Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit

superu

Neighbourhood Social Mix and Outcomes for Social Housing Tenants: Rapid Review

NOVEMBER 2015

CRESA Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment

Acknowledgements

Superu commissioned the Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment (CRESA) to complete this research for the purposes of the Ministerial Social Sector Research Fund.

Authors: Kay Saville-Smith (CRESA), Nina Saville-Smith (CRESA), Bev James (Public Policy & Research).

Peer reviewer: Blair Badcock – Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) Editorial Board member.

Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment (CRESA)
PO Box 11260
Wellington 6142

Telephone: 04 384 5921
Email: info@cresa.co.nz
Website: cresa.co.nz

Superu
PO Box 2839
Wellington 6140

Telephone: 04 917 7040
Email: enquiries@superu.govt.nz
Website: superu.govt.nz

Follow us on Twitter: @nzfamilies

Like us on Facebook: Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit

ISBN 978-0-478-36905-2 (print)
ISBN 978-0-478-36906-9 (online)

Learn more at: **superu.govt.nz**

Preface

Superu Commissioned Report: Neighbourhood social mix and outcomes for social housing tenants.

Part of Superu's role is to "commission social science research in the social sector on behalf of the Government and others". In response to this, Superu set up the Ministerial Social Sector Research Fund in 2015. The purpose of the Fund is to provide Ministers with quality commissioned research to inform decision-making. Superu recently received a request from the Minister of Social Housing to review available evidence on a specific research question:

> *What does the evidence show about the proportion of social housing in an area and outcomes for social housing tenants, and what factors mitigate possible negative outcomes?*

Superu commissioned the Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment (CRESA) to conduct a 'Rapid Review' of the literature. The scope of a rapid review is not as extensive as a full systematic in-depth review, and CRESA provided a quality review under a demanding timeframe. We would like to acknowledge Blair Badcock – member of the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) Editorial Board for his input as external peer-reviewer.

The CRESA report found that the relationship between concentrated social housing and outcomes for social housing tenants does not necessarily have negative outcomes for the tenant. Rather, the authors found that:

> *Evidence around low concentrations of social housing and resulting benefits for social housing tenants is weak, benefits are mixed or remain undemonstrated (p.31)*

CRESA's analysis of the overseas literature highlights issues that need to be addressed irrespective of social mix proportions, that is, important factors that might mitigate negative outcomes for social housing tenants. These include:

- Design of both dwellings and the surrounding environment
- Allocation and tenant management
- Neighbourhood services, amenities and policing
- Retention of housing and community opportunities for social housing and low income households (p.34).

We believe that this rapid review adds to the knowledge base around evidence to inform services and programmes. We encourage you to read the full CRESA report.

Clare Ward

Clare Ward
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Executive summary

The Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (Superu) has been asked by Ministers to commission a rapid review of New Zealand and international literature for available evidence on:

- the outcomes for social housing tenants of higher or lower concentrations of social housing stock within particular neighbourhoods
- the factors that might mitigate possible negative outcomes for social housing tenants.

This rapid review has embraced three types of international material published from 2000 onwards:

- Expert commentary and analysis of social mix published in reputable international journals or key agencies
- Systematic reviews of evaluative research and analysis of secondary data sets directed at establishing the outcomes of 'naturally' occurring or intervention promoted social mix
- Primary evaluative research and analysis of secondary data sets directed at establishing the outcomes of intervention promoted social mix.

To some extent the focus on material published after 2000 reflects the demands of and limits arising from the rapid review methodology. It is not, however, entirely random. Although public policy discourse around social mix has a long history, de-concentration interventions designed to increase social mix have been a feature of the last decade of the 20th century. Consequently, it is only in the last decade or so that there has been an accumulation of evaluative findings around the efficacy of those programmes and interventions.

It should be noted that the terminology of social mix is not well defined in either the policy, planning or research literature. Consequently, the research generally is weakened by poor operationalisation and conflation of different types of mix. Typically, social mix is used to refer to one or more of the following:

- Income mix – typically low and middle income in an area.
- Ethnic mix.
- Tenure mix – owner occupation and rental mix.

Tenure mix is generally used as a proxy for income mix. But it should be noted that most attention is given to the mix of tenants receiving public housing assistance and owner occupiers. This reflects the policy drivers for social mix which are typically:

- Breaking down, where they exist, high concentrations – certainly in excess of 65% - of (often) high-rise, high density, under-maintained public housing.
- Regeneration or new build developments with covenants requiring inclusion of set proportions of social rental or ownership dwellings for low income people.

The outcomes sought through de-concentration relate to both area improvement and improved outcomes for individuals. The overseas policy and research literature identifies a multiplicity of desired benefits. These are set out below.

Area benefits sought	Benefits sought for disadvantaged tenants
Improved housing quality	Reduced fear of crime and victimisation
Improved service density and accessibility	Improved education
Destigmatisation of area	Higher incomes
Less crime	Improved health
Improved environment	Higher employment
Business attracted and increased	Destigmatisation and reduced discrimination
Increased social cohesion, civic participation	Improved inclusion and reduced isolation

In relation to the benefits sought from de-concentration and maintaining low concentrations of social housing, the material for this rapid review set out in Appendix A suggests:

- Anxieties around concentrations of social housing and the associated harmful impact generated by negative neighbourhood effects have been overstated and, consequently, so too have the benefits of reducing concentrations.
- Evidence around low concentrations of social housing and resulting benefits for social housing tenants is weak, benefits are mixed or remain undemonstrated. In some cases the benefits of social mix interventions may not be due to the intervention and reflect either or both:
  - allocation policies for people seeking to move from concentrated public housing to regenerated mixed housing estates
  - selection bias in the subsequent evaluations.

Both those tendencies tend to generate a cream-skimming or cherry-picking effect in which social housing tenants with the most likelihood of positive trajectories are selected.

- The main areas in which there is some suggestion of positive outcomes for social housing tenants appear to be:
  - less exposure to crime
  - a feeling of greater safety
  - quicker response to crime and disorder by police or neighbourhood/block managers – this often is contingent on the extent and competency of the managers
  - some increase in mental health and well-being – this is less pronounced in young men, and
  - improved local amenities and built environment – these can be done through redevelopment and are not contingent on social mix.

- There are areas in which the research appears to indicate possible problems with intervention based social mix:
  - social isolation
  - reduced access to targeted services and supports
  - area specific stigmatisation of tenants in general and social housing tenants in particular
  - over surveillance and discrimination against renters
  - loss of previous supports and resourcing
  - differential turnover, particularly among owner occupiers and private rental occupants and neighbourhood instability.

Overall, it can be concluded that social mix interventions can be used to reduce spatial expressions of inequality. That does not mean, however, that life chances for individuals and families are improved. Indeed, de-concentration can lead to the 'covering-up' of the needs of vulnerable people and make the provision of needed services more complex and encouraging take-up more difficult. There is a strong argument that poverty resolution is most effectively dealt with by policies directly orientated to employment, education and health interventions. In particular that improved life chances are most likely to be generated by:

- area improvement including housing, connectivity and service access
- positive investment in individuals and families, and
- specialised interventions for individuals and families with persistent and complex needs.

Overall, it can be concluded that **social mix interventions** can be used to reduce spatial expressions of **inequality**.

It should be noted that the overseas research platform is limited in focus because the social mix interventions pursued overseas are themselves limited in focus. In particular, there is little research around the precise proportion of a neighbourhood in social housing that generates either beneficial or problematic outcomes:

- The inclusionary zoning practice often associated with social mix policies targeted at a proportion at 10-20% of new dwellings in a masterplan neighbourhood development as affordable reflects attempts to incentivise and engage developers. Those proportions are not evidence-based in relation to tenant or other resident outcomes. They reflect, primarily, the business models of developers and, to a lesser extent beliefs among developers that higher proportions of tenants will reduce the attractiveness of dwellings to owner occupiers and higher income households.
- Much of the research concerned with de-concentrating social housing relates to very high concentrations – well in excess of two thirds – and highly problematic built environments. One of the few studies that attempts to establish the optimal mix of tenure suggests that beneficial effects will only be seen by reducing very heavy concentrations of rental tenancy and social housing rentals – in excess of 60% to 30%.[1]
- Little research has been undertaken on intensification of social housing areas compared to the de-concentrating of social housing areas.

1 Graham, Manley, Hiscock, Boyle, and Doherty, 2009.

In addition, there is no research into increasing the density of existing social housing areas such as the very low density public housing found amongst some of New Zealand's currently state-owned housing stock. However, there are some lessons that can be learnt from overseas attempts to increase social mix and deconcentrate public housing overseas. In particular:

- Homogeneity can be associated with benefits including community stability and the creation of targeted resourcing and supportive networks.
- The physical condition of houses and neighbourhoods are important and neighbourhood decline can exacerbate disengagement.
- Neighbourhood and tenant management are both important to ensure that vulnerable neighbourhoods do not become dominated by anti-social and criminal behaviours. The effective participation of social housing tenants and the management of social housing stock need to be accompanied by good neighbourhood policing and management. Private rental practices can undermine any benefits of re-development and improved social tenancy management for social housing tenants.
- Targeting and allocation regimes in social housing can exacerbate problems associated with not so much low income concentration but the concentration of socially dysfunctional individuals and families.
- The United Kingdom experience suggests that mixed tenure is most likely to be positive where it can maintain kinship and other social networks. That is, where it maintains longstanding communities which would otherwise be 'broken-up' through some households having to move out of the area because they are no longer eligible for public housing. This has particular relevance to the context of changing allocation and tenure security policies in New Zealand.
- Mixed use (rather than social mix in and of itself) and connectivity are important elements of re-vitalising low income neighbourhoods and improving life chances.
- Regeneration strategies need to include retention policies of the housing stock for social housing residents and provide for housing opportunities for other low income households to avoid the loss of housing accessible to low income households.

Contents

Tables

01

Introduction

The Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (Superu) has been asked by Ministers for a rapid but up-to-date review of:

- the outcomes for social housing tenants of higher or lower concentrations of social housing stock within particular neighbourhoods
- the factors that might mitigate possible negative outcomes for social housing tenants.

This paper provides a preliminary comment on the current direction of evidence relating to social mix and public housing concentrations. The rapid review bibliography to date is set out in Appendix A. The material falls broadly into three, sometimes overlapping, categories:

i. Theoretical, discourse or discursive reviews of the development of social mix policies, definitions around social mix, key outcomes sought by social policies, and how those policies have been implemented in different jurisdictions and at different scales

ii. Evaluations of outcomes associated with specific social mix initiatives. These include evaluations using primarily qualitative data and evaluations using primarily quantitative data. A few use mixed methods.

iii. Reviews of a variety of evaluative material including systematic reviews on the outcomes associated with social mix.

The latter are particularly useful within the context of a rapid review process because they provide access to a wide range of detailed material. However, as Bond *et al*.,(2011), demonstrate that systematic reviews themselves vary in quality. There appears to be, in some at least, inconsistencies between the conclusions presented regarding the merits or demerits of social mix (at least as it relates to tenure mix) and analysis of the various research under review.

This rapid review is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides a brief statement of the background to social mix policies in the context of housing
- Section 3 provides a review of recent systematic reviews around the outcomes of social housing social mix interventions and developments
- Section 4 provides an analysis of the evidence around the key benefits sought from social mix interventions
- Section 5 draws out some key points arising from the evidence on social mix
- Section 6 makes a comment on the transferability of evidence from overseas to New Zealand.

The content of this rapid review should be treated with caution. It is preliminary and based on a close reading of the two systematic reviews described in section 3 but only an initial reading of the remaining material contained in Appendix A. Overall, however, it is probably reasonable to state that the evidential base is weak. Moreover, the findings, even across the most robust studies, can be mixed across different jurisdictions and/or sites.

02

Expectations of and pathways to social mix

The merits or otherwise of social mix within neighbourhoods has been debated for many decades. Some urbanists have argued that mixed neighbourhoods had a sense of community across income, ethnic and class differences. Others have argued that settlements are better seen as mosaics in which people with similar experiences and in similar circumstances can live in communities in which they feel comfortable with shared identities. The development of housing classes suggest that some degree of differentiation between communities as well as homogeneity within local areas is a result of market forces and the exercise of choice, albeit that some lower income groups have often severely limited choices.

From about the 1980s the debate about social mix becomes increasingly focused on spatial disadvantage and inequality, inaction and choice limitations, and the impact of concentrations of poverty on life chances. Those in turn were connected to two issues:

- the provision of public housing, especially in the form of public housing estates
- neighbourhood effects.

The latter suggested that the impacts of poverty were exacerbated by already impoverished people living *en masse*. The neighbourhood itself became an independent variable in poor life chances by providing poor role modelling, socialisation into cultures of poverty, underinvestment in local services and infrastructure, poor informal regulation and social control, and limited ties with people who could pave the way into better education and employment. The former, especially in the United States and to a lesser extent the United Kingdom was associated with issues with public housing estates: design (often high density tower blocks), poor maintenance and lack of connectivity, the lack of choice because of the priority given to bricks and mortar supply rather than demand-side benefits, and increasingly targeted allocation which led to estates becoming peopled by not only poor people marginal to the housing market but, within that group, individuals with multiple personal and familial problems.

Those two problems came together in the United States, to a lesser extent Australia, and in Canada and the United Kingdom in the form of social mix policies around housing. In the New Zealand context it was reflected in: the implementation of the accommodation supplement and the removal of income-related rent subsidies in the state housing stock; and the development of implicit and sometimes explicit decisions in Housing New Zealand to limit its presence in some areas.

Since then problems of affordable housing development, rather than public housing developments, have seen social mix reflected in inclusionary zoning regulations in some overseas jurisdictions. However, the most targeted implementation path has been by way of attempts to de-concentrate poverty and improve life chances through redeveloping public housing estates and introducing transferrable housing benefits. This rapid review focuses on the former of those – attempts to improve life chances of social housing tenants and de-concentrate poverty through social mix.

The essential logic of social mix is that tenure mix (the mixing of social housing tenants and owner occupiers) will generate diversified communities. Those communities once mixed will:

i. Provide social housing tenants with role models among higher income owner occupiers that encourage them to pursue income rich pathways through educational achievement and employment.

ii. Give social housing tenants what some call 'bridging capital'. That is, through interactions with higher income neighbours, social housing tenants will be sponsored into employment and access other resources.

iii. Ensure better informal community control because high income neighbours will take the lead in, manage and put pressure on issues around order, safety and protection.

iv. Provide better services and amenities within the community because higher income residents will be able to leverage those both through community promotion and through the exercise of their higher realised demand and spending power.

Notably social mix in existing public housing developments have largely ignored private renters. This reflects, in part, the low social-economic profile of many private renters. The increase of private rental stock in social mix areas, particularly where this has been associated with reductions of both social housing tenants and less than desired increase in owner occupation is repeatedly noted as problematic. Private rental tenants are seen as less well managed than social housing tenants and with both tenants and private landlords have less commitment to the neighbourhood.

03

What do the most recent systematic reviews tell us?

Mining existing data and undertaking meta-analyses has been an emergent theme over the last two decades. It is driven by three considerations. Those are a desire to:

- Use data emerging from previous investments in research both to realise that investment and to respond in a more timely manner to end-users, particularly in policy
- 'Join-up' and develop a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics that underpin many of the research findings arising across disparate and narrowly bounded studies. The latter are particularly common in intervention studies
- Assess more rigorously the robustness and transferability of research.

One of the 'building blocks' of meta-analyses is the systematic review. Systematic reviews are an attempt to synthesise evidence in a particular field with a particular, although not universal, focus on science-based or structured studies. The systematic review method is designed to resolve the problem of covert bias in traditional narrative reviews. Best practice in systematic reviews requires:

- Transparency around the method of and criteria around study selection
- Explicit attention to study method and limitations
- Transparent comparison between studies based on their problem definition, hypotheses, methods, samples and analytic parameters
- Assessment of the comparability of evidence across studies and the weight with which the findings of cross-study analysis can be treated.

In some areas, such as random control trials, the meta-analysis based on cross-study comparisons may be quantified.

3.1_ Systematic reviews and social mix

There are a set of systematic reviews included in the literature identified in the rapid review bibliography in Appendix A. Many of the articles and reports also include narrative reviews in their introductory statements. Those are excluded from this rapid review. It is notable that the more discursive reviews which include practitioner perspectives tend to be more positive about social mix as a pathway for improving the outcomes of vulnerable or disadvantaged people. This is also evident in some of the research and indicates that social mix is 'taken-for-granted' in planning and housing policy. This, of course, does not mean that the paradigm is evidence based.

The reviews that are of interest in this section are those presenting themselves as systematic reviews. The most recent of those are: Sautkina, Bond and Kearns published in 2012 focusing on United Kingdom studies of tenure mix between 1995 and 2009.[2] Its findings are summarised in section 3.2; and, Morris, Jamieson and Patulney which includes an international set of studies and is summarised in section 3.3.[3]

2 Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns, 2012.

3 Morris, Jamieson, and Patulney, 2012.

Bond and colleagues have also undertaken a 'review of reviews' which is cautionary for a number of reasons.[4] In reviewing six systematic reviews, they found that:

- Few meet best practice in regard to transparency about their own selection criteria and assessment method
- Many failed to deal with the limitations of studies or confounding factors that might mitigate or enhance the impacts of tenure mix
- Reviewer assessment of the overall impact of tenure mix was poorly aligned with the analysis of the studies themselves:
  - Only two of the six reviews appear to have a consistent position across their own summaries, conclusions and the body of the evidence they discuss
  - Four are more positive in their conclusions than the evidence presented in the substantive reviews themselves.

They also note – and this is consistent with our reading of the material to date – the difficulties arising out of:

- The conflation of terminology and therefore ambiguities around focus. Our reading suggests that problems of terminology and focus are persistent around:
  - social mix
  - tenure mix
  - mixed use
  - density.
- Failure to deal with confounding factors, by-products or the equivalent of 'Hawthorne Effects'. In particular, not enough attention is given to impacts that may arise from collateral activities rather than mix in and of itself.

4 Bond, Sautkina, and Kearns, 2011.

3.2_ Findings of a systematic review of UK studies 1995-2009[5]

Sautkina, Bond and Kearns' review of studies around mixed tenure, is one of the most recent of the systematic reviews relevant to social mix and social housing. It considers twenty-seven published studies undertaken between 1999 and 2005. This appears to exhaust the number of formally structured, evaluative studies using primary and secondary data. Overall, the authors conclude that the evidence base as a whole is weak, in part, they suggest, owing to poor problem specification, politicisation and low and uncertain funding.

The twenty-seven studies have the following characteristics:

- The majority use cross-sectional data
- Most data is derived from case studies covering close to one hundred sites with a few studies using national data sets
- Studies using qualitative data are included as well as quantitative studies
- Most studies are of medium or low quality and robustness.

The review categorises findings by five effects categories: positive, negative, mixed evidence, evidence of no effect, and absence of evidence. Those effect categories are applied separately to primary and secondary studies and in relation to six outcome domains. The outcome domains are as follows:

i. Social
ii. Human capital
iii. Residential (and property)
iv. Environmental
v. Safety
vi. Economic.

The evidence of mixed tenure effects on each of those domains as analysed by Sautkina *et al*., are set out in Table 3.1. The reviewers conclude that the evidence on the impacts of tenure mix policies and strategies suggests:

- The evidence base is weak. Even where robust studies exist they are minimal in number and have yet to be replicated and raise issues of generalisability.
- Positive effects are most likely to be found in low quality evidence, otherwise there is mixed evidence or evidence of no effect.

5 Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns, 2012.

TABLE 3.1

Summary of findings Sautkina *et al.*, 2012

Domain	More robust evidence on mixed tenure effects	Less robust evidence on mixed tenure effects
Social	• Local kinship network maintenance • Sharing schools, public and shared spaces assist cross-tenure interaction • Similar housing design and spatial integration support cross-tenure interaction • Cross-tenure interaction improvements are mixed • No effect on social capital or peer behavioural influences	• No effect on sense of community or social cohesion • Community participation impacts are mixed with some studies finding reduced and other studies finding increased participation
Human capital	• No effect on health outcomes	• Mixed education achievement effects
Residential and property	• Increased property values • Mixed effects on housing satisfaction • Mixed effects on residential satisfaction and turnover	• Positive social housing demand • Mixed effects on the impact on housing quality
Environmental	• Mixed outcomes in relation to neighbourhood satisfaction	• Mixed evidence on neighbourhood reputation, physical environment and local service quality and amenities
Safety	• Mixed outcomes in perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour	• Mixed evidence on crime rates and anti-social behaviour
Economic	• Mixed outcomes related to employment • Mixed outcomes on job opportunities in primary studies, secondary studies report negative effect on resident perceptions of opportunities	• Mixed outcomes on local spending and local economy

3.3_ Findings of a systematic review of international studies 2000-2011[6]

Morris, Jamieson and Patulney's review of studies around social mix considers eleven articles published since 2000 and includes studies from Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom and Europe. They too note the variability in, but overall weakness of, the robustness of research method. This is attributed to difficulties in research design and calls for quasi-experimental studies of social mix. How this could ethically or practically be achieved is less clear.[6]

The eleven reviewed studies are categorised as interventionist[7] or organic[8] studies and their methods are described. Six of the eleven studies are described as interventionist, four are described as organic and one study is not categorised but appears to be interventionist in that it relates to a re-development of a previously social housing dominated neighbourhood with mix sought through the addition of owner occupied dwellings.

The reviewed studies range over both quantitative and qualitative methods and in some cases use mixed methods. The reviewers make an explicit statement regarding the outcomes against which social mix is being measured. Those and the findings are presented in Table 3.2.

6 Morris, Jamieson, and Patuley, 2012.
7 Interventionist studies refer to those dealing with a purposeful attempt to engender social mix.
8 Organic studies are where social mix is measured as a characteristic of a community and the implications of that mix measured on outcomes. There is no specific, purpose intervention to change the social mix of the measured communities prior to analysis.

TABLE 3.2

Summary of findings Morris *et al.*, 2012

Outcome measured	Findings	Study locality and type	Key quality of evidence issues
Diversified social and employment ties	• No effect	• US • Interventionist • Quantitative	• One study • Limited control
Reduced stigma of social housing	• Residual stigma toward social housing tenants	• Australia • Interventionist • Qualitative • 3 estates	• One study • Case frame skewed
	• Higher social mix associated with less neighbourhood stigma • Intra-tenure stigma present	• 16 European cities • Organic • 29 housing estates	• Pathway to social mix is unclear • Unclear sample bias
	• Low intra-neighbourhood stigma	• UK • Interventionist • 3 estates • Similar house design across all tenures • Mixed method • 1981-2001	• Limited transferability • No differentiation between social and private tenants • Indirect outcome measurement
	• Social housing tenant satisfaction low in redevelopment context	• Australia • Interventionist • 1 estate • Mixed method	• One case study only • Focus on redevelopment process rather longer term outcomes
	• Increased sense of community spirit • Stigma reduction	• Australia • Interventionist • Four states • Mixed method	• Case control method • Weak in engagement with residents relative to strong funder, developer and housing organisation staff • Poor link with outcome measurement
Social interaction different	• Minimal effect	• Australia • Interventionist • Qualitative • 3 estates	• One study • Case frame skewed
	• Stronger networks associated with higher social mix	• 16 European cities • Organic • 29 housing estates	• Pathway to social mix is unclear • Unclear sample bias

Outcome measured	Findings	Study locality and type	Key quality of evidence issues
Social interaction different (continued)	• Limited interaction except where children share schooling • Casual interaction facilitated by shared public space	• UK • Interventionist • 3 estates • Similar house design across all tenures • Mixed method • 1981-2001	• Limited transferability • No differentiation between social and private tenants • Indirect outcome measurement
	• Low interaction with social mix	• Australia • Interventionist • Four states • Mixed method	• Case control method • Weak in engagement with residents relative to strong funder, developer and housing organisation staff • Poor link with outcome measurement
	• Limited interaction between old and new residents	• Netherlands • Interventionist • Quantitative	• Descriptive statistics only • No before and after • No differentiation between social and private tenants
	• Social housing tenants are isolated from other residents	• Scotland • 3 estates • Interventionist • Qualitative	• Case frame skewed • Limited range of outcomes explored
Employment and unemployment	• No impact	• UK • Organic • Quantitative	• No differentiation between social and private tenants • Income mix not established
	• Housing mix is not a significant indicator of employment outcomes	• Sweden • Organic • Quantitative	• Large sample but use of indirect measures around housing mix • Spatial disadvantage and broader social homogeneity study of advantage and disadvantage
Limiting long-term illness	• Mixed outcomes probably related to broader socio-economic conditions	• UK • Organic • Quantitative	• No differentiation between social and private tenants • Income mix not established

Outcome measured	Findings	Study locality and type	Key quality of evidence issues
Mortality and premature death rate	• Mixed outcomes probably related to broader socio-economic conditions	• UK • Organic • Quantitative	• No differentiation between social and private tenants • Income mix not established
Neighbourhood satisfaction	• High social rental concentration associated with neighbourhood problems • Concludes social renters advantaged by living in high ownership areas	• UK • Organic • Quantitative	• Limited cross-sectional data • No income measure • Misalignment between neighbourhood measures and ward based population analysis • Pathway to social mix is unclear
	• Low bond with neighbourhood among new residents • Old residents are more satisfied	• Netherlands • Interventionist • Quantitative	• Descriptive statistics only • No before and after • No differentiation between social and private tenants
House prices and property	• Increased house price	• UK • Interventionist • 3 estates • Similar house design across all tenures • Mixed method • 1981-2001	• Limited transferability • No differentiation between social and private tenants • Indirect outcome measurement
	• Increased house value	• Australia • Interventionist • Four states • Mixed method	• Case control method • Weak in engagement with residents relative to strong funder, developer and housing organisation staff • Poor link with outcome measurement
Local economic impact	• New residents access goods and services outside the regeneration sites	• Netherlands • Interventionist • Quantitative	• Descriptive statistics only • No before and after • No differentiation between social and private tenants
	• Owners direct activities outside the area • Social tenants remain closely involved in local services and activities	• Scotland • 3 estates • Interventionist • Qualitative	• Case frame skewed • Limited range of outcomes explored

04

Evidence on benefits of social mix

Evidence regarding benefits

This section provides a brief summary of findings in relation to the benefits that are sought through social mix interventions. Those benefits are as follows:

TABLE 4.1

Area and individual benefits sought through social mix

Area benefits sought	Benefits sought for disadvantaged tenants
Improved housing quality	Reduced fear of crime and victimisation
Improved service density and accessibility	Improved education
Destigmatisation of area	Higher incomes
Less crime	Improved health
Improved environment	Higher employment
Business attracted and increased	Destigmatisation and reduced discrimination
Increased social cohesion, civic participation	Improved inclusion and reduced isolation

4.1_Improved housing and built environment

Morris, Jamieson and Patulney's review found that regeneration projects associated with social mix interventions did improve the housing stock itself. That tendency, however, came from the investment process that authorities chose to follow in their attempt to create social mix. It did not derive from the social mix itself. [9]

There was evidence that difficulties arose in establishing and maintaining social mix in new housing areas in France.[10] In the Chicago Gautreaux projects, the Henry Homer redevelopment started to show serious maintenance problems within three years.[11] Similar problems were identified in the Regent Park community in Toronto.[12] This contrasts with Joseph's findings around a new development (Jazz on the Boulevard) in Chicago where the housing stock was seen by all residents as high quality, particularly those who had come from other public housing estates in Chicago.[13]

Social mix policies may reduce the availability of stock to low income tenants and those previously in social housing. There is an average rate of return of previous tenants to redeveloped estates into social mix areas in Chicago of 5-14%.[14] In the Henry Homer redevelopment less than 20% of those guaranteed to be provided places in the development after regeneration actually returned. More than 20% were refused relocation back to the estate because they were subsequently deemed ineligible and voucher recipients found that landlords in the redeveloped estate were exclusionary.[15]

9 Morris, Jamieson, Patulney, 2012.
10 Lelévrier, 2013.
11 Popkin, Buron, Levy, and Cunningham, 2000.
12 Rowe and Dunn, 2015.
13 Joseph, 2008.
14 Joseph and Chaskin, 2012.
15 Popkin, Buron , Levy, and Cunningham, 2000.

Difficulties in getting access to redeveloped housing estates within a social mix framework was also a feature of the experience of the previous residents at St Thomas in New Orleans. The evaluators concluded that both developers and some housing authorities had misused the HOPE VI model and turned "a social welfare programme into a type of taxpayer funded gentrification."[16] Similar concerns are expressed by Blanc in relation to social mix policies in France in relation to the redevelopment of existing social housing policies.[17] Arthurson as well as Arbaci and Rae also note that problems with retention of low income and social housing tenants subsequent to social housing regeneration projects tend to exacerbate rather than resolve housing instability, affordability and access.[18] This follows a similar pattern of what might be referred to as organic gentrification in Canadian cities which is associated not with mix but with social polarisation.[19]

The improvement in housing stock noted in regeneration is also noted in the built environment in general.[20] However, there is research suggesting that stigmatisation and discrimination can lead to social housing tenants feeling unable to access improved amenities. In some cases, site managers put in place rules that limit social housing tenant use of public space.[21] There is some indication that bringing about improvements to the built environment through social mix (as opposed to direct investment) requires high concentrations of owner occupiers – around 80 percent – compared to private housing tenants and social housing combined.[22] Those rates are high, difficult to achieve and in a context of falling owner occupation unlikely to be sustained.

4.2_Improved service density and accessibility

The idea that services will be amplified in socially mixed areas because of the demands of higher income and owner-occupier residents is not confirmed by the research. Either there appears to be no change or a tendency for change to be negative. Indeed, the provision of services in an area is, according to one study, a driver rather than an outcome of social mix and better employment outcomes.[23]

Many of the evaluations that follow have been undertaken in the context of the HOPE VI programme in the United States. That programme was initiated in 1993 and as of 2010 involved $6.1 billion investment in a wide variety of programmes ranging from revitalisation, demolition, main street improvements and planning responses. The extreme diversity of these interventions makes them difficult to evaluate and many have not been subject to formal evaluation. At their heart, however, is the concept of social mix. Due the diversity of these interventions, and that relatively few evaluations of specific interventions have taken place, to the diversity of these interventions and the interventions tend to be named. Notably it is not always clear when an intervention is part of the HOPE VI programme.

16 Lisbon, 2007.
17 Blanc, 2010.
18 Arthurson, 2002; Arbaci and Rae, 2013.
19 Walks and Maaranen, 2008.
20 Leventhal and Brooke-Gunn, 2003; Stal and Zuberi, 2009; Bond, Sautkina and Kearns, 2011; Joseph and Chaskin, 2012; Morris, Jamieson and Patulny, 2012; Rowe and Dunn, 2015.
21 Levein, Arthurson, Ziersch, 2014.
22 Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns, 2012.
23 Galster, Santiago, and Lucero, 2015.

An evaluation of the Belmont Heights Estate which was part HOPE VI found that only a minority of social housing residents were accessing the health or social services they required and a minority also reported that the shops were inadequate.[24] By contrast the Regent Park development was associated with new amenities such as banks and stores. For some of the social housing tenants, problems with their homes, however, outweighed the benefits associated with those amenities.[25]

Graves' ethnographic research over fourteen months in a Boston mixed housing development found that higher income residents were largely uninterested in improving the services located in or around the development. They tended to use services elsewhere. Higher income residents did require, however, the development managers to intervene in casual interactions, particularly in the public space.[26] Similar results are indicated by Bond *et al*., in their review of studies evaluating social mix interventions.[27]

The Bijlmermeer Revival Project in the Netherlands specifically involved multi-group participation in regeneration plans and combined mixed use facilities and service development with social mix intervention.[28]

Unless regeneration or social mix is carefully managed service access may not increase. Arbaci and Rae's analysis of twenty neighbourhoods and four social mix case studies in Greater London showed that access to resources may be reduced, it may reduce public investment and improvements to local services, and harden segregation effects around education.[29] One study also found that relocations from public housing to more mixed areas through the use of vouchers were associated with reductions in access to primary health care.[30]

In addition, there is some evidence that informal supports and service networks can be lost through re-locations associated with regeneration or voucher systems directed to allowing low income people into less impoverished areas. For instance, a longitudinal, qualitative investigation into the social networks of low income women who moved into mixed areas from concentrated public housing estates found that around half found their social networks decreased. For those who experienced a significant geographical move from their original residences, this, in some cases, led to child care problems. A few gave up paid employment because child care support through a local network was no longer available.[31]

Notably, Sautkina and Kearns suggest that in the United Kingdom mixed tenure is most likely to be positive where it can maintain kinship and other social networks. That is, where it maintains longstanding communities which would otherwise be 'broken-up' through some households having to move out of the area because they are no longer eligible for public housing.[32]

24 Vogel, Smith and Williamson, 2007.
25 Rowe and Dunn, 2015.
26 Graves, 2011.
27 Bond, Sautkina, and Kearns, 2011.
28 Stal and Zuberi, 2009.
29 Arbaci and Rae, 2013.
30 Cooper, Wodarski, Cummings, Hunter-Jones, Karnes, Ross, Druss, and Bonney, 2012.
31 Curley, 2009.
32 Sautkina, Bond and Kearns, 2012.

4.3_Destigmatisation

Area destigmatisation does lead to improved property values.[33] Whether that benefits social housing tenants or simply puts pressure on them to exit under gentrification is another issue. The impact of social mix on destigmatisation of an area (as opposed to stigma and discrimination experienced by an individual) is less clear.

There is evidence that redevelopments and relocation of social housing into other areas can create a NIMBY effect which can reinforce rather than resolve stigmatisation for individuals.[34] Individual stigmatisation is discussed below, but the association with a stigmatised previous residence can impact on reception in new socially mixed communities.[35] In general, mixed use can have a positive effect on the area's perception by outsiders.[36] This appears to be compromised by subsequent exit of higher income groups or owner occupiers if they promulgate a view that social mix does not work.[37]

Systematic reviews tend to give a mixed view of stigmatisation outcomes which suggests that it is contingent on other factors including the redevelopment or development history, allocation and management practices and social composition issues.[38] Social housing tenants displaced out of public housing estates can feel exposed to both stigma and vulnerability when placed in socially mixed communities,[39] or because of stigmatisation find themselves in housing in alternative but also stigmatised estates.[40] There is also widespread evidence that tenants and social housing tenants in particular feel both more stigmatised within mixed developments (both new and redeveloped)[41] and are subject to exclusion in relation to complex or estate matters and regulation.[42] Notably in some areas, private renters are seen as the most problematic residents.[43]

Stigmatisation and positive interaction between people of different tenure can change over time. But the evidence is mixed on trajectory. In some cases interaction improves,[44] in others it decreases.[45]

4.4_Less crime, perceptions of safety and victimisation

There are mixed outcomes in the research in relation to the prevalence as well as the perception of safety and exposure to crime. Some higher income residents living in areas which had an influx of people from public housing estates perceived higher risks of crime,[46] although other analysis suggests that there is a net benefit of crime reduction through deconcentration policies.[47]

---

33 Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns, 2012.
34 Stal and Zuberi, 2009; Onatu, 2010; Darcy, 2012.
35 Keen and Padilla, 2010.
36 Arthurson, 2013.
37 Lelevrier, 2013.
38 Bond, Sautkina and Kearns, 2011.
39 Thompson, Bucerius, Luguya, 2013.
40 Popkin, Buron , Levy, and Cunningham, 2000.
41 Lisbon, 2007; Gwyther, 2009; Manzi, 2009; Bretherton and Pleace, 2011; Arthurson, 2013;
42 Lisbon, 2007; Joseph, 2008; Duke, 2009; Darcy, 2012; Thompson, Bucerius, Luguya, 2013; Chaskin and Joseph, 2013; August, 2014, Markovich, 2015.
43 Arthurson, 2013.
44 Patillo, 2007.
45 Joseph and Chaskin, 2010.
46 Chaskin and Joseph, 2011; Chaskin, Sichling and Joseph, 2013.
47 Aliprantis and Hartley, 2015.

Bond *et al*., suggest that overall the research outcomes in this area are mixed.[48] Residents in Toronto's Regent Park who had been familiar with the area prior to redevelopment reported that the neighbourhood was more stable with the dispersal of some individuals who had engaged in criminal behaviour and drug use.[49] Improved management of building complexes and rule enforcement contributed to a feeling of safety.

However, there is evidence that some social housing tenants who are displaced both fear victimisation and are in fact victimised. For instance, social tenants displaced out of Regent Park in Toronto felt vulnerable to victimisation and crime in new areas because they felt they were stigmatised, that they would not be protected by management or authorities and had lost their protective social network.[50] Similar experiences were reported for those displaced from St Thomas in New Orleans.[51]

4.5_Social cohesion, interaction, social capital, civic participation and isolation

Social mix can be associated with stigmatisation which, *a priori*, undermines civic participation, and interaction.[52] This is particularly problematic given that some of the key arguments for de-concentration policies and social mix interventions have been to provide social housing tenants with interactions and role models which will:

- Encourage them to pursue income rich pathways through educational achievement and employment
- Provide 'bridging capital' into employment and access other resources through establishing casual relations between people in employment and social housing tenants seeking employment
- Take a more active part in managing order, safety and protection.

The evidence around the promotion of social cohesion, interaction, social capital building and participation through social mix is extremely variable. Where there are well-designed public spaces and where interactions can emerge organically there may be some increase in casual interaction between residents irrespective of tenure.[53]

This is often not the case and in some developments social housing tenants are excluded from public space available to owner occupiers. Overall, there is some evidence for no change in interaction through social mix strategies or mildly negative outcomes.[54]

48 Bond, Sautkina, and Kearns, 2011; Sautkina, Bond and Kearns, 2012.
49 Joseph, 2008; Rowe and Dunn, 2015.
50 Thompson, Bucerius, Luguya, 2013.
51 Lisbon, 2007.
52 Cahskin, Sichling and Joseph, 2013; Mugnano and Palvarini, 2013.
53 Graves, 2011; Morris, Jamieson and Patulny, 2012.
54 Arthurson, 2002; Vogel, Smith and Williamson, 2007; Joseph, 2008; Tach, 2009; Stal and Zuberi, 2009; Sautkina, Bond and Kearns, 2012; Rowe and Dunn, 2015.

The little evidence available regarding civic participation suggests that owner occupiers:

- Either dominate co-ordinated efforts to improve neighbourhood or complex operations, sometimes to the detriment of social housing tenants[55]
- Or largely dissociate themselves with civic engagements within the complex and rely on managerial interventions where management exists[56]

In addition, displacement and redevelopment in some cases reduced the density of known neighbours and interactions.[57] This was exacerbated in differences in style and taste evident between owner occupiers and tenants and among tenants (private and social).[58]

Associated with evidence of limited interaction, social cohesion and social capital building, there is evidence that suggests that the processes as well as the outcomes of social mix interventions generated negative outcomes for social housing tenants in relation to isolation.[59] Isolation effects appear to vary from population group to population group. Isolation is exacerbated where social housing tenants or particular populations of them are:

- Confined to single buildings in an estate or complex
- Newcomers
- Women, young people, and older people.[60]

4.6_Education

There is little evidence on the rates of educational participation or achievement associated with social mix interventions. Chaskin *et al.*, show that the Chicago regenerations into social mix developments typically see children from owner occupier families going to schools which are different from social housing tenant families.[61] Under those circumstances, and given the limited interaction between people from mixed tenure groups, it might be expected that there will be little change in educational participation or achievement.

A longitudinal study of 700 deprived estates where social mix was encouraged (500 estates) compared to 200 estates where it was not, found that social mix was difficult to achieve and so were stable communities. There was no association between social mix and education.[62] By way of contrast, a review of the outcomes associated with HOPE VI and the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration (MTO) found higher levels of educational achievement as well as participation among public housing tenants who subsequently moved into more mixed areas with voucher assistance.

55 Duke, 2009; Lisbon, 2007; Mugnano and Palvarini, 2013; Chaskin and Joseph, 2013; Chaskin, Sichling and Joseph, 2013; August, 2014.
56 Lisbon, 2007; Graves, 2011; Chaskin and Joseph, 2011.
57 Chaskin and Joseph, 2011; Goetz, 2012.
58 Graves, 2010; Markovich, 2015.
59 Arthurson, 2002; Gwyther, 2009; Slater, 2012; Morris, Jamieson and Patulney, 2012.
60 Arthurson, 2002; Curley, 2009; Tach, 2009; Mugnano and Palvarini, 2013.
61 Chaskin, Suchling and Joseph, 2013.
62 Christienson, 2015.

However, the reviewers conclude that education gains are difficult to disentangle. They may reflect social mix or reflect differences in school quality.[63] Tach finds no evidence that higher income newcomers facilitated contact with employment or education.[64] Notably some research has also found that there is a tendency for some relocated families to move back to their areas of origin and a tendency for early removal from school-voucher schemes.[65] In addition, analysis tracking children from public housing estates suggests that 30% of variation in education, employment and income outcomes for those children arises from family characteristics rather than from the characteristics of the housing estates in which they lived.[66]

4.7_Health

Improved health has been identified as a benefit associated with relocation. Nevertheless, impacts can be mixed.[67] A longitudinal study of 23 households in Glasgow who moved from public housing due for demolition found little or no improvement in self-assessed health. There were mixed views from relocated residents about whether the relocation had been beneficial.[68] By contrast, 550 New York families interviewed two years after moving from high poverty concentration areas (in excess of 40%) to lower poverty areas (less than 10%) reported reduced symptoms of distress and anxiety among relocated adults compared to non-relocated adults. The differences between relocated children and non-relocated children were limited. However, relocated boys showed a 25% reduction in anxiety and depressive symptoms. That pattern was not evident among girls.[69] Other evaluations have found the impact on boys' and girls' mental health respectively to be reversed.[70] Similarly, a small study of African Americans relocated from Chicago to Eastern Iowa found that stigmatisation in the new location was associated with poor mental health.[71]

Issues of causality are difficult to address, but Graham *et al*., found more positive health in areas in which less than 30% of residents were social housing tenants.[72] There is also some evidence that drug and alcohol abuse shows some reduction with relocation to improved housing and built environments for African Americans.[73] Overall, improvements in health tend to be mixed and contingent on a variety of conditions both personal and local which are untouched by the intervention itself. It is unclear whether they derive from social mix or improvements in the built environment. In addition, the data must be treated with care because of the way in which research selection processes tended to choose people of a similar social profile or experience.[74]

63 Levy, McDade and Bertumen, 2013.
64 Tach, 2009.
65 DeLuce and Dayton, 2013.
66 Oreopoulos, 2007.
67 Ludwig, Kling, Katz, Sanbonmatsu, Liebman, Duncan, and Kessler, 2008; Jackson, Langille, Lyons, Hughes, Martin, and Winstanley, 2009; DeLuca and Dayton, 2009; Ludwig, Duncan, Gennetian, Katz, Kessler, Kling, and Sanbonmatsu, 2012; Levy, McDade and Bertumen, 2013.
68 Egan, Lawson, Kearns, Conway, and Neary, 2015.
69 Leventhal and Brookes-Gunn, 2003.
70 Jackson, Langille, Lyons, Hughes, Martin, and Winstanley, 2009.
71 Keen and Padilla, 2010.
72 Graham, Manley, Hiscock, Boyle, and Doherty, 2009.
73 Cooper, Bonney, Ross, Karnes, Hunter-Jones, Kelley, and Rothernberg, 2013.
74 Ludwig, Kling, Katz, Sanbonmatsu, Liebman, Duncan, and Kessler, 2008; DeLuca and Dayton, 2009; Ludwig, Duncan, Gennetian, Katz, Kessler, Kling, and Sanbonmatsu, 2012; Levy, McDade and Bertumen, 2013.

4.8_Business, employment and income

Social mix interventions were expected to establish a pathway of business expansion which would provide new employment opportunities. In addition, employment participation was expected to arise from behaviour modelling and bridging into employment through contacts between owner occupiers and social housing tenants. In general these pathways have not been activated by social mix interventions. Indeed, there is some evidence that promoting new businesses within regeneration areas may reduce or lead to exit of existing businesses.[75]

Issues of causality are difficult to address, but Graham *et al*., found more employment in areas in which less than 30% of residents were social housing tenants, but significant advantages only in areas with less than 20%.[76] The latter probably reflects social housing allocation policies which heavily target housing to welfare recipients and, *a priori*, unemployed.[77] Those same patterns do not appear in the Danish context.[78] Oreopolous's analysis tracking outcomes for children in public housing estates of different quality in the United States also found no appreciable differences associated with the quality of the estate in relation to employment or earnings.[79]

Direct impacts of interventions on generating higher employment are more difficult to establish. There were no improvements evident in the employment status of re-located families compared to families that have not stayed in very poor areas in New York.[80] A systematic review of six United Kingdom studies of social mix interventions similarly found no change in employment.[81] There was no change either in the employment or higher income outcomes for low income residents in Toronto's Regent Park regeneration, in part because higher income residents were wary of sponsoring low income residents into work.[82] That is consistent with Tach's evaluation of the employment outcomes associated with a Boston redevelopment under HOPE VI which is mixed income but not mixed tenure.[83] For some, relocation was associated with reductions in employment as networks that previously provided informal child care were no longer available. This was the case for women moving out of the United States Maverick Gardens public housing estate.[84]

There have been a series of reports around the MTO programmes released by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development over the last decade in 2003 and 2011.[85] There are some outcome evaluations that do find improvements in employment outcomes in HOPE VI and MTO programmes. These results are contested among researchers and there are claims that employment effects may reflect both research selection bias as well as residential allocation bias.[86]

75 Stal and Zuberi, 2009;
76 Graham, Manley, Hiscock, Boyle, and Doherty, 2009.
77 Morris, Jamieson, and Patulny, 2012.
78 Christensen, 2015.
79 Oreopoulos, 2007.
80 Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2003.
81 Bond, Sautkina and Kearns, 2011; Sautkina, Bond and Kearns, 2012.
82 Graves, 2011.
83 Tach, 2009.
84 Curley, 2009.
85 Ord et al., 2003; Sanbomatsu *et al*., 2012.
86 Clampet-Lundquist and Massey, 2008; Ludwig, Kling, Katz, Sanbonmatsu, Liebman, Duncan, and Kessler, 2008; Ludwig, Duncan, Gennetian, Katz, Kessler, Kling, and Sanbonmatsu, 2012; Levy, McDade and Bertumen, 2013.

05

Some key points on social mix

The following points may be noted:

- Anxieties around concentrations of social housing and the associated harmful impact generated by negative neighbourhood effects have been overstated and, consequently, so too have the benefits of reducing concentrations
- Evidence around low concentrations of social housing and resulting benefits for social housing tenants is weak, benefits are mixed or remain undemonstrated
- Concentrations of low income and low socio-economic status individuals and families in certain areas are a typical spatial pattern generated by market forces not simply by the acquisition, building and management of social housing estates
- Some of the negative effects associated with social housing concentrations (and indeed low income communities) are not caused by the concentration but relate to poorly designed and maintained built environments, a lack of control of derelict properties, inaccessible or poor service provision, poor allocation practices and tenant management, and under- or over- policing. Those problematic issues can be addressed without social mix directed initiatives
- There is little research around the precise proportion of a neighbourhood in social housing that generates either beneficial or problematic outcomes:
  - The inclusionary zoning practice often associated with social mix policies targeted at a proportion at 10-20% of new dwellings in a masterplan neighbourhood development as affordable reflects attempts to incentivise and engage developers. Those proportions are not evidence-based in relation to tenant or other resident outcomes. They reflect, primarily, the business models of developers and, to a lesser extent beliefs among developers that higher proportions of tenants will reduce the attractiveness of dwellings to owner occupiers and higher income households
  - Much of the research concerned with de-concentrating social housing relates to very high concentrations – well in excess of two thirds – and highly problematic built environments. One of the few studies that attempts to establish the optimal mix of tenure suggests that beneficial effects will only be seen by reducing very heavy concentrations of rental social housing – in excess of 60% to 30% [87]
  - Little research has been undertaken on intensification of social housing areas compared to the de-concentrating of social housing areas.
- Homogeneity can be associated with benefits where communities are stable including resource and supportive networks

87 Graham, Manley, Hiscock, Boyle, and Doherty, 2009.

- Where mixed tenure policy has been undertaken it tends to ignore the rise of private rental tenure, although there is some evidence that private rental practices can undermine any benefits of re-development and improved social tenancy management for social housing tenants
- The main areas in which there is some suggestion of positive outcomes for social housing tenants appear to be:
  - Less exposure to crime
  - A feeling of greater safety
  - Quicker response to crime and disorder by police or neighbourhood/block managers – this often is very contingent on the extent and competency of the managers
  - Some increase in mental health and well-being – this is less pronounced in young men
  - Improved local amenities and built environment – these can be done through the redevelopment and are not contingent on social mix.
- There are areas in which the research appears to indicate possible problems with intervention based social mix:
  - Social isolation
  - Disruption of social capital
  - Reduced access to targeted services and supports
  - Considerable opportunities for stigmatisation and discrimination of low income families and social housing tenants
  - Over surveillance and discrimination against renters
  - Loss of supports and resourcing
  - Differential turnover.
- Social mix interventions can be used to reduce spatial expressions of inequality. That does not mean, however, that life chances for individuals and families are improved. There is a strong argument that poverty resolution is most effectively dealt with by policies directly orientated to employment, education and health interventions.

06

Some issues of transferability

Best practice guidelines arising from evaluations and research into the dynamics of communities shaped by social mix policies have noted that if such communities are to achieve successful outcomes they require "careful management and monitoring... [including] systems... to maintain streets and public spaces." [88] At the broadest level of analysis the overseas literature implies, and best practice guidelines emphasise, the importance of ensuring good:

- Design of both dwellings and the surrounding environment
- Allocation and tenant management
- Neighbourhood services, amenities and policing
- Retention of housing and community opportunities for social housing and low income households.

Those are important factors in optimising community functions, social cohesion and economic participation irrespective of mix proportions.

Over and above that, the issue of transferability of interventions, metrics or the research that supports or challenges them, is critical. In addition, considerable care needs to be taken around overseas research:

- Transferability is problematic from site to site within a jurisdiction and cultural context let alone between countries. Galster, for instance, is cautious about the applicability of tenure mix to European jurisdictions although he sees both equity and efficiency merits in the context of de-concentrating poverty in the United States. [89]
- The particular combination of high density, often multi-unit high-rise apartments, and public housing stigma with a very low safety net welfare system which prompted the social mix policies and interventions in the United States and, to a lesser extent the United Kingdom, are not the same as New Zealand. The latter is marked by low density neighbourhood developments which are poorly serviced and connected. The impacts of de-concentration may be quite different to intensification whether or not social mix is involved.

Overall, it can be concluded that social mix interventions can be used to reduce spatial expressions of inequality. That does not mean, however, that life chances for individuals and families are improved. Indeed, de-concentration can lead to the 'covering-up' of the needs of vulnerable people and make the provision of needed services more complex and encouraging take-up more difficult.

88 Bailey et al., 2007; Bailey and Manzi, 2008.
89 Galster, 2007.

There is a strong argument that poverty resolution is most effectively dealt with by policies directly orientated to employment, education and health interventions. In particular improved life chances are most likely to be generated by:

- Area improvement including housing, connectivity and service access
- Positive investment in individuals and families
- Specialised interventions for individuals and families with persistent and complex needs.

Notably, the United Kingdom experience suggests that mixed tenure is most likely to be positive where it can maintain kinship and other social networks. That is, where it maintains longstanding communities which would otherwise be 'broken-up' through some households having to move out of the area because they are no longer eligible for public housing. This has particular relevance in the context of changing allocation and tenure security policies in New Zealand.

Appendix A: Rapid review bibliography

Aliprantis, D., and D. Hartley, 2015, Blowing it up and knocking it down: The local and city-wide effects of demolishing high concentration public housing on crime, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 88: 67–81.

Alpana, S., and S. Karuppannan, 2015, Density Design and Sustainable Residential Development, Institute for Sustainable Systems and Technologies (ISST) University of South Australia, Australia.

Arbaci, S., and I. Rae, 2013, Mixed-Tenure Neighbourhoods in London: Policy Myth or Effective Device to Alleviate Deprivation? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Volume 37.2: 451–79.

Arthurson, K., 2002, Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix: A Critical Relationship or Tenuous Link? *Urban Policy and Research*, 20:3: 245-261.

Arthurson, K., 2013, Mixed tenure communities and the effects on neighbourhood reputation and stigma: Residents' experiences from within, *Cities* 35: 432–438.

Atkinson, R., 2008, *Housing Policies, Social Mix and Community Outcomes*, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, AHURI Final Report No. 122.

August, M. 2014, Negotiating Social Mix in Toronto's First Public Housing Redevelopment: Power, Space and Social Control in Don Mount Court *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Volume 38.4: 1160–80.

Bailey, N., Haworth, A., Manzi, T., and M. Roberts, 2007, C*reating and sustaining mixed income communities in Scotland: A good practice guide*, The Chartered Institute of Housing Scotland and The Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Edinburgh and York. https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/37244/download?token=fORIy5ea

Bailey, N., and T. Manzi, 2008, D*eveloping and sustaining mixed tenure housing developments: Round-up Reviewing the Evidence*, The Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York. https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/37796/download?token=qphzBSZY.

Barrett, E. 2013, The Needs of Elders in Public Housing: Policy Considerations in the Era of Mixed-Income Redevelopment, *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, 25:3: 218-233.

Bergsten, Z. and E. Holmqvist, 2013, Possibilities of building a mixed city – evidence from Swedish cities, *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 13:3: 288-311.

Blanc, M., 2010, The Impact of Social Mix Policies in France, *Housing Studies*, 25:2: 257-272.

Blockland, T., and G. van Eijk, 2010, Do people who like diversity practice diversity in neighbourhood life? Neighbourhood use and the social networks of 'diversity seekers' in a mixed neighbourhood in the Netherlands, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2):313-332.

Bolt, G. Phillips, D., and R. Van Kempen, 2010, Housing Policy, (De)segregation and Social Mixing: An International Perspective, *Housing Studies*, 25:2: 129-135.

Bond, L. Sautkina, E., and A. Kearns, 2011, Mixed Messages about Mixed Tenure: Do Reviews Tell the Real Story?, *Housing Studies*, 26:1: 69-94.

Bretherton, J., and N. Pleace, 2011, A Difficult Mix: Issues in Achieving Socioeconomic diversity in deprived UK neighbourhoods, *Urban Studies*, 48(16): 3429-3443.

Bricocoli, M., and R. Cucca, Social mix and housing policy: Local effects of a misleading rhetoric. The case of Milan, *Urban Studies*: 1–15.

Camina, M., and M. Wood, 2009, Parallel Lives: Towards a Greater Understanding of What Mixed Communities Can Offer, *Urban Studies*, 46(2): 459–480.

Chaskin, R. 2011, Social Interaction in Mixed-Income Developments: Relational Expectations and Emerging Reality, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Volume 33, Number 2: 209–237.

Chaskin, R. Sichling, F., and M. Joseph, 2013, Youth in mixed-income communities replacing public housing complexes: Context, dynamics and response, *Cities* 35: 423–431.

Chaskin, R., and M. Joseph, 2013, 'Positive' Gentrification, Social Control and the 'Right to the City' in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place, I*nternational Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Volume 37.2: 480–502.

Cheshire, P. 2007, *Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities A critical analysis*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Cheshire, P. Gordon, I., and S. Gibbons, 2008, *Policies for 'mixed communities': a critical Evaluation*, SERC POLICY PAPER 2.

Christensen, G., 2015, A Danish Tale of Why Social Mix Is So Difficult to Increase, *Housing Studies*, 30:2: 252-271.

Clampet-Lundquist, S., and D. Massey, 2008, Neighbourhood Effects on Economic Self-sufficiency: A reconsideration of the Moving to Opportunity Experiment, *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(1): 107-143.

Cooper, H., Wodarski, S., Cummings, J., Hunter-Jones, J., Karnes, C., Ross, Z., Druss, B., and L. Bonney, 2012, Public housing relocations in Atlanta, Georgia, and declines in spatial access to safety net primary care, *Health & Place* 18: 1255–1260.

Cooper, H., Bonney, L., Ross, Z., Karnes, C., Hunter-Jones, J., Kelley, M., and R. Rothernberg, 2013, The aftermath of public housing relocation: Relationship to substance misuse, *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 133: 37– 44.

Curley, A. 2009, Draining or gaining? The social networks of public housing movers in Boston, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Volume 26(2–3): 227–247.

Darcy, M. 2012, De-concentration of Disadvantage and Mixed Income Housing: a Critical Discourse Approach, *Housing, Theory and Society*, Volume 27, No. 1: 1–22.

Darcy, M. 2013, From high-rise projects to suburban estates: Public tenants and the globalised discourse of deconcentration, *Cities*, 35: 365-372.

DeLuca, S. and E. Dayton, 2009, Switching Social Contexts: The Effects of Housing Mobility and School Choice Programs on Youth Outcomes, *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 35: 457–91.

Doney, R. McGuirk, P. and K. Mee, 2013, Social Mix and the Problematisation of Social Housing, *Australian Geographer*, 44:4: 401-418.

Duke, J. 2009, Mixed Income Housing Policy and Public Housing Residents' 'Right to the City,' *Critical Social Policy* Volume 29(1): 100-120.

Dunn, J. 2012, "Socially Mixed" Public Housing Redevelopment as a Destigmatization Strategy in Toronto's Regent Park A Theoretical Approach and a Research Agenda, *Du Bois Review*, 9:1: 87-105.

Egan, M., Lawson, L., Kearns, A., Conway, E., and J. Neary, 2015, Neighbourhood demolition, relocation and health. A qualitative longitudinal study of housing-led urban regeneration in Glasgow, UK, *Health &Place* 33: 101–108.

Ellickson, R. 2010, The False Promise of the Mixed-Income Housing Project, *UCLA Law Review*, 57: 983-1021.

Fautha, R, Leventhalb, T., and J. Brooks-Gunn, 2004, Short-term effects of moving from public housing in poor to middle-class neighborhoods on low-income, minority adults' Outcomes, *Social Science & Medicine*, 59: 2271–2284.

Fogel, S. Smith, M., and A. Williamson, 2007 Creating New Patterns of Social and Economic Activity Through Planned Housing Environments, *Journal of Community Practice*, 15:4: 97-115.

Galster, G. 2007, Should Policy Makers Strive for Neighborhood Social Mix? An Analysis of the Western European Evidence Base, *Housing Studies*, 4: 523-546.

Galster, G. 2007, Neighbourhood Social Mix as a Goal of Housing Policy: A Theoretical Analysis, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 7(1): 19–43.

Galster, G., Andersson, R., Musterd, S., and T. Kauppinen, 2008, Does Neighbourhood Income Mix Effect Earnings of Adults? New Evidence from Sweden, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63: 858-870.

Galster, G., Booza, J., and J. Cutsinger, 2008, Income diversity within neighbourhoods and very low-income families, *Cityscape* 10(2): 257-300.

Galster, G. Santiago, A., and J. Lucero, 2015, Employment of Low-Income African American and Latino Teens: Does Neighborhood Social Mix Matter? *Housing Studies*, 30:2: 192-227.

Goetz, E. 2013, The audacity of HOPE VI: Discourse and the dismantling of public Housing, *Cities*, 35: 342-348.

Graham, E., Manley, D., R. Hiscock, P. Boyle, and J. Doherty, 2009, Mixing Housing Tenures: Is it good for social well-being? *Urban Studies*, 46(1): 139-165.

Graves, E. 2010, The Structuring of Urban Life in a Mixed-Income Housing "Community," *City & Community* 9:1: 109-131.

Graves, E. 2011 Mixed Outcome Developments Comparing Policy Goals to Resident Outcomes in Mixed-Income Housing, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 77, No. 2: 143-153.

Groenhart, L. 2013, Evaluating Tenure Mix Interventions: A Case Study from Sydney, Australia, *Housing Studies*, 28:1: 95-115.

Gwyther, G. 2009, The Doctrine of Social Mix in the Mobile Society: A Theoretical Perspective, Housing, *Theory and Society*, 26:2: 143-156.

Hoppenbrouwer, E., and E. Louw, 2005, Mixed-use development: Theory and practice in Amsterdam's Eastern Docklands, *European Planning Studies*, 13:7 967-983.

Jacobs, K. Marston, G., and M. Darcy, 2004 'Changing the mix': Contestation surrounding the public housing stock transfer process in Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania, *Urban Policy and Research*, 22:3: 249-263.

Jackson, L., Langille, L., Lyons, R., Hughes, J., Martin, D., and V. Winstanley, 2009, Does moving from a high-poverty to lower-poverty neighborhood improve mental health? A realist review of 'Moving to Opportunity,' *Health & Place*, 15: 961–970.

Joseph, M, 2008, Early Resident Experiences at a New Mixed-Income Development in Chicago, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Volume 30, Number 3: 229–257.

Joseph, M., and R. Chaskin, 2010, Living in a mixed-income development: Resident perceptions of the benefits and disadvantages of two developments in Chicago, *Urban Studies* 47(11): 1-20.

Joseph, M., and R. Chaskin, 2012, Mixed-income developments and low rates of return: insights from relocated public housing residents in Chicago, *Housing Policy Debate*, 22:3: 377-405.

Kearns, A., and P. Mason, 2007, Mixed tenure communities and neighbourhood quality, *Housing Studies*, 22(5): 661-691.

Keene, D., and M. Padilla, 2010, Race, class and the stigma of place: Moving to "opportunity" in Eastern Iowa, *Health & Place*, 16: 1216–1223.

Kilburn, D. 2013, Together, Apart? *Situating social relations and housing provision in the everyday life of new-build mixed-tenure housing developments*, A thesis submitted to the Cities Programme of the London School of Economics for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, London.

Kleit, R., 2005, HOPE VI New Communities: Neighborhood relationships in mixed-income housing, *Environment and Planning* A 37: 1413-1441.

Kleit, R., and N. Carnegie, 2011, Integrated or Isolated? The impact of public housing redevelopment on social network homophily, *Social Networks* 33(2): 152-165.

Lelévrier, C. 2013, Social mix neighbourhood policies and social interaction: The experience of newcomers in three new renewal developments in France, *Cities*, 35: 409-416.

Leventhal, T., and J. Brooks-Gunn, 2003, Moving to Opportunity: an Experimental Study of Neighborhood Effects on Mental Health, *Am J Public Health*, 93: 1576–1582.

Levin, I. Arthurson, K., and A. Ziersch, 2014, Social mix and the role of design: Competing interests in the Carlton, Public Housing Estate Redevelopment, Melbourne, *Cities* 40: 23–31.

Levy, D. McDade, Z., K. Bertumen, 2013, Mixed-Income Living: Anticipated and Realized Benefits for Low Income Households, Cityscape: *A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, Volume 15, Number 2:15-28.

Lisbon, B. 2007, River Garden: New Orleans' Model for Mixed-Income Housing? *Social Policy*, Spring/Summer: 98-105.

Ludwig, J., Duncan, G., Gennetian, L., Katz, L., Kessler, R., Kling, J., and L. Sanbonmatsu, 2012, Neighbourhood effects on the long-term well-being of low income adults, *Science* 337(6101): 1505-1510.

Ludwig, J., Kling, J., Katz, L., Sanbonmatsu, L., Liebman, J., Duncan, G., and R. Kessler, 2008, What can we learn about neighbourhood effects from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment? *American Journal of Sociology* 114(1): 144-188.

Lupton, R, and C. Fuller, 2009, Mixed communities: A new approach to spatially concentrated poverty in England, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33 (4): 1014-1028.

Manzi, T. 2010 Promoting Responsibility, Shaping Behaviour: Housing Management, Mixed Communities and the Construction of Citizenship, *Housing Studies*, 25:1: 5-19.

Markovich, J. 2015, 'They Seem to Divide Us': Social Mix and Inclusion in Two Traditional Urbanist Communities, *Housing Studies*, 30:1: 139-168.

Melis, G., Marra, G., and E. Gelormino, 2013, *Housing and Social Mix*, Equity Action Work Package 6 – Literature Review.

Morris, A. Jamieson, M., and R. Patulney, 2012, Is social mixing of tenures a solution for public housing estates? *Evidence Base*, 1: 1-21.

Mugnano, S., P. Palvarini, 2013, ''Sharing space without hanging together'': A case study of social mix policy in Milan, *Cities* 35: 417–422.

Musterd, S. 2002, Response: Mixed Housing Policy: A European (Dutch) Perspective, *Housing Studie*s, 17(1): 139–143.

Nyden, P. 1998, Comment on James E. Rosenbaum, Linda K. Stroh, and Cathy A. Flynn's "Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed-income housing", *Housing Policy Debate*, 9:4: 741-748.

Onatu, G. 2010, Mixed-income housing development strategy Perspective on Cosmo City, Johannesburg, South Africa *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 3 (3): 203-215.

Ord, L., Feins, J., Jacob, R., Beecroft, E., Sanbomatsu, L., Katz, L., Liebman, J., Kling, J., 2003, Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration: Interim Impacts Evaluation, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington.

http://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/fairhsg/mtoFinal.html.

Oreopoulos, P. 2007, The Long-Run Consequences of Living in a Poor Neighborhood, B*erkeley Program on Housing and Urban Policy*, Working Paper No W02-003; 1533-1575, University of California Berkeley.

Ostendorf, W. Musterd, S., and S. De Vos, 2001, Social Mix and the Neighbourhood Effect, Policy Ambitions and Empirical Evidence, *Housing Studies*, 16 (3): 371-380.

Popkin, S. Buron , L. Levy, D. and M. Cunningham, 2000, The Gautreaux Legacy: What Might Mixed Income and Dispersal Strategies Mean for the Poorest Public Housing Tenants?, *Housing Policy Debate*, 11:4: 911-942.

Putnam, R., 2007, E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30: 137-174.

Roberts, M. 2007 Sharing Space: Urban Design and Social Mixing in Mixed Income New Communities, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 8:2: 183-204.

Rowe, D. and J. Dunn, 2015 Tenure-Mix in Toronto: Resident Attitudes and Experience in the Regent Park Community, *Housing Studies*, 31: March: 1-24.

Rowlands, R. Murie, A. and A. Tice, 2006, *More than Tenure Mix: Developer and Purchaser Attitudes to New Housing Estates*, University of Birmingham, Published by the Chartered Institute of Housing/Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Octavia House, Westwood Way Coventry CV4 8JP.

Ruming, K. 2015, ''It wasn't about public housing, it was about the way it was done'': challenging planning not people in resisting the Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan, Australia, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 23(1): 39-60.

Sautkina, E. Bond, L., and A. Kearns, 2012 Mixed Evidence on Mixed Tenure Effects: Findings from a Systematic Review of UK Studies, 1995–2009, *Housing Studies*, 27:6: 748-782.

Slater, T. 2013, Expulsions from public housing: The hidden context of concentrated Affluence, *Cities*, 35: 384-390.

Sanbomatsu, L., Katz, L., Ludwig, J., Gennetian, L., Duncan, G., Kessler, R., Adam, E., McDade, T., and S. Lindau, 2012, Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program - Final Impacts Evaluation, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington. http://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/pubasst/MTOFHD.html.

Stal, G. and D. Zuberi, 2010, Ending the cycle of poverty through socio-economic integration: A comparison of Moving to Opportunity (MTO) in the United States and the Bijlmermeer Revival Project in the Netherlands, *Cities*, 27: 3-12.

Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., Read, S,, and N. Allum, 2011, *Does ethnic diversity erode trust?: Putnam's 'hunkering-down' thesis reconsidered*, http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/15382/2/Sturgis(2011)%20Does%20ethnic%20diversity%20erode%20trust.pdf.

Tach, L. 2009, More than Bricks and Mortar: Neighbourhood Frames, Social Processes, and the Mixed-Income Redevelopment of a Public Housing Project, *City & Community* 8:3 September: 269-299.

Thompson, S. Bucerius, S. and M. Luguya, 2013. Unintended Consequences of Neighbourhood Restructuring: Uncertainty, Disrupted Social Networks and Increased Fear of Violent Victimization among Young Adults, *British Journal of Criminology*, 53: 924–941.

Tunstall, R. 2003, 'Mixed tenure' policy in the UK: Privatisation, Pluralism or Euphemism? *Housing, Theory and Society*, 20:3: 153-159.

Vale, L. 1998, Comment on James E. Rosenbaum, Linda K. Stroh, and Cathy A. Flynn's "Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed income housing", *Housing Policy Debate*, 9:4: 749-756.

Vale, L. 2006, Comment on Mark Joseph's "Is mixed income development an antidote to urban poverty?" *Housing Policy Debate*, 17:2: 259-269.

Walks, R. and R. Maaranen, 2008, Gentrification, Social Mix, and Social Polarization: Testing the Linkages in Large Canadian Cities, *Urban Geography*, 29:4: 293-326.

Families Commission Kōmihana ā Whānau

The Families Commission operates under the name Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (Superu)