, so new housing must be built for private sale to pay for the new development as a whole. The total cost of the scheme is anticipated to be in the region of £400 million.

**Hulme, Manchester**

Hulme is a neighbourhood in South East Manchester, less than a mile from the city centre. The area went into decline and between 1962 and 1972 underwent major redevelopment, when all the terraced housing was bulldozed and replaced by 5,000 new dwellings. The majority of these were deck access and Hulme was renowned for being Britain’s largest system-built estate. Hulme suffered from many of the problems of modern council housing estates of that period. The multistorey crescent blocks presented huge problems in terms of management, were hard to let and suffered from structural problems.

In 1991 the council owned 91% of the land and 98% of the housing properties. Diversification of tenure and the introduction of a private sector housing market was a key priority. In order to make the area attractive for private sector development, it was recognised that all the crescents had to be demolished first and replaced with new, high quality social housing. Following the introduction of new private sector housing the programme would move on to replacing the district shopping centre, which was located on the border of Hulme where it joined Moss Side. Following that, efforts would be made to attract major new commercial employers into the area.

The first phase of Hulme’s regeneration was managed and funded through the City Challenge programme that provided £35.5 million of government grant. Other public sector monies were also directed towards Hulme with funds from the Department of Transport, the regional health authority and the European Commission. By the end of the City Challenge programme in 1997 the public sector had committed £65.3 million to the area. The development process was aided by securing a private sector partner, the construction company AMEC, early in the bidding process. Two RSLs, Northern British Housing Association and the Guinness Trust, were appointed as development agents.

By the end of the City Challenge programme, 3,016 units of unfit council housing had been demolished, 874 council dwellings had been improved, and 1,000 housing associations units had been completed. Only 214 private sector dwellings had actually been finished but 1,151 were expected to be complete by 1999. This included 564 student flats and 48 privately rented flats. Bellway was the first of the private developers to build in Hulme. Moss Side and Hulme Partnership was set up in 1997 and funded by Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), Capital Challenge and European funding. Over £400 million of private and public sector investment has been levered into the area. By July 2001, over 2,000 new homes for sale or rent had been created in addition to
three new public parks, the formation of a new business and office development site, a new bridge and a new ASDA superstore. The ongoing development of Hulme is now being overseen by the council-led South Manchester Regeneration Team.

Rebuilding the city: A guide to development in Hulme was published in 1994. This guidance amplified the masterplan that set out an overall development framework. The guide suggests that Hulme should not be redeveloped as a series of suburban style ‘estates’ or enclaves but that it should form a seamless web of streets and spaces that integrate Hulme with its hinterland and the city centre. The density was set at 75–87 dwellings per hectare. Mixed uses were proposed together with the re-instatement of Stretford Road as the high street through the northern part of Hulme. A lower level of car usage was envisaged and the principle of fronting dwellings onto the street to promote an urban character with ‘natural surveillance’ was upheld. The design guidance also made proposals with regard to energy sustainability, visual identity and the provision of a ‘legible’ street pattern. The guidance allowed for considerable variation between blocks and in fact encouraged innovation. Because of the phasing, the tenures are disposed in different grid blocks throughout Hulme, with some larger tranches of RSL housing, as in the Guinness Trust’s developments that are outside the main area of Hulme. The SURF report (2002) notes that Land Registry figures demonstrate that the average increase in property prices between 1998 and 2001 was higher (49%) in Hulme than in Greater Manchester as a whole (29%).

Kings Hill, West Malling

West Malling in Kent is seven miles from Maidstone, and about 75 miles from central London. The Kings Hill development began with the building of a business park on the former airfield in the late 1980s. The development is described as “a quality mixed use development of approximately 263 hectares with outline consent for 185,805m² of office and business space, and approximately 65,032m² occupied by over 100 businesses, with a residential community with consent for 2,600 homes – 1,390 are now occupied and around 354 under construction”.

The development partners are Liberty Property Trust Ltd (formerly Rouse Kent), Kent County Council and Russet Homes. Described as a collaborative public/private partnership, the development began in the late 1980s. The masterplan was developed by Rouse Kent Ltd using local architects Clague. According to www.buildingforlife.org, the original masterplan was superseded and this resulted in the removal of all cul-de-sacs and the road layout becoming more organic. In addition, the development was required to have a village centre in order to meet the requirements of the local plan.

Phase 1 of the residential development was completed in 2005; phase 2 (the final anticipated phase) will complete by 2011. One hundred units of affordable housing are located in five phases around the site with another 150 (out of 750) projected for the next stage of the development. The mix was 50% for rent, 50% shared ownership in the first stage and will be 75% rent, 25% shared ownership in the next stage. The site also accommodates an 18-hole golf course, an ASDA store, a retail development, which includes cafes, restaurants, hairdresser, beautician, estate agents, building society, a medical centre, a campus of the University of Greenwich, two primary schools and a day nursery.

Kings Hill provides a range of house types from apartments to detached family homes, affordable housing and a variety of urban forms including high density development in the central area. It also has housing that provides the opportunity to accommodate differing housing needs and to create a diverse community, for example, accommodating the needs of the elderly, single-person households and lower-income families. The average site density is 30 houses per hectare.

New Gorbals, Glasgow

In the 19th century the Gorbals was a high density, tenemented neighbourhood lying close to the southern bank of the River Clyde. The Crown Street Regeneration Project was formed in 1990 made up of a partnership between the Glasgow Development Agency, Glasgow City Council, Scottish Homes and the local community. The long-term aim of the project was to make the Gorbals an attractive area where people wanted to live in a balanced and sustainable community, to boost the local economy and to integrate the new development into the social, economic and physical fabric of the city.

The urban design competition was won by CZWG Architects who worked closely with residents to develop the masterplan.
The aim of the masterplan was to create high quality housing for a mixed community, to promote the full range of services and jobs, and to ‘stitch’ the new development into its urban context. The masterplan proposed almost 1,000 new houses: 75% for sale, 25% for rent; a new business centre; a new local shopping centre based on the former Crown Street; a budget hotel; some small local office accommodation; student housing; light industrial units; and a new local park.

The original vision of the masterplan has been successfully maintained with most development being carried out in a built form that recreates the traditional Glasgow tenement. In most cases the squares are designed as a single entity with one side of a square development being constructed as social housing and the other three sides in private ownership. The central court is landscaped and is shared by all residents. A number of new parks and leisure facilities have been integrated in the area.

The masterplan proposed dividing the area into manageable development packages for phased release. Each package is procured through developer/architect competitions based on detailed urban design briefs and fixed land prices. In the early stages developers bid for a subsidy from the Scottish Development Agency in order to make the development viable. The first phase of the development began in 1992 and was carried out by two consortia: Miller Partnerships with the Holmes Partnership (architects) and Wimpey Homes with Cooper Cromar Associates (architects). Two further packages involved 61 houses for rent constructed by the New Gorbals Housing Association (NGHA). These developments together created two new street blocks (Ballater Gardens and Errol Gardens) and also included eight new ground floor shops fronting Crown Street. A competition in 1994 for phase 2 was won by Tay Homes with Hypostyle Architects and included 70 homes for sale and 44 socially rented houses provided by NGHA.

The Crown Street Regeneration Project partnership has been replaced by the NGHA as the main implementation agency. The NGHA has also taken on a wider role in managing and developing housing in four other adjoining areas: Hutchesontown, Gorbals East, Queen Elizabeth Square and Waddel Court. In total 1,157 private units have been completed or are proposed compared with 715 socially rented units and 31 in shared ownership. In addition, 1,015 homes are rented from the Glasgow Housing Association (GHA), 57 are owned through the RTB from GHA, 618 have been modernised by NGHA, 230 have been acquired through the RTB from NGHA and 40 are privately rented. This indicates that a total of 2,348 units are socially rented out of a total of 3,863 homes – approximately 61%. Different tenures are integrated in the New Gorbals developments on a block basis with normally one side of a four-sided square being socially rented.

In the early phases a subsidy was available to the developer of private housing in the form of GRO grant provided by the Scottish Development Agency. This was a form of gap funding to bridge the difference between development costs and sales value. Also, in the early phases there was a priority purchase scheme where discounts were offered to potential purchasers with local connections. Approximately a third of owners used this scheme. Portable discounts of £10,000 are also available to previous council tenants who want to purchase in the area. Research by the city council shows that property prices in the New Gorbals have risen faster than the Glasgow average. The NGHA is expecting to play a major part in the development of Laurieston to the west of New Gorbals.

The Ocean Estate, East London

Ocean Estate, built between 1949 and 1960, is located in central Stepney less than a mile away from the City and Canary Wharf. It houses 6,500 people in 2,000 homes, of which 1,400 are in local authority ownership. Around 400 homes have been purchased under the RTB and the balance is managed by RSLs. The layout and design of the estate together with inadequate maintenance, infestation and overcrowding have created many problems, some of which are: lower health standards, difficulties in learning at home coupled with low self-esteem, fear of crime and high levels of drug abuse. High rates of unemployment and poor performances at school are among other deprivation indicators. The Ocean Estate has been the subject of several attempts at regeneration, most recently under the New Deal for Communities (Ocean NDC), but it remains one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England.

The development partners are London Borough of Tower Hamlets, local...
residents, Ocean NDC, Sanctuary Housing Association (SHA), together with lead consultants PRP architects and Frost Associates. The Government Office for London and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) were consulted to determine the recommended option as the proposal went through phases of amendments to reach a financially viable one. The business plan, developed by PRP architects and Frost associates describes the masterplan as “a realisable financial model in which all stakeholders can have confidence and to ensure the support of residents, public and private sector funders”. The business plan will only become operational after council tenants vote in favour of the stock transfer to SHA. The ballot was held in the summer of 2006 and a majority of residents voted against the transfer.

A total of 659 rented homes in 47 blocks will be refurbished to Decent Homes standards and 440 affordable rented and 103 leaseholder homes in 15 blocks will be demolished. The new build will be for 440 new affordable rented homes, 103 new homes for affordable home ownership and 714 new homes for private sale to diversify tenure and to provide a cross-subsidy. Under the original masterplan produced in 2002, 748 flats were to be demolished and replaced with 1,150 new homes with 190 new homes for private sale. However, the business plan for stock transfer proposal indicated that an additional subsidy of £115 million was necessary that the ODPM could not support. The objectives for the project had to be revised again in order to achieve Decent Homes standards. The balance of affordable and private housing also had to be changed to include more private housing (714 units), requiring further amendments to the masterplan.

The Ocean Estate currently accommodates a high proportion of residents from minority ethnic groups and has high levels of unemployment and ill health. The estate contains a wide variety of housing sizes and types, from pre-war walk-up flats to high quality town houses with gardens. The site includes a canal that fronts onto the recently renovated Mile End Park. If the regeneration plan is implemented, much will depend on young single and two-person households being attracted to the area because of its proximity to the City of London and Canary Wharf. This will enable much-needed improvements to be carried out to the social rented housing through redevelopment and refurbishment. Leaseholders will be required to fund improvements to their own properties.

**Royal Quays, North Shields**

The 80-hectare Royal Quays development in North Shields is on the north bank of the River Tyne. With the decline of traditional industries in the area land on the banks of Tyne and Wear became derelict, alongside severe economic problems. Tyne and Wear was exhibiting many aspects of decay at the time with little business investment. Tyne and Wear Development Corporation (TWDC), a government-appointed body, was the key partner responsible for the development to regenerate 2,428 hectares of land alongside 30 miles of the Tyne river bank. EDAW acted as masterplanners for the scheme. Homes Housing Association developed the affordable and special needs housing and three private developers were involved in the private housing.

Royal Quays was developed as a mixed use scheme with new homes, jobs and leisure facilities to uplift the economy and the environment in an area spreading beyond the site. The project was completed in 1998 at a cost of £260 million. The development progressed alongside extensive community development activity and confidence building, providing mixed tenure housing, leisure facilities in Wet’n’Wild, a Morrisons factory outlet, a shopping centre, and industrial floorspace providing employment and training opportunities for local people.

The unique topography forming a giant amphitheatre around the Albert Edward Dock was one of the major site opportunities for the development. Two parks, Chirton Dene and Redburn Dene, have been created around this, and both are popular with residents and visitors. There are 1,200 new homes, 300 of which are affordable housing for rent and shared ownership developed and managed by Homes Housing Association. The special needs housing is developed to meet Lifetime Homes standards and is managed by Habinteg Housing Association. The balance of 900 private homes was developed by three developers, Leech, Cussins and Bellway Homes. The houses vary in design and size, ranging from bungalows, flats and terraced houses to detached homes.

The densities are around 30–40 units per hectare with the social housing at
the lower end of this range. The initial market for the private development was identified as being at the cheaper end of the market. Phase 1 of the scheme proved to be successful with rapid sales of homes, contrary to the national housing market trends at the time. Subsequent phases attracted developers willing to build houses for the middle and upper ends of the market.

Upton, Northampton

Upton is situated in the designated south west development area of Northampton, and forms the first phase of the local plan proposals for the area which will include 5,000 homes, 280,000m² of industrial space, a country park and associated services and facilities. Upton is on a 43-hectare greenfield site owned by English Partnerships. It has outline planning permission for up to 1,200 homes and 280,000m² of industrial space.

The key agencies involved are: English Partnerships as the landowner, Northampton Borough Council as the planning and housing authority, EDAW that leads a consortium to produce the masterplan, and The Prince’s Foundation. Upton is divided into eight sites, “varying in size and development capacity so that large and small developers can participate in the process”. When a developer tenders for the work on each site, they must identify an RSL partner and both then work with the Upton Working Group to bring the plan to fruition. This process is described in the following terms: “the land is owned by English Partnerships, working with Northampton Borough Council, The Prince’s Foundation and EDAW to bring forward the area as an example of how large-scale development projects can adopt sustainable principles of urban growth”.

The requirements for the development are stated in the design code as “achieving social diversity (critical mass, diverse dwelling types and tenure mix, indistinguishable affordable housing, mix of uses, area wide integration); environmental sustainability (BREEAM excellent, SUDS); long-term biodiversity (enhance local ecology); local identity (distinctive local character); liveability (accessible public transport, well-connected open space network, legible design, resident management) … [with a] range of dwelling types to suit people of different incomes and at different stages of their lives”.

A total of 400 homes have planning consent and around 200 have been completed. Of these, 22% will be ‘affordable’ (for rent and shared ownership). These are pepper-potted in the development with no more than three social housing houses together and no more than four social housing apartments next to one another.

Shenley Lodge Developments (now Paul Newman Homes) was selected in November 2003 as the preferred developer for the first 3.7-hectare development site (site A). The site has just over 200 homes, including a mix of higher density townhouses and apartments as well as semi-detached and detached homes and includes 22% of affordable homes. The private housing is in three courts, Ashby, Brixworth and Kirby Row (92 properties). Servite Houses has 14 properties for shared ownership distributed throughout the site.

The developers for site B are Fairclough Homes and Cornhill Estates; Leicester Housing Association is the RSL. Plans for site C have been approved. The development is being carried out by Cornhill Estates at a density of 35 dwellings per hectare.
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Mixed tenure, twenty years on

Nothing out of the ordinary

*Chris Allen, Margaret Camina, Rionach Casey, Sarah Coward and Martin Wood*

Mixed tenure features strongly in current policy yet there have been no studies of long-established estates which were originally built on these principles. This study fills that gap, looking at three estates designed with tenure mix in mind and which are now ‘mature’ and can show whether the benefits are real or illusory.

Case studies of mixed tenure also often focus on adults’ attitudes and miss those of children and young people – yet the benefits of mixed schooling (for example) are acknowledged by educationalists.

By looking at established estates from younger as well as older residents’ perspectives, this topical study fills two important gaps in our knowledge and makes an important contribution to the debate on how to achieve more sustainable communities.

Amongst the conclusions reached in this report are:

- There is a clear case to be made for mixed tenure. Areas with a limited social range of residents, housing design similarities and a comprehensively-planned environment help to produce civilised communities and a relative absence of tenure prejudice. Mixed tenure might therefore be a useful policy tool to prevent anti-social behaviour.

- Well-planned mixed tenure developments are better able to offer support to extended family networks and this is important both for divorced and separated people who form new families and for inter-generational support.

The study is an important addition to the evidence about mixed tenure and should be considered by all those planning ‘sustainable’ communities – for whom the long-term outcomes should be as important as any immediate results.
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A good place for children?

Attracting and retaining families in inner urban mixed income communities

*Emily Silverman, Ruth Lupton and Alex Fenton*

This important report presents a challenging mix of debate and findings about how mixed income new communities (MINCs) are working for families. This has a number of implications for government, local authorities and RSLs, housebuilders and the providers of local public services.

In particular, it poses policy and practice questions regarding:

- The mix of housing types needed to ensure that families can be attracted to – and then retained in – MINCs.

- The costs of achieving income mix.

- The importance of an attractive and safe physical environment and social infrastructure of schools, community facilities and services.

- How can social mixing be achieved?

The research team focused on four MINCs, where an income and social mix of market-rate families together with families living in affordable housing was part of the vision for a sustainable community.

- Two of them, Hulme in Manchester and New Gorbals in Glasgow, remodelled existing social housing areas.

- The other two, Greenwich Millennium Village and Britannia Village in London were wholly new, and built on brownfield sites.

There is currently great enthusiasm for planning for income mix in new housing developments in order to achieve more sustainable communities.

Key messages from the report include:

- MINCs lack affordable and/or well-designed family-sized homes.

- MINCs could be made to work better for family households and, in so doing, could have a valuable part to play in the revitalisation of Britain’s inner cities.

- Place-making rather than housebuilding needs to be part of the vision.
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More than tenure mix
Developer and purchaser attitudes to new housing estates
Rob Rowlands, Alan Murie and Andrew Tice
As social mix has become central to government policy, this report examines the delivery of mix through housing tenure on new housing estates. It particularly focuses on developer attitudes to producing mix and to the experiences of purchasers in living on these estates. The report poses a number of policy and practice questions regarding:

- What is tenure mix and what is its connection to social and income mix.
- The attitudes of private house builders to developing mixed tenure estates.
- The experiences of households in non-social housing on mixed tenure estates.
- The extent to which mixing tenure affects property prices.
- The ingredients which contribute to successful and sustainable new housing estates.

The research utilised interviews with national house builders, seven case study estates and a social survey of non-social residents in five estates. In all of the estates, a form of tenure mix had been employed to meet wider objectives including the provision of affordable housing, rebalancing of the local housing market and to create social mix.

Mixed tenure aims not only to achieve social mix, but also to promote interaction within communities. It depends on the planning system, which determines numbers and outputs, but the desired outcome is a qualitative improvement in community life.

Against this background, the key messages in the report include:

- Mixing tenure cannot deliver social or income mix on its own.
- Developers accept that mixed tenure is unavoidable and many want to work towards a better solution.
- Purchasers accept that mixed tenure is inevitable in all neighbourhoods.
- The role of the private rented sector is misunderstood by policy makers.
- Qualitative approaches must be adopted if estates are to be successful.
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