Positioning Paper

The benefits of tenure diversification

authored by
Bill Randolph and Martin Wood

for the

**Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute**

UNSW/UWS Research Centre

December 2003

AHURI Positioning Paper No. 65

AHURi

Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute

AHURI POSITIONING PAPER SERIES

AHURI Positioning Papers is a refereed series presenting the preliminary findings of original research to a diverse readership of policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Tenure diversification strategies that involve the transfer of public housing to alternative forms of ownership or management have been an important part of the operational management plans of a number of state housing authorities in Australia since at least the early 1990s.

The research project of which this Positioning Paper forms the first output will undertake the first review of the extent and nature of tenure diversification in the public housing sector in Australia and to make an initial assessment of the effectiveness of this approach in meeting the range of objectives that have been associated with the practice.

The key research questions the research will address are:

- What has been the extent of tenure diversification in public housing estates across Australia?

- How do these initiatives vary?

- What are the espoused objectives for this activity?

- Have the objectives of diversification been achieved, including the notion that tenure mixing has led to greater social mix and beneficial social interaction on these estates?

- What are the perceived benefits and/or disadvantages of diversification for both stakeholders and residents on estates where the policy has been implemented?

- What are the policy and practice implications that flow from the research findings for current and future diversification initiatives?

A background to tenure diversification

Early tenure diversification initiatives in Australia can be traced back to the late 1980s. These initiatives were usually justified on the basis of a range of asset management related objectives – enhancing the value of the remaining public assets on larger estates and achieving "asset sustainability". From this perspective, state housing authorities argue that one of the principle benefits of tenure diversification is that stock reconfiguration and the dispersal of tenants to new areas allows them to reconfigure the stock to better reflect new patterns of demand. The reduction in the concentration of public housing on particular estates has also, it is maintained, eased the housing management burden and reduced associated costs. Furthermore, it is suggested, the policy has enhanced estate and neighbourhood amenity and reduced "stigma" or "normalised" the estates. These, together with the straightforward goal of promoting home ownership and alternative housing options and choice, particularly for lower income households and public housing tenants, have all been cited to support tenure diversification strategies.

In more recent times the rationale has shifted and it is now common to see tenure diversification initiatives associated with arguments about the amelioration or prevention of a range of wider socio-economic problems that have beset larger public housing estates in recent years. A strong line of policy logic has developed which more or less explicitly maintains that tenure diversification leads to an increased social mix in areas with previously high concentrations of public housing and consequently helps create more "balanced" and therefore more stable communities. A series of related social and economic benefits are then said to flow on from achieving this goal.

Within this broader framework, tenure diversification is cast as a means of improving social inclusion and cohesion within disadvantaged areas. The breaking up of large concentrations of public housing, primarily through sales to home owners (who will, almost by definition include working household members) becomes, from this point of view, a means of promoting a 'more balanced community'.

Policies of tenure diversification in Australia have mainly taken the form of sales of existing, refurbished or redeveloped stock into home ownership, although transfers of housing management (and stock in some cases) to community housing providers has also been pursued as an alternative option (NSW Office of Community Housing, 1999). In either case, this action has often been linked to notions of greater choice in housing opportunities in these areas, leading to social mix. Such policies have been actively pursued in a number of States. These include, for example, the New Living Program being undertaken by the Ministry of Housing in Western Australia, the various Urban Improvement Programs undertaken by the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) and initiatives such as the Inala and Leichart Urban Renewal projects by the Queensland Department of Housing (QDoH). In New South Wales, considerable activity has been undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program which ran from 1995 to 1999 to bring forward stock sales in key estates, although here, as in Victoria, large scale stock disposal is only now being actively pursued as part of redevelopment strategies.

Objectives of tenure diversification

Tenure diversification is considered an essential element in addressing a range of inter-related objectives. These include:

- Improving asset values and financial viability of public housing

- Enabling stock reconfiguration and dispersal

- Ameliorating housing management problems

- Breaking up concentrations of public housing

- Encouraging home ownership and alternative housing assistance options for lower income households

- Achieving a greater social mix

- Creating a range of non-shelter benefits

While not all these have been invoked by every housing jurisdiction at the same time, this list indicates the wide variety of benefits that policy makers have advanced to justify the process of diversification. In addition, these kinds of diversification programs have also often been associated with broader social or community development policies specifically aimed at strengthening community cohesion or social wellbeing. At times, it is at least implied that diversification can assist in developing stronger, more resilient communities through the supposed benefits of greater social mix.

The benefits of social mix which are said to flow from tenure diversification include:

- Promotion of greater social interaction and social cohesion;

- Encouragement of mainstream norms and values;

- Creation of social capital;

- Opening up of job opportunities;

- Overcoming place-based stigma;

- Attracting additional services to the neighbourhood;

- Leading to sustainability of renewal/regeneration initiatives;

However, the extent to which diversification, which by its very nature leads to the break up of existing communities, actually assists in community strengthening and community building is open to question. Again, these kinds of benefits remain to be proved.

The conceptual basis of social mix

At a broader conceptual level, the debate on the social benefits of tenure diversification can be related to several academic debates that have focused on aspects of the way housing markets have restructured in recent decades and the effect of space in structuring social relationships. The first concerns the issue of tenure-specific or tenure-based social polarisation. This refers to the way in which wider social and economic changes have been expressed in the changing housing tenure positions of households with differential market capacity. In particular, the way public housing has become associated with the most economically disadvantaged, while home ownership, and home purchase in particular, has become the dominant tenure of the economically active. An associated literature has concentrated on the processes leading to the residualisation of social housing – the tendency for social housing being increasingly confined to the welfare dependent and economically inactive. The second conceptual strand underlying approaches to tenure diversification centers on the role localities play in reinforcing aspects of social disadvantage. The idea that social disadvantage is exacerbated by spatial concentration of disadvantaged populations is often now referred to in terms of 'neighbourhood' or 'area effects'. Put simply, the concentration of poverty in local areas creates a social milieu that reinforces aspects of disadvantage and actively reduces an individual's ability to move out of poverty or disadvantage. A third debate concerns the appropriate level at which social mix occurs. Practical concern over this question surfaced in Australia in the question as to what percentage of an estate should be left as public housing in the various initiatives that have been introduced in some States to reduce concentration of public housing.

Current justifications for interventions to break up public housing estates have been summarised by Schoon (2001) into three distinctive arguments. The "Defending the Neighbourhood" argument states that middle class people are much better at arguing for their fair share of public resources for their areas and then defending this investment. Therefore a neighbourhood with a share of middle class households will fair better in the competition for pubic investment and resources than those without. The "Networks and Contacts" argument states that proximity of different classes promoted contacts that foster greater social cohesion among the poor, providing role models and improving their chances for employment contacts and the other 'weak ties' of social cohesion. And the "Money-Go-Round" argument states that concentrations of the poorest leads to a poor local economy as there is not enough cash in the local economy to support services and shops. In contrast, mixed neighbourhoods with a strong home ownership market are much more able to support a thriving local economy.

Australian academic discussion of the benefits of tenure mix has been limited. Early approaches were sceptical of any long-term benefits. However, there are few, if any, recent systematic evaluations of the impacts tenure diversification and the resulting social mix on the kinds of positive outcomes attributed to this policy.

Have the outcomes of tenure diversification been achieved?

A number of research and evaluation projects have attempted to assess whether the supposed benefits of tenure diversification polices have been successful. Much of this evidence comes from overseas, in particular, the US and UK. However, the current evidence suggests the arguments put forward for the social outcomes of tenure diversification are far from proven.

In general, there is little evidence that tenure diversification has so far led to the promotion of inclusive social networks between owners and renters and greater cohesion, or the adoption of mainstream norms and values among disadvantaged public tenants, or greater social capital, even if the latter could be accurately measured. It could be argued, however, that most tenure diversification programs have only really been in effect for a short period (a decade at most), so it may be too soon to really tell if these benefits have emerged. The improvement of service provision is also open to question. While some private sector services might improve (although no one has shown this to be the case), a reduction in the concentration of disadvantaged tenants may promote the loss of welfare services, leaving those reliant on these services who remain on the estate worse off. On the other hand, positive results have been found in relation to the reduction of feelings of stigmatisation expressed by tenants on mixed estates.

This discussion raises the question of sustainability. The idea presented in both Australia and Britain is that past programs have failed because they have been focussed on physical issues rather than the underlying social and economic causes of disadvantage. Promoting social mix together with other 'community building' initiatives, it is often argued leads to sustainable renewal. The idea, in short, is that socially mixed communities are more likely to ensure that the 'gains' that have been made through physical renewal are maintained. The focus on community building is by no means unanimous, however, and a recent tendency is to question some of the underlying suppositions. However, US research suggests that mixed income housing was more likely to be successful in low-poverty neighbourhoods, especially where tight housing markets ensured a high demand for the housing being offered to higher income residents.

Design quality, high quality management and maintenance and strong financial viability were also very important. Mixed income schemes also worked better when low-income tenants were in a minority, and there was a reasonable range of incomes, not just the poorest and middle incomes and that subsidised units should not stand out. Nevertheless, upward mobility for low-income residents needs more than just social mix, but rather activities that are specifically aimed as creating opportunities for these residents to gain access to jobs and higher incomes.

What of the impact on tenants displaced by the renewal process? There may well be positive benefits from this, in terms of the greater access to better services and job opportunities living in more 'balanced' communities may provide disadvantaged tenants, not least in simply living in a more 'normal' neighbourhood. Evidence from the US provides clear support for policies that disperse low income tenants into higher income areas, with research evidence showing that those relocating in high income areas showed greater long term benefits than those relocating in poor areas. Evidence from Australia of this effect is mixed.

More fundamental critics have argued that tenure mix developments simply serve simply to obfuscate the social and political drivers behind poverty and the run down of welfare provision that result in spatial concentrations of disadvantaged in poor neighbourhoods. In doing so, these polices represent simplistic and deterministic solutions to the problem of entrenched poverty, without ever attempting to overcome the fundamental drivers of poverty and exclusion.

Less attention has been paid in the academic literature to the benefits to landlords of adopting tenure diversification policies. In the UK, where tenure diversification is widespread, research found that asset management strategies have been the dominant drivers to tenure diversification on existing estates among local authority landlords. These drivers included the need to respond to falling demand for public housing, the desire to avoid the high costs of major repairs, or to reduce housing management problems. Reported benefits typically included improved local property prices, higher satisfaction ratings among remaining tenants, reduced turnover,

increased demand for lettings, and reduced stigma or increased reputation of the estate. The potential benefits in terms of greater social sustainability were largely reported as "add ons" to support the asset-based intentions. In the US, similar supply side drivers are evident. However, there appears to be little published US research into the specific financial or management benefits public landlords gained from renewal activity leading to social mix.

The evidence to date on the impacts of tenure diversification and social mix policies in public housing estates is therefore mixed at best. Moreover, the complexity of the social processes and outcomes that are associated with this policy leaves researchers wishing to examine the policy of tenure diversification in a conceptual minefield with a range of issues that need to be clarified before any realistic evaluation can be made. The final section of this chapter aims to raise some of the more obvious conceptual problems.

Tenure diversification policies in practice

There is a range of policies and programs that could be classified as approaches to tenure diversification. While state housing authorities in Australia have been involved in most of these at one time or another, others have been more prominent in overseas contexts. Together they represent a continuum of policies that can broadly be considered to contribute to tenure diversification of estates.

The four main approaches are:

- Property sales: The longest standing form of effective diversification on larger estates has been through the sale of public housing to individual tenants.

- Stock transfer: Transfer of property (either of title or management) to other, usually social, landlords. This has played a small role in the Australian tenure diversification policy mix to date.

- Spot Purchase (salt and pepper approaches): This involves purchasing or leasing property in smaller blocks or single dwellings on new estates or in areas with low numbers of public housing in order to broaden the range of stock available and to diversify into new areas where public housing has not been built in large numbers.

- Segmented estate development: This approach, common in both Australian and UK involves the diversification of the stock within a new or redeveloped estate through the development of tenure specific sub-areas. Typically in this form of diversification, estates incorporate areas transferred to private developers for on-sale to *homeowners*.

All four of these approaches have been adopted by state housing authorities in Australia, albeit at various times, although some have been much more prominent than others. Stock transfers have not been widely used, while all the other three are common approaches to delivering a socially mixed public housing stock.

Tenure diversification in Australia has largely been associated with predominantly asset-based approaches to the problems of the larger public housing estates involving investment in the physical infrastructure – housing improvements and environmental work often rectifying design defects and addressing safety and security issues. A major strand in this approach has been the re-modelling of estates through demolition, sales and redevelopment.

Three states have pursued vigorous tenure diversification and estate renewal policies over the last decade: South Australia, Queensland and West Australia. Diversification policy in these states has normally involved the sale or transfer of stock or cleared sites to external developers, often in partnership arrangements with a private project manager who takes the lead in the renewal and marketing process. New South Wales and Victoria are only now beginning major programs of estate renewal and sales.

Summary

From the review of existing programs of tenure diversification, it is possible to suggest that the principle benefits of these strategies for housing authorities appear to fall into three broad areas:

Asset management benefits

- The ability to disinvest from stock that is perceived to be obsolete or with high maintenance costs (stock rationalisation).

- Portfolio reconfiguration, especially in terms of restructuring the stock mix and location to match emerging patterns of demand, often through a process called 'asset farming' where higher value stock is sold to generate revenue for new stock development (stock realignment).

Housing management benefits

- Reduced concentrations of public housing towards much lower 'average' levels across targeted suburbs (dispersing disadvantage).

- Improved housing management outcomes from a reduction of tenant based problems associated with larger concentrations of public housing (managing residualistion).

Social welfare outcomes

- Reductions in wider social expenditures on welfare support in the renewal areas (generating service efficiencies).

- Anticipated positive social outcomes for remaining tenants in communities with a more 'normal' social profile, reduced stigma, stronger social networks, improved access to services and employment (tackling social exclusion).

The research method

The Positioning Paper highlights a significant gap between claims for tenure diversification polices and the research evidence as to whether these claimed outcomes have been achieved. The research for the project has been devised to test these claims in the context of current tenure diversification policies in four States: New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and West Australia.

Quantitative and qualitative fieldwork will be conducted. The quantitative techniques will involve the analysis and comparison of data from the 1996 and 2001 Censuses to identify the extent of tenure and social changes between these two dates, and from a range of other secondary sources – such as internal state housing monitoring systems and reports. The aim is to identify the scale of diversification and change that has resulted from this activity.

The qualitative techniques will include key actor interviews in each state and focus groups in diversified case study areas. The aim here will be to clarify the nature of any changes that have occurred, to ascertain how local people make sense of these changes and explore the extent to which any changes in social outcomes are attributable to tenure diversification. Importantly, this will clarify how any benefits of diversification have impacted upon images and perceptions.

Three focus groups will be undertaken in each state: a group of tenants and a group of new owners will be convened on a 'target' estate that has undergone renewal and diversification, and a third 'control' group of tenants will be convened on an estate that has not undergone renewal. In this way, it is hoped that the effects of the renewal process on the target group of tenants can be exposed in contrast to the views of tenants on the control estate.

The triangulation of these methods will allow the research questions to be addressed thoroughly and in a methodologically robust manner.

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper reports research by the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute: University of New South Wales and University of Western Sydney Research Centre, which examines the policy and practice of tenure diversification or the 'breaking up' of concentrations of public housing through the sale and transfer of stock.

This is the first in a number of outputs from this project. It provides a comprehensive review of the relevant academic literature, describes the policy issues that are to be addressed in subsequent stages of the research project, and details the research methods that will be adopted in the subsequent stages of the project.

Further outputs from this project will include a work in progress report, a final report and a findings paper. The project will be completed in 2003.

The research aims to undertake the first review of the extent and nature of tenure diversification in the public housing sector in Australia and to make an initial assessment of the effectiveness of this approach in meeting the range of objectives that have been associated with the practice.

One of the key aims of the proposed research is to explore the extent to which the issues emerging from the UK and US experience are applicable to similar developments in the Australian public housing system, and the policy and practice implications that flow from them.

The key research questions are:

- What has been the extent of tenure diversification in public housing estates across Australia?

- How do these initiatives vary?

- What are the espoused objectives for this activity?

- Have the objectives of diversification been achieved, including the notion that tenure mixing has led to greater social mix and beneficial social interaction on these estates?

- What are the perceived benefits and/or disadvantages of diversification for both stakeholders and residents on estates where the policy has been implemented?

- What are the policy and practice implications that flow from the research findings for current and future diversification initiatives?

Outline of positioning paper

Chapter 2 of the paper presents a literature review of the previous research on tenure diversification drawing on both Australian and overseas sources. This chapter focuses on the concepts behind tenure diversification and its close policy relative, social mix and the evidence for the assumed benefits of mix in terms of positive social outcomes for the communities involved. Chapter 3 reviews the range of tenure diversification approaches that have been adopted by various housing authorities and the recent experience of these in both Australia and the UK. Chapter 4 presents a review of the actual policy frameworks and programs that have been implemented to diversify the tenure and social structures of larger public housing estates in the four case study states that form the empirical basis of this research: South Australia, New South Wales (NSW), West Australia (WA) and Queensland. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the research methods that will be followed in the research, and the research questions that will be addressed.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

> There are those that say you should mix people all the time; that, that is the only socialist or sociable or egalitarian thing to do, or anything else is villainy. There are those who say that that is ridiculous, and against human nature. The market always segregates people; people anyway like to live with their own kind. Talk of residential mix is manipulative social engineering of the worse kind; you cannot mix people if they do not want to mix. Both these simple attitudes are very easily shown to be part silly, part meaningless…. (Stretton, 1978, p11 quoted in Gribbin, 1979)

Tenure diversification strategies that involve the transfer of public housing to alternative forms of ownership or management have been an important part of the operational management plans of a number of state housing authorities in Australia since at least the early 1990s (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993; Mant, 1992). Early initiatives were usually justified on the basis of a range of asset management related objectives – enhancing the value of the remaining public assets on larger estates and achieving "asset sustainability". The practice has involved State Housing Authorities (SHAs) selling land and/or stock in estates that have previously consisted mostly of public housing. The equity generated from sales has in some cases permitted further investment in remaining stock and the purchase of new stock in other locations. Stock reconfiguration and the dispersal of tenants to new areas, it is suggested, has allowed SHAs to better reflect new patterns of demand. The reduction in the concentration of public housing on particular estates has also, it is maintained, eased the housing management burden and reduced associated costs. Furthermore, it is suggested, the policy has enhanced estate and neighbourhood amenity and reduced "stigma" or "normalised" the estates. These, together with the straightforward goal of promoting home ownership and alternative housing options and choice, particularly for lower income households and public housing tenants, have all been cited to support tenure diversification strategies (for example, South Australian Housing Trust, 1998; NSW Department of Housing, 1999a; Queensland Department of Housing 2000a; West Australia, 2000). All these strategies are set within the context of an era of continuing fiscal restraint that has imposed limitations on funding options for public housing assistance.

In more recent times, however, the rationale appears to have shifted. It is now common to see tenure diversification initiatives associated with arguments about the amelioration or prevention of a range of wider socio-economic problems that have beset larger public housing estates in recent years. This perspective acknowledges the inter-connected nature of the social problems experienced by many public housing tenants and asserts the need for 'joined-up' solutions (Spiller Gibbin Swan, 2000). Tenure diversification is seen as an important component in tackling these kinds of broader social problems.

As a result, a strong line of policy logic has developed which more or less explicitly maintains that tenure diversification leads to an increased social mix in areas with previously high concentrations of public housing and consequently helps create more "balanced" and therefore more stable communities. A series of related social and economic benefits are then said to flow on from achieving this goal (see for example, NSW Department of Housing, 2001). These kinds of interrelationships and the positive social outcomes expected to follow are explicit in several of the bilateral agreements under the current Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA).

Within this broader framework, tenure diversification is cast as a means for improving social inclusion and cohesion within disadvantaged areas. The breaking up of large concentrations of public housing, primarily through sales to homeowners (who will, almost by definition include working household members) becomes, from this point of view, a means of promoting a 'more balanced community' rather than a simple mechanism of asset management. This is a response to the perception that the social and economic problems experienced by individual households are reinforced on public estates by the concentration of large numbers of similar households; that residents in these areas are isolated from the wider community; have fewer opportunities to gain education and employment; and are more likely to suffer poorer mental and physical health as a result of their isolation (Bell, 1983; Vinson, 1995; Stubbs and Storer, 1996; Woodward, 1997, 2000; Arthurson, 1998; Randolph and Judd, 2000a).

Policies of tenure diversification in Australia have mainly taken the form of sales of existing, refurbished or redeveloped stock into home ownership, although transfers of housing management (and stock in some cases) to community housing providers has also been pursued as an alternative option (NSW Office of Community Housing, 1999). In either case, this action has often been linked to notions of greater choice in housing opportunities in these areas, leading to social mix. Such policies have been actively pursued in a number of States. These include, for example, the New Living Program being undertaken by the Ministry of Housing in Western Australia, the various Urban Improvement Programs undertaken by the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) and initiatives such as the Inala and Leichart Urban Renewal projects by the Queensland Department of Housing (QDoH). In New South Wales, considerable activity was undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program which ran from 1995 to 1999 to bring forward stock sales in key estates, although here, as in Victoria, large scale stock disposal is only now being actively pursued as part of redevelopment strategies (Western Australia Ministry of Housing, 2000; Queensland Department of Housing, 2000a; South Australian Housing Trust, 2000; NSW Department of Housing, 1999b; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000; Randolph, *et al*, 2001).

In summary, tenure diversification is considered an essential element in addressing a range of inter-related objectives. These include:

- Improving asset values and financial viability of public housing

- Enabling stock reconfiguration and dispersal

- Ameliorating housing management problems

- Breaking up concentrations of public housing

- Encouraging home ownership and alternative housing assistance options for lower income households

- Achieving a greater social mix

- Improving interaction between renters and owners

- Reducing stigma and 'normalising' estates

- Creating a range of non-shelter benefits

While not all these have been invoked by every housing jurisdiction at the same time, this list indicates the wide variety of benefits that policy makers have associated with, and have therefore advanced to justify, the process of diversification. In addition, these kinds of diversification programs have also often been associated with broader social or community development policies specifically aimed at strengthening community cohesion or social wellbeing.   At times, it is at least implied that diversification can assist in developing stronger, more resilient communities through the supposed benefits of greater social mix. However, it might be questioned whether diversification,

which by its very nature leads to the break up of existing communities, actually assists in community development. Again, these kinds of relationships remain to be proved.

However, little, if any, research has been conducted to systematically establish the range of tenure diversification strategies adopted across Australia. Neither has there been an assessment of whether tenure diversification has achieved the goals set for it, either from an asset and housing management position or in terms of its wider 'non-shelter' and community building role, or the lessons to be learnt from them.

The research project, of which this Positioning Paper is the first output, aims to address some of the gaps in our understanding of this important housing and asset management strategy. In doing so it will provide policy and good practice guidance as to how best to deliver the desired outcomes from investment in tenure diversification initiatives.

The conceptual basis of diversification policy

At a broader conceptual level, these kinds of practical policy approaches can be related to several academic debates concerning firstly, the significance of housing tenure as a key social fault line, and secondly, the role of neighbourhoods in generating additional impacts on disadvantaged households over and above their individual social position. A third body of literature which has a longer history concerns the issue of social mix more generally.

i) Housing tenure and social differentiation

The academic literature in this area centres on the issue of tenure-specific or tenure-based social polarisation. This refers to the way in which wider social and economic changes have been expressed in changing housing tenure locations of households with differential market capacity (Saunders, 1979; Hamnett, 1984; Forrest and Murie, 1990, 1994; Winter and Stone, 1998, 1999). This debate has its roots in the discussion of housing classes (Rex and Moore, 1968) and social area analysis that first pointed to the link in the UK between housing tenure (specifically social housing) and social class and its impact of residential differentiation (for example, Robson, 1969) and is also related to discussion of the links between housing and labour markets (Randolph, 1991). Put simply, the growth of home ownership in the post-Second World War period in most English speaking post-industrial countries has largely been seen to have been associated with the most economically able, while rented tenures, and particularly social rented housing, have been increasingly associated with less advantaged. At the same time, the issue of social division within a maturing home ownership market has also emerged (particularly with an ageing home ownership cohort), indicating that the pattern of tenure based social division that emerged in the last thirty years is not an immutable model and will undoubtedly change in the future (Murie, 1991; Burbidge and Winter, 1995, Badcock and Beer, 2001).

The processes leading to the residualisation of social housing – the tendency for social housing being increasingly confined to the welfare dependent and economically inactive – have been well documented in the UK (English, 1976; Hamnett and Randolph, 1987; Randolph, 1999). The combined processes that have led to this situation are straightforward, including the limitation of the growth of the sector in recent years and the targeting of remaining allocations to those households in greatest social need. In Australia, the small size of the social rented sector means that many disadvantaged households are still heavily represented in the private rented housing market and so the social-private rental division is not so marked (Winter and Stone, 1999). Instead, the increasing affordability problems of younger age cohorts in accessing home purchase have resulted in the low income and low skilled and single income households being "locked out" of the home ownership market. Nevertheless, the association between public housing and disadvantage in Australia has been clearly

established in the literature (Peel, 1995; Vinson, 1995; Arthurson, 1998; Randolph and Judd, 2000a).

The net outcome of this debate has been a much clearer understanding of the way the housing market has acted to 'sift and sort' social classes into different positions along tenure lines. While it is clear that specific characteristics of these cleavages differ between countries and over time, the relationship between market capacity and tenure has been established as a major social fault line in English speaking countries, including Australia. That it is not necessarily the case in other countries reflects different housing and class interrelationships.

This understanding has to a great extent underpinned, albeit implicitly, the idea that mixing tenures in a local area will lead to greater social mix. At one level, of course, the introduction of alternative housing tenures in a neighbourhood will undoubtedly lead to greater social mix in a simple statistical sense. Replacing half an estate of public tenants with home owners will inevitably change the social mix within that area, as measured by indicators of employment levels, household type, social class, demographic profiles, and so on. The results will show up in subsequent censuses as a net shift in the social characteristics of the area. However, whether the supposed broader benefits of 'social mix', in terms of greater social interaction and the spin offs for more disadvantaged households, will occur as a result has been much more difficult to assess.

ii)   Neighbourhood effects

The second conceptual strand underlying approaches to tenure diversification can be found in the emerging debates on the role localities play in reinforcing aspects of social disadvantage. The idea that social disadvantage is exacerbated by spatial concentration of disadvantaged populations is often now referred to in terms of 'neighbourhood' or 'area effects' (Ellen and Turner, 1997; Buck, 2001; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001b). Essentially, the argument from this literature is that concentration of poverty in local areas creates a social milieux that reinforces aspects of disadvantage and actively reduces an individual's ability to move out of poverty or disadvantage. Atkinson and Kintrea summarise this situation as follows:

> The mechanism for this additionality are found in processes such as burdens on local service provision, poor reputation that is projected onto individual residents, poor quality or absent private services, lower standards of public service provision and the socialisation process in poor neighbourhoods (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001b, p. 2278). .

However, the evidence for and against such neighbourhood effects is not clear, not least due to the difficulty in measuring them, as well as the problem that many of the supposed processes behind these effects are circularly interrelated. It has therefore proved difficult to conclusively prove the additional impacts that neighbourhoods make in the generation and maintenance of disadvantage, or at what threshold of concentration these effects have an impact (Galster *et al*, 2000). Counter arguments that suggest the impacts of mainstream welfare policies, macro-economic conditions and intra-household dynamics are more important than neighbourhood effects *per se* in the generating neighbourhood disadvantage have also been made (Kleinman, 1998; Amin, *et al*, 2000; Webster, 2000).

Whatever the evidence is for or against neighbourhood effects, the fact remains that concentrations of disadvantage exist and that many of these are found in areas of high concentrations of public housing (Power and Tunstall, 1995; Randolph and Judd, 2000a). The flow on from this debate into the housing policy arena is that it is now argued that large public housing estates are themselves an increasing barrier to positive social outcomes simply due to the numbers of disadvantaged households that

have piled up there. While the critical threshold triggering this effect is unclear and unproven (or indeed, when that threshold was crossed), this argument contends that the large proportion of public tenants who are excluded from mainstream economic engagement and constrained by the negative impacts of social welfare dependency in these areas means that few opportunities arise whereby residents can effectively break back into the social mainstream. The estates are simply too large to allow the social permeability that might assist in breaking the dependency cycle. The logical next step is to argue that the estates themselves need to be broken up and the public housing populations dispersed to give an opportunity for this reconnection to occur.

iii) A question of social balance

This discussion raises the issue of what is meant by social balance. While social mix describes a state of affairs – broadly the presence of a range of different attributes such as household size and type, age, income, employment status, and ethnicity – 'social balance' is a normative concept which suggests that the over-representation of certain groups is undesirable and results in a lack of social cohesion (although this argument is only engaged in relation to concentration of socially disadvantaged households - no one has yet argued for breaking up the privileged populations of Vaucluse or Toorak in the name of the desirability of better social mix!). Cynically, it might be argued from this perspective that the problem is not poverty or the concentrations of people with high social needs, but rather the fact that these people are not spread around enough. In fact, as Cole and Hunter (2002) note, " … the 'inclusive' connotations of the mixed community carry within them counter-tendencies towards the 'dilution', or 'exclusion', of those 'over-represented' groups". Consequently, they explain, "[t]he 'mixed community' in practice is thus one that rejects and expels as much as it accepts and welcomes".

A key issue here is the precise level at which "mix" might be achieved – the reverse of Galster *et al's* (2000) notion of the threshold at which neighbourhood effects kick in to multiply individual social disadvantages. Practical concern over this question surfaced in Australia in the question as to what percentage of an estate should be left as public housing in the various initiatives that have been introduced in some States to reduce concentration of public housing. In Queensland, West Australia and South Australia, for example, the have been debates around whether this proportion should be reduced to the State average for this tenure or some other benchmark proportion. However, in all three states, the debate on this threshold has not been backed by any empirical or objective assessment of appropriate levels of social mix. Neither was their any real indication at which scale the mix would be measured – precinct, estate, neighbourhood, etc. While the present research project will explore perceptions of this issue, it will not be attempt to develop any definitional tests for social balance.

To a large extent, a potentially major outcome of introducing tenure/social mix policies on the larger estates may be the greater mix of those public tenants displaced through a process of dispersal in other areas with lower concentrations of public housing. If greater social mix on existing estates is thought to be beneficial, then greater dispersal of tenants in smaller numbers in other suburbs might also be equally as beneficial. Little research on this issue has been pursued in Australia, although it has been extensively studied abroad, notable in the United States (see below). In one of the few Australian studies to explicitly explore the impacts of renewal activity on displaced tenants, Parry and Strommen's (2001) analysis of 120 tenants relocated and remaining tenants in the Lockridge and Langford suburbs of Perth concluded that the majority of tenants who transferred from the estates said they had benefited for the move, while an "overwhelming" majority also considered the renewal program a good thing for the community. However, no detailed examination of the reasons behind these views appeared to have been undertaken, or what the longer-term implications of this might be. Nevertheless, on this evidence, social mix has indeed had positive benefits to tenants who have been displaced by the process. While the current research project

will explore the attitudes of remaining tenants in the case study areas, it will not pursue the issue of the impacts on tenants displaced or relocated as a result of the renewal process.

A short history of 'social mix'

The idea of social mix has a long tradition in the English-speaking world (Woodward, 2000). Sarkissian, for example, notes its usage in the plan for the London district of Ilford in 1839 and has charted its progression from the time of Bournville's model village through to more recent times (Sarkissian, 1976; Sarkissian and Heine, 1978). Sarkissian identifies two main strands to the social mix argument: one romantic and conservative, the other functional. The former strand looks back to the *gemeinschaft* idyll of the pre-industrial village where rich and poor were naively deemed to live together in harmony in contrast to the class division associated with industrialisation. Sarkissian criticises the 'village enthusiasts' for lacking an appreciation of the class barriers and social conventions that removed the necessity for physical barriers but there is no mention of the radical motifs present in early advocates such as William Morris (Sarkissian, 1976). Morris was a libertarian socialist whose utopian vision explicitly excluded a disparity of wealth (Morris, 1884). As Kamenka (1967, p52) has noted, "the socialist vision of the non-commercial society is distinguished from the romantic conservative view by the rejection of hierarchy and by that alone".

The second of Sarkissian's strands, which she labels as 'functional', was based on the assumption that nineteenth century cities, characterised by high levels of overcrowding and inadequate houses and services, would be made to function better through a process of desegregation. This perspective was also prominent among reformers and town planners in the antipodes during the latter half of the nineteenth century. As Sarkissian points out, the utilitarian E. G. Wakefield recommended mix in his schemes for new colonies in New Zealand and South Australia in 1849 and Buckingham's ideas for Victoria made a similar case in 1898 (Sarkissian and Heine, 1978). It should be noted, however, that even at this stage no clear rationale appears to have been articulated.

Both the romantic and functional strands clearly influenced Cadbury's subsequent ideas for Bournville in the UK, with the aim of "gathering together as mixed a community as possible applied to character and interests as well as to income and social class" (Bournville Village Trust, 1956). Unlike the Buckingham plan for Victoria, however, the aim was to integrate social classes in close proximity to each other in what was, at the time, a unique approach, although once again, as others have pointed out, the objective of this approach must be 'divined rather than read' in the founding charters (Eversley, 1973).

Undoubtedly, Cadbury's experiment proved very influential both in the development of other model villages like Rowntree's New Earswick and subsequently the Garden City Movement of Ebenezer Howard. Other influences on the idea of social mix, such as the settlement movement, also emerged at this time. Canon Samuel Barnet, one of the founders of the nineteenth century Charity Organisation Society and the Vicar of St Judes in Whitchapel, London, had become increasingly dissatisfied with the inability of charitable organisations to address the poor (Popple, 1995). Together with his wife, Henrietta, he established the University Settlement Association with the aim of "bringing rich and poor together in mutual understanding" (Bell, 1942, p 211).

Cole and Hunter also note the prominence of the term in the English New Towns movement of the 1950s and 1960s (Cole and Hunter, 2002). Bevan, as Minister of Health and Local Government in the post-war UK Labour Government, was particularly critical of the social divisions that had resulted from earlier forms of urban development: describing them as "castrated communities". He envisaged public housing as a means of creating "the living tapestry of a mixed community" (Foot, 1975, p75-6).

This theme has been picked up more recently by Schoon (2001) in his review of current urban policy in the UK. Schoon notes that even right wing commentators like Edward Banfield in the US have espoused notions of social mix in order at least to dilute or disperse the poor and excluded so as not to develop a critical mass of disadvantage. However, Schoon argues that the forces of the market and the importance of the home as a positional good in a class and status conscious society such as ours will inevitably lead to socio-spatial polarisation if left to their own devices. The pre-industrial *gemeinschaft* social mix beloved of community studies therefore appears to be a forlorn hope.

Schoon categorises contemporary attempts by government to justify interventions to encourage social mix into three distinctive arguments. The "Defending the Neighbourhood" argument states that middle class people are much better at arguing for their fair share of public resources for their areas and then defending this investment. Therefore a neighbourhood with a share of middle class households will fair better in the competition for pubic investment and resources than those without. Moreover, politicians are more likely to take note of their demands. He cites Page and Broughton's (1997) study of mixed tenure development in West London where tenants reported that they supported social mix because it reduced the probability of stigmatisation, while the home owners were more likely to take action and complain about local disamenity to maintain standards of presentation on the estate. Atkinson and Kintrea's (1998) research in Scotland also showed that tenants and owners on mixed tenure estates said the introduction of home owners into the estates had improved them and reduced stigmatisation.

Schoon characterises the second argument for social mix as "Networks and Contacts". This is the argument that proximity of different classes promoted contacts which foster greater social cohesion among the poor, providing role models and improving their chances for employment contacts and the other 'weak ties' of social cohesion. However, the evidence to support this argument is lacking. He cites the research of Atkinson and Kintrea (1998) to show that while owners and tenants on mixed tenure estates may live in close proximity, there was no evidence that they interacted greatly. Owners, in particular, are much more likely to have their established social contacts and networks beyond the estate and had much lower local ties than did tenants. Moreover, they report that it was often the owners who ended up feeling excluded from activity on the estates, mainly because they were at work when most of it went on. Owners were also much more likely to move on fairly quickly and only saw residence on the estates as a first stepping-stone into home ownership. As a consequence, Atkinson and Kintrea argued that larger family homes need to be part of the mix along with affordable starter homes to ensure growing families have housing they can move into over time and remain in the neighbourhood.

Schoon calls the third argument for social mix the "Money-Go-Round". Concentrations of the poorest leads to a poor local economy. Low incomes mean there is not enough cash in the local economy to support services and shops. Little is invested in property as there are relatively few owners and those who do own are also poor and spend little on their property. There are few local jobs. What money there is leaches out of the neighbourhood as people spend elsewhere. In contrast, mixed neighbourhoods with a strong home ownership market are much more able to support a thriving local economy for exactly the opposite reasons. However, Schoon notes a key objection, one also noted by Randolph (2000, see below). Surely the objective of renewal is to enhance opportunities for existing communities, not provide opportunities for new comers. Nevertheless, he concludes that something is better than nothing, and a regeneration scheme that only partially benefits the original community is better than no intervention at all. He concludes:

> To sum up, the strongest argument for policies favouring socially
> mixed neighbourhoods is that they can help to prevent
> concentrations of poverty from widening, deepening and
> eventually damaging entire cities (2001, p 151).

Apart from the work of Sarkissian noted above, the Australian academic literature on social mix on public housing estates has been limited. The collection of conference papers edited by Gribbin (1979) is a useful summary of the debate around this issue that emerged in the 1970s. In this collection, social mix is seen broadly as a planned process aiming to engender a wider access to urban resources and as a means of improving social integration. For example, Lambert (1979) reviews the prevailing processes that appeared to be intensifying the differences between public housing tenants and the rest of the population at that time. He discusses the then innovative polices of buying properties in estates otherwise being sold to home owners (a policy now referred to as spot purchase, or salt and pepper development), and notes that planning zone polices often militated against social mix. He concludes that there are a number of substantial arguments against trying to generate social mix and that "It is probably time the concept of social mix was laid to rest" (Lambert, 1979, p17) due to the largely untestability of many of the claims made for it. Moreover, he argues that housing market segregation is primarily a product of broader social inequalities, not a cause of it. Social mix policies will do little to change this. Wulff, contrarily, argues that spot purchase approaches to public housing development, rather than estate-based development, might be the easiest way of ensuring greater social mix and the avoidance of larger concentrations of stigmatised tenants (particularly in the form of high rise flats) (Wulff, 1979).

The overall conclusion drawn by Gribbin is that public housing authorities should not attempt to engineer social mix on estates:

> The discussion of these issues leads us to the conclusion that
> public housing bodies not only <u>should</u> not, but <u>cannot</u> have
> general 'policies' concerning social mix. They do, however, need
> to have a clear understanding of the sort of consequences liable
> to occur in different situations as a result of mixing different types
> of people, and to be able to use this understanding to assess
> each individual planning situation in these terms" (1979, p5).

The implication from this is that social mix policies *per se* are unviable, but that the social impact of planned asset management strategies (including renewal) need to be fully built into scenario testing. The quote by Stretton (1978) in the introduction also seems to confirm a prevailing degree of scepticism about such approaches at this time. Indeed, the evidence available at the time suggested that higher levels of social integration were more likely to occur in neighbourhoods that have high levels of social homogeneity. More specifically, social mix policies pursued without consideration of wider social processes that generate disadvantage and stigmatisation are unlikely to generate much greater integration. However, this conclusion was drawn against a background of the continued growth of the sector and a situation where, despite clear differences between public tenants and surrounding populations (Wulff, 1979), the degree of difference had not reached the levels currently observed in some estates.

Have social mix objectives been achieved through tenure diversification?

While the idea of 'social mix' has generated considerable policy attention, there has been a noticeable lack of clarity about what the policy is supposed to achieve and, as Lambert (1979) pointed out twenty years ago, little empirical evidence in support the assertions that have been made, both in Australia and elsewhere. However, a number of studies have looked at this issue in recent years in the UK and the US and these are reviewed in this chapter.

Where commentators (Jupp, 1999; Forrest, 2000; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001a and 2001b; and Cole and Goodchild, 2001) highlight the objectives of social mix, they normally identify a range of potential benefits of diversification. In particular, diversification:

- Promotes greater social interaction and social cohesion;

- Encourages mainstream norms and values;

- Creates social capital;

- Opens up job opportunities;

- Overcomes place-based stigma;

- Attracts additional services to the neighbourhood;

- Leads to sustainability of renewal/regeneration initiatives;

Empirical research in the UK on the practice of tenure diversification appears, nevertheless, to be weighted against these outcomes.

For example, research questioned the extent to which tenure diversification has resulted in higher levels of social interaction between renters and owner-occupiers. Atkinson and Kintrea's (2001b) study of three diversified estates in Scotland, noted above, revealed that owners occupied largely different social worlds, spending much of their time away from the estates and using local facilities far less than renters. There was also little evidence of inter-tenure socialising (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001b). A similar picture can be found in Jupp's (1999) earlier study where it was found that 'most relatively new mixed estates were not characterised by inclusive social networks'. Only 20 per cent of respondents to a survey of residents said they would ask for help or advice from a resident of a different tenure and that 'no significant correlation was found between residents overall feelings about the estate and their perception of whether mix causes problems or not'.

Jupp maintains that street level mixing is better than zoning and claimed that the policy agenda should be to develop the positive features of community (1999). However, much of the tenure diversification that has occurred in the UK has resulted in the segmentation and division of neighbourhoods, rather than tenure integration within streets, often increasing rather than reducing division. Wood and Vamplew (1999) describe the experiences of regeneration in two neighbourhoods in the North of England where large sections of the existing stock had been demolished and re-developed by private builders and housing associations. In one area residents claimed that the occupants of the new houses were perceived as outsiders and therefore separate or isolated from the rest. The estate had, in effect, been cut into three segments and there were clear tensions between the owners, housing association tenants and council tenants. In the other area, which had undergone diversification somewhat earlier, the initial enthusiasm had dissipated as the value of private houses had dropped and growing numbers of private and housing association properties became empty, boarded up and vandalised (Wood and Vamplew, 1999).

While similar research in Australia has yet to emerge, there is, for example, evidence that existing residents resent the introduction of what they perceive to be more affluent households into their estates. Arthurson notes how an evaluation of a regeneration project in Adelaide found that public housing tenants were sceptical about whether homeowners would want to live next to them (Arthurson, 2002). This raises the question as to whether tenure mix helps to smooth the way to the development of integrated communities or exacerbates class differences. In reality, integration may lead to increased tensions rather than social cohesion or more harmonious integration.

The idea that social mix leads to the introduction of mainstream norms and values is predicated on the notion that the existing norms and values of public housing estate residents diverge from those held by wider society. This perspective stems from the largely discredited 'underclass' thesis – 'the poor are poor because they are morally inept' - popularised in the 1990s by Murray (1994). Most evidence suggests that values are in fact largely similar (Dean and Taylor Gooby, 1992), but even if there were differences, the argument would be refuted by the evidence noted above that tenants are largely isolated from the newer owner-occupiers on renewal estates. Similarly, the suggestion that social mix leads to the creation of social capital – normally defined, after Putnam (1995), as 'networks, norms and social trust that facilitate co-ordination and cooperation for mutual benefit' – could also be questioned on the same basis, notwithstanding the difficulties with the social capital concept itself (Fine, 2001).

The notion that tenure diversification opens up job opportunities rests primarily on the assertion that by introducing employed owner-occupiers into a neighbourhood, isolated tenants have the opportunity to broaden their employment horizons. The general thesis that personal networks are especially important to the poor in finding jobs is supported by labour market research in the US (Bauder, 2002). While there is some empirical evidence to show that there are reductions in joblessness associated with the introduction of owner-occupation, this is normally linked with the 'dilution' effect of importing employed people onto estates rather than through an increase in opportunities for unemployed tenants to access the job market (Tarlin, *et al*, 1999; Scottish Homes, 1999).

There is, in contrast, support in the UK literature for tenure diversification as a strategy for overcoming stigma (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000). This almost certainly emerges from the cogency of stigma as a neighbourhood effect. Several studies have highlighted the way in which postcode prejudice can operate to reduce employment opportunities and reinforce social polarisation (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001b), but the assertion that diversifying tenure will overcome this problem represents something of an article of faith. The concentration of public housing has not always resulted in stigma and exclusion from the workforce; rather it is increasing residualisation that has reinforced the stigma. As Wood and Vamplew (1999) have demonstrated tenure diversification on historically disadvantaged estates is not a sufficient condition for overcoming stigma. Continued residualisation may, however, make it a necessary condition. It should also be noted that where diversification might appear to succeed this might ultimately be due to the exclusion of certain sectors of the existing population (Cole and Goodchild, 2001).

A broadly similar point may be made in relation to the argument that tenure diversification attracts additional or improved services to a neighbourhood (Rosenbaum, *et al*, 1998) – an outcome that has, to date, not apparently been subject to empirical investigation. Arguably, additional private services will only be attracted if there is considered to be a market for their services and this depends therefore on the achievement of social mix. If stigma remains in these areas it is more likely that buyers will come from similar 'low-income' socio-economic groups to existing residents. In relation to public services, the argument could be reversed. Often specialist services are targeted directly at those localities with the greatest need. If tenure diversification changes the social mix and reduces the concentration of those in greatest need,

welfare resources and services might be lost, to the potential detriment of those disadvantaged households remaining in the area.

This discussion raises the question of sustainability. The idea presented in both Australia and Britain is that past programs have failed because they have been focussed on physical issues rather than the underlying social and economic causes of disadvantage. Promoting social mix together with other 'community building' initiatives, it is often argued leads to sustainable renewal (Schoon, 2001). The idea, in short, is that socially mixed communities are more likely to ensure that the 'gains' that have been made through physical renewal are maintained. This relates to the social capital argument mentioned earlier. Forrest notes, for example, that:

> Neighbourhoods where existing levels of trust and reciprocity are weak will lack the qualities which can create and sustain voluntary association and partnership (Forrest, 2000, p10).

The focus on community building is by no means unanimous, however, and a recent tendency is to question some of the underlying suppositions. Kleinman, for example, has questioned the usefulness of community facilities and self-help initiatives – in his terms, 'things which better off areas don't have, or don't have much of' - and questions whether social order requires social cohesion (Kleinman, 1998). This theme is also raised by Atkinson and Kintrea who suggest that community-based responses lead to 'unreconstructed' introspection. Despite their scepticism about the veracity of tenure diversification to tackle neighbourhood effects and despite seeing community participation as a means for the effective demand for more resources, they maintain that "a serious insistence on community based approaches is unlikely to favour what [they] believe to be the better approach of desegregation" (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001a, p30).

Nevertheless, a critical question in relation to many of the community building initiatives on Australian public housing estates also undergoing tenure diversification activity is the extent to which the latter actively contradicts the objectives of the former. Trying to build communities through the social and economic initiatives generally adopted in estate improvement programs while dismantling the existing community through redevelopment and dispersal is hardly conducive to achieving the usual goals of social and community capacity building *in situ*, but simply shift the problems to other areas. As Randolph has noted in relation to Australian urban renewal programs:

> Put simply, urban renewal programs address some of the physical symptoms of disadvantage but not the underlying causes – [the] social and economic marginalisation of the populations on these estates. In other words, these kinds of renewal schemes *improve the place but at the expense of the community* (2000, p11, original emphasis).

There are other potentially negative consequences of tenure diversification policies. The most obvious is the reduction of the overall supply of public housing that often results and the impact this has on both waiting lists and potential transfer opportunities for existing tenants. The former is probably the most pressing. However, no evidence as to the impact on waiting lists of tenure mix policies has emerged. The impact on the estates themselves while renewal is in progress and on the tenants who are either being decanted or worked around is a further short-term issue. In most cases, and certainly in Australia, the involvement of tenants in such renewal activity has been low, at least until recently (Wood, 2002). There have been few real opportunities to use renewal and diversification programs to promote the role of resident participation and engagement other than at a fairly low level.

The dispersal of tenants displaced as a consequence of the activity of renewal and redevelopment has already been noted. There may well be positive benefits from this, in terms of the greater access to the kinds of services and opportunities living in more 'balanced' communities may provide disadvantaged tenants, not least in simply living in a more 'normal' neighbourhood. Parry and Strommen's (2001) research in West Australia (noted above) offers support for this position, with the majority of tenants in their survey of renewal areas, including those who had moved away, reporting positive benefits of the process.

But as we have noted, these benefits have yet to be shown conclusively either in the UK or Australia. Indeed, Arthurson (2002) notes how relocated public tenants have experienced feelings of social isolation in some cases. At worse, relocated tenants may suffer greater levels of social exclusion from the new community they find themselves in compared to the more cohesive community they have been displaced from. All these aspects of the impact on tenants and potential tenants resulting for tenure diversification have yet to be fully studied. In those programs where stock is redeveloped but levels of public housing are retained, albeit at higher densities (for example, in the newly announced estate renewal proposals in NSW – see below) then these aspects of disruption may be lessened. But again, this need to be tested.

However, a very different line of evidence has emerged from programs to develop greater social mix, or to be more specific, greater dispersal of lower income households, in the United States. Social mix has been a dominant bipartisan approach in US social housing policy for some years, based on the emergent consensus in the early 1990s that concentration of poor households in distressed neighbourhoods, particularly those with high proportions of public housing, resulted in negative social outcomes (Schwartz and Tajbakhsh, 1997; Crump, 2002). These policies have been strongly associated with related welfare reform strategies, particularly aimed at *families* in receipt of welfare (predominately through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program).   Indeed, much of the debate on social mix approaches is conducted in the explicit context of the broader welfare reform debate and, in particular, children living in poverty and transition to work issues. This broader understanding of social mix as an element of welfare reform has yet to surface in Australia, in part, no doubt, due to the much less profound levels of neighbourhood decline found here compared to that experienced in the inner cites of the larger US cities from the 1960s onwards.   There has been a close link in the US literature to the notions of an underclass culture (Wilson, 1987). Social mix is also strongly related to notions that poor children benefit from growing up in a socially mixed neighbourhood, where role models among the working population offer alternatives to those experienced within the child's own family.

In the US there have been three broad 'solutions' put forward to the social problems resulting from the concentration of disadvantaged households in certain, largely inner city, areas (Shroder, 2001). These include:

- Programs to enable families living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods to move to neighbourhoods with low poverty rates – *dispersal* strategies;

- Programs to help promote the renewal of disadvantaged neighbourhoods – *mixed income* strategies.

- Programs to assist families in disadvantaged neighbourhoods to link to areas with employment opportunities – *employment* strategies.

Social mix programs refer to the first two. The first approach – dispersal – was piloted through the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program, a Federal program based on the earlier Gatreaux initiative, where a court ordered the Chicago Public Housing Authority to instigate a tenant dispersion program to counter the negative impact of living in highly disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Essentially, the Gatreaux program involved low

income Black families being provided with housing assistance to move to higher income, largely White, neighbourhoods in both the inner city and suburbs. MTO was launched when significant differences were observed between the employment and education outcomes of those families who had moved to the suburbs compared to those who moved within the inner city.

The US$234m MTO program is a pilot program, introduced in 1994 in five cites exceeding 350,000 people and within a larger metropolitan area exceeding 1.5m people, and with a strong in-built evaluation component (Stroder, 2001). The focus of the evaluation, to report in mid-2004, is on the long-term housing, educational and employment outcomes of the program. MTO recipients were given Section 8[1] housing vouchers, but were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The first group was directed to census tracts with less than 10 per cent of households at or below the poverty level, mainly in the suburbs, together with counselling in finding a place to rent. The second group received the vouchers but with no counselling and were given no geographical constrains on where they used them. A third control group of non-movers who continued to receive project-based housing assistance was also monitored.

Initial evidence from the pilots suggest that the suburban group fared much better in terms of feelings of safety and experience of crime, outcomes for youth, with lower levels of delinquency and behavioural problems, and had better expressed health outcomes. In addition research showed that welfare dependency fell faster in the suburban group compared to the control group of non-movers. In particular, the evaluation of the MTO pilot showed that the "experimental " group who moved to low poverty neighbourhood were more likely to report positive social outcomes compared with the other groups (Katz, *et al*, 2000; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2000). For example, while 64 per cent of both the control and experimental groups were on welfare at the time of their move, thirteen quarters later some 47 per cent of the control group remained on welfare compared with 34 per cent of the experimental group (Ludwig, *et al*, 1999). Other positive outcomes included lower rates of physical and mental health problems, lower levels of juvenile violent crime and behavioural problems, and higher degrees of parental involvement. The evaluation was set to continue for 10 years after the program started. It is envisaged that the longer-term impacts will be greatest for the children of the families involved in the pilot study.

The second approach to social mix in the US, that of introducing mix through the redevelopment of public housing, has primarily been achieved through the HOPE VI program, began in 1993. Here, severely disadvantaged public housing estates are in part or totally demolished and renewed using planning and implementation grants, while in some cases tenants are provided with Section 8 vouchers to allow them to move out into the private sector. Demolition to reduce physical concentrations of stock is a common approach, with renewal at lower densities. HOPE VI funding has been used extensively to create mixed income redevelopment, although the level of income mixing varies. The presence of higher income renters allows additional private finding to be attracted to the redevelopment, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits and bank mortgages (Schwatz and Tajbakhsh, 1997).

In addition to HOPE VI, other programs and policies, some locally generated, have stimulated social mix in new developments by including subsidised and unsubsidised tenants. These include changes in allocation rules to promote greater income mix among tenants, changes to Federal Housing Administration insurance rules to reduce barriers to the funding of mixed income housing, planning gain approaches (density

---

[1] Section 8 Vouchers are the primary assistance given to low income households to subsidise the rental of private rented housing in the US. The vouchers are tied to a household, not a property, and are portable to any location providing the rent of the property does not exceed that area's fair market rent level. The program is Federally funded but administered by local public housing authorities. Section 8 assistance forms the largest single form of US Federal housing assistance at the present time.

14

bonuses, inclusionary zoning, etc.), state and local housing programs that require mixed income occupancy as a condition of funding, often through tax-exempt financing, and a range of other funding arrangements and programs aimed at generating lower income housing, including schemes financed through the Low Income Tax Credit system (Khadduri and Martin, 1997; Swartz and Tajbakhsh, 1997).

The presumed benefits that flow from mixed income developments in the US closely parallel those cited for mixed tenure development in Australia. It is seen primarily as a tool to address problems surrounding the *culture of poverty*, changing the "social pathology" of low income neighbourhoods (Brophy and Smith, 1997). Behaviour pattern of low income households will be altered by emulation of higher income residents, employment rates will increase as non-workers enjoy informal networking with employed neighbours, crime rates will fall because higher income neighbours will demand better security, and low income household will benefit for the improved schools, services and local amenity that higher income households support. Some of these programs have been evaluated.

In a study of 9,200 mixed income multifamily Federally funded housing projects, Khadduri and Martin (1997) conclude that successful mixed income housing was more likely to succeed in low poverty neighbourhoods than in high poverty areas. They also conclude that mixed income projects might work in high poverty areas only where market conditions mean there is little alternative accommodation for working households, or where recent immigrants are willing to rent assisted housing in poor areas as a first rung on the housing ladder.

The evaluation of the Lack Parc Place renewal scheme in Chicago by Rosenbaum, *et al* (1998), where a large public housing estate was redeveloped with 50 per cent of units set aside for households with one working adult and incomes between 50 and 80 per cent of the area median, drew mixed results. Rosenbuam *et* al tested three propositions: whether there was increased social interaction between the low and moderate income groups; whether moderate income groups actively contributed to the support of management outcomes; and whether there was a positive effect on employment outcomes for low income tenants. While the project did succeed in attracting moderate income residents and broadly similar proportions of both groups participated in the maintenance and upkeep of the property, low income residents were more likely to interact with neighbours than the moderate income group, and employment rates fell among both groups after moving in.

Swartz and Tajbakhsh (1997) argue that the success of socially mixed development is critically dependent on a large number of factors: the location and size of the development, its design, condition and amenities and other social and demographic attributes (ethnic composition, for example). Any one of these could militate against a successful outcome in terms of attracting higher income residents. The state of the local and regional housing market was also an important factor. The opportunity of alternative accommodation for these groups will affect demand, and mix will be difficult to achieve in weak markets. However, they concluded that the evidence for the success of project-based social mix renewal had yet to be established.

Discussing the factors that make for successful mixed income non-public development, after a review of seven multi-family mixed income developments in seven metropolitan locations, Brophy and Smith (1997) emphasise the effect of location on successful mixed income development. The stronger the local housing market, the better chance mixed income developments will succeed, as middle income market rate renters have fewer alternatives. Design quality, high quality management and maintenance and strong financial viability were also very important. They also found that the level of interaction between different income groups in these development was "minimal". The need not to overload schemes with lower income tenants who might affect marketability has forced many developers to provide only minimal amounts of affordable housing.

Mixed income also worked best where the social mix attributes were downplayed during marketing, and quality of dwellings was comparable throughout the development – subsidised units should not stand out. Moreover, it appeared that mixed income housing was more difficult to manage when there was a rather abrupt division between low income renters and market rate renters. Schemes seemed to work better where middle income earners were present, not just the poor or the working population. They conclude that upward mobility of low income residents needs more than just social mix, but rather activities that are specifically aimed as creating opportunities for these residents to gain access to jobs and higher incomes. Finally, social mix is also less likely to deliver positive outcomes in those neighbourhoods where property management cannot set local behavioural norms.

While much of the literature on mixed income programs has centred on evaluations of the supposed benefits to residents, which, as we have seen, is often far from clear cut, others have proposed more fundamental critiques of these policies. Crump (2002), for example, argues that such policies have served simply to obfuscate the social and political drivers behind poverty and the run down of welfare provision that result in spatial concentrations of disadvantaged in poor neighbourhoods. In doing so, these polices represent simplistic and deterministic solutions to the problem of entrenched poverty, without ever attempting to overcome the fundamental drivers of poverty and exclusion.

The benefits to landlords

Much less attention has been paid in the academic literature to the benefits to landlords of adopting tenure diversification policies. This is perhaps surprising, given the importance of asset management as a key stimulant to estate renewal. In a recent study in the UK, Martin and Watkinson (2003) surveyed a sample of local authorities and housing associations to establish the proportion of social landlords who have adopted tenure diversification strategies in the last decade. They found over half those that responded to the survey reported that new estate developments were being built on a mixed tenure basis. Overall, over 90 per cent said they "always, usually or on occasion" promoted mixed tenure on existing estates, often associated with regeneration activity.

Tenure diversification therefore appears to be widespread in the UK. However, and tellingly, they found that among local authority landlords, asset management strategies were the dominant drivers to tenure diversification on existing estates. These drivers included the need to respond to falling demand for public housing, the desire to avoid the high costs of major repairs, or to reduce housing management problems. The potential benefits in terms of greater social sustainability were largely reported as "add ons" to support the asset based intentions. On the other hand, housing associations landlords were more likely to report that social objectives were central to the reasons they committed to tenure mix approaches. This difference in perspective may stem from the fact that local authorities are often faced with major repairs costs for old and run down housing, while the housing association stock is usually more recent and less subject to major repair problems. Nevertheless, both types of landlord reported benefits, typically in terms of improved local property prices, higher satisfaction ratings among remaining tenants, reduced turnover, increased demand for lettings, and reduced stigma or increased reputation of the estate. However, empirical evidence for these beneficial effects is not presented.

In addition to the survey of social landlords' diversification policies, Martin and Watkinson also report on the SAVE (Selling Alternate Vacants on Estates) program launched in 1997 by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust in which every other vacancy on the Trusts York estates have been sold, either at full market rate or on a shared ownership basis (Martin and Watkinson, 2003). This program was initiated specifically to stimulate greater socials mix. The resulting property prices showed an 88 per cent

increase in five years, compared to 36 per cent increase in the Yorkshire and Humberside area overall. Interestingly, the Trust sells the properties with a perpetual covenant which prevents the property being let, to ensure the stock does not simply revert to low income rental, and also includes a clause giving the Trust right of first refusal on any resale within 21 years. In this way, the Trust retains some control over what happens to the property, at least in the medium term. In general, the Trust reported significant social benefits in this program, although empirical evidence for this is, again, not presented.

In the US, similar supply side drivers are evident. Khadduri and Martin (1997) note that the problem of expiring federal subsidy programs in the 1990s forced the issue of the costs of long term maintenance onto the agenda for public housing authorities in the US, prompting a call for the disposal or market leasing of stock as a response. In addition, the introduction of higher income rent payers into the public stock able to pay unsubsidised rents makes financial sense for public landlords, allowing cross-subsidy to flow to lower income tenants. This issue is also mentioned by Schwartz and Tajbakahsh (1997) who note that some proponents of socially mixed development assume that such schemes require a smaller public subsidy than traditional public housing. However, there appears to be little published US research into the specific financial or management benefits that public landlords have gained from renewal activity leading to social mix.

The evidence to date on the impacts of tenure diversification and social mix policies in public housing estates is therefore mixed at best. Moreover, the complexity of the social processes and outcomes that are associated with this policy leaves researchers wishing to examine the policy of tenure diversification in a conceptual minefield with a range of issues that need to be clarified before any realistic evaluation can be made. The final section of this chapter aims to raise some of the more obvious conceptual problems.

Other conceptual problems with tenure diversification research

A significant issue to be addressed in studies of tenure diversification is the clarification of the objectives of the process and an understanding of what outcomes would be deemed to show the process has been successful. Some of the issues surrounding this question have already been alluded to above. What, for example, would constitute an acceptable social mix and what would a balanced community actually look like? In fact, there is substantial doubt as to whether social mix does lead to greater social cohesion. Cole and Goodchild (2001) have suggested that it is equally possible to argue that more mixed neighbourhoods result in greater social tensions. Homogeneous communities may well exhibit higher levels of social cohesion. This raises the important question of what would constitute 'social cohesion'? Kearns and Forest have, for example, suggested that the term 'social cohesion' is often used in a nebulous way:

> … the impression is given that everyone knows what is being referred to. The usual premise is that social cohesion is a good thing, so it is conveniently assumed that further elaboration is unnecessary (Kearns and Forrest, 2000, p 10).

Nevertheless, they list what they consider to be the constituent dimensions of social cohesion:

- Common values and a civic culture;

- Social order and social control;

- Social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities;

- Social networks and social capital;

- Territorial belonging and identity.

Their conclusion, however, is far from salutary:

> A city can consist of socially cohesive but increasingly divided neighbourhoods. The stronger the ties which bind local communities, the greater may be the social, racial or religious conflict between them. The point is that social cohesion at the neighbourhood level is by no means unambiguously a good thing. It can be about discrimination and exclusion and about a majority imposing its will or value system on a minority (Kearns and Forrest, 2000, p 20).

This raises an important question: is social cohesion the objective of tenure diversification and if so what type of cohesion? This question relates to current debates about the strong and weak ties that exist between individuals and social groups, originally proposed by Granovetter (1972). The notion is that weak ties, often outside of the immediate vicinity, provide crucial information (such as job availability) and link close-knit groups to the wider society. In the social capital discourse this is frequently referred to as 'bridging' rather than 'bonding' capital (Winter, 2000). If this issue is to be addressed empirically it will be necessary to tie the concept down, yet some commentators question the feasibility of doing so (for example, Fine, 2001).

A more fruitful avenue may be to explore the ultimate aim of the regeneration, of which tenure diversification strategies are a part. The notion of sustainable renewal/regeneration, in particular, needs to be examined closely. Most commentators now accept that neighbourhood effects, discussed above, are only part of the broader problem of inequality. This reflects earlier social policy dilemmas. As Forrest notes, the emphasis on 'neighbourhoods that don't work' might lead to the re-emergence of the structural perspective put forward in the various Community Development Projects in the UK in the 1970s (CDP, 1976; Forrest, 2000). Atkinson and Kintrea also preface their comments about neighbourhood effects with a restatement of the structural source of the problem – neighbourhood effects they suggest simply serve to 'further intensify' the disadvantage created beyond the neighbourhood (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001a). Elsewhere, they opt for a 'middle-range' position that asserts that both structure and agency are important influences on neighbourhood problems (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001b). This bifurcation is pivotal to the whole neighbourhood renewal agenda. What is the relationship between local intervention and structural problems? Community development has struggled with this issue since the 1970s (Popple, 1995; Ife, 1995). The problem with the social capital/ cohesion axis is that it denies the power relationships that reinforce the social polarisation that it seeks to remedy. Studies which aim to examine the contribution of tenure diversification to the process of renewal need to critical examine the relationship, if any, between the establishment of social mix and the empowerment of disadvantaged communities.

There are clearly limits to how this current research project can and should address these conceptual issues. It is not our intention to consider the issue of the structural determinants of disadvantage and exclusion. Neither do we intend to explore the details of social cohesion or the role of neighbourhood effects in the process. These must await further research. Our task is much more immediate, that of exploring the objectives and outcomes of the various tenure diversification policies that have been introduced in Australia. Our research method limits the study to a qualitative review of these outcomes from the residents and stakeholders rather than a thoroughgoing testing of the various benefits of the process that have been proposed. Nevertheless, the above discussion has highlighted a number of important conceptual issues that will need to be borne in mind during the research project and which point to further research in this area.

3 TENURE DIVERSIFICATION POLICIES IN PRACTICE

While the main subject of this research project is the recent practice of diversifying through the sale of stock and land for redevelopment, the following review places this in the context of various programs that, over the years, have in some way broken up concentrations of public housing in Australia. Reference is also made to similar policies and practices adopted in the UK and the US. The most significant factor in transforming the tenure make up of public estates, for example, has been the policy of permitting and encouraging individual tenants to purchase their homes through sales policies (Hayward, 1996). Clearly, this history of sales is a policy inspired and perpetuated by the notion of home ownership as 'The Great Australian Dream' (Kemeny, 1983), and one that has come to the fore several times during the development of the public housing system in Australia since World War II. As such, the tenure diversification policies of the last decade can be seen to have been an extension of this long-standing policy focus.

Policy approaches to tenure diversification

At this point it may be useful to clarify the range of policies and programs that could be classified as approaches to tenure diversification. While state housing authorities (SHAs) in Australia have been involved in most of these at one time or another, others have been more prominent in overseas contexts. Together they represent a continuum of policies that can broadly be considered to contribute to tenure diversification in neighbourhoods or estates which are or have been predominantly built by public landlords.

Property sales

The longest standing form of effective diversification on larger estates has been through the sale of public housing to individual tenants. This policy has been actively transferring stock out of public ownership in Australia since the 1950s (Hayward, 1996) and is comparable in outcome to the Right-to-Buy sales policies introduced in 1980 in the UK, especially in terms of the removal of the most economically able households and more desirable public stock from the sector (Forrest and Murie, 1983). While this has not been seen in term of a diversification policy *per se* in terms of the general objectives discussed above, it nevertheless should be seen as a major form of tenure diversification. The extent to which it has led to social mix is questionable, however. Given sales were predominantly to sitting tenants, then there would be no immediate impact on social composition of the area. Over time, if the home buyers remained economically active while remaining public tenants (especially the new allocations) became increasingly characterised by high dependency levels, then this policy might have aided retention of economically active residents in the estate. However, those who bought in the past thirty years and who have not moved on will now be ageing and generally unlikely to have substantial incomes; neither will they generally own property with high value, given its location. In addition, it is likely that on-sales have been to households with moderate or low incomes or the properties may have passed to private landlords who will be letting to households with characteristics not dissimilar to those of many public tenants. The extent to which general sales policies have led to significant social mixing, other than where sales have occurred in high value areas and of more desirable stock, then the impact on social mix, is likely to have been limited in most cases.

Stock transfer

Transfer of property (either of title or management) to other, usually social, landlord has played a small role in the Australian tenure diversification policy mix to date. In NSW, for example, the management of some public tenancies have been transferred to community housing associations in recent years, of which the most prominent is the

transfer of stock in Claymore in Campbelltown to Argyle Housing Association (NSW OCH, 1999). More recently, the NSW Office of Community Housing has been allocating numbers of new stock in redevelopment sites to housing associations, although this is mainly to assist in the growth of the sector rather than to pursue diversification *per se*. Queensland has experimented with the transfer of housing management to private real estate agencies in recent years, although at this point of the research, little information on this initiative has been gathered. However, the main impact of these management transfers will have been minimal in terms of their social mix outcomes, as the tenants will almost certainly be eligible for public housing and therefore add little to the social mix of the area.

The situation is different in the UK, for example, where a fifth of the pubic housing stock has been transferred to the ownership of registered social landlords in the period from 1989. This represents a major shift in the ownership of the social housing stock in the UK. However, whether this has resulted in significant social mixing is another matter, especially as the stock has been transferred with the sitting tenants and waiting lists intact.

Spot Purchase (salt and pepper)

Since the 1960s at least in Australia, there have been moves by state housing authorities to purchase new property in smaller blocks or single dwellings on new estates or in areas with low numbers of public housing in order to broaden the range of stock available and to diversify into new areas where public housing has not been built in large numbers. This policy may not be specifically initiated to achieve social mix objectives, but is usually seen as a way of expanding social housing in new development areas. This policy of spot purchase acquisition will undoubtedly be associated with a greater spatial mix of tenants within the general housing stock. It may be that these policies have indeed been accompanied by the kinds of positive neighbourhood effects for those tenants who have been allocated this property. However, there appears to be no research that has tested this outcome to date. In the UK, pepper potting social housing tenants among the stock in newly developed estates which are otherwise sold to home owners has been a common approach and some evidence has emerged to support the notion that this form of diversification has proved more successful in achieving social mix objectives than developments that segregate public and private residents to separate precincts on estates (see below).

Segmented estate development

This approach, common in both Australian and UK involves the diversification of the stock within a new or redeveloped estate through the development of tenure specific sub-areas. Typically in this form of diversification, estates incorporate areas transferred to private developers for on-sale to homeowners. In this approach, separate areas of the estate being renewed are redeveloped or refurbished for sale to homeowners and others that are distinct from those areas retained for public or community housing tenants. In this way, separate tenure based precincts are created within the renewed estate. This model of diversification has been prominent in West Australia, South Australia and Queensland, and appears to be the preferred model for estate renewal being introduced in NSW.

Tenure diversification policy in Australia

Assistance for home purchase was added to the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA) in 1956 and this resulted in the widespread sale of public housing to tenants and a depletion of housing stock. Hayward (1996) describes how these changes allowed States to use Federal funds to finance the sale of public housing into home owners. Prior to this time the CSHA had made sales difficult by requiring the full value of the loans to be re-paid at the time of the sale. Hayward suggests that the sales policy was picked up enthusiastically by the States and notes that, by the end of

the 1960s, almost 90,000 CSHA dwellings had been sold. Clearly, this has had an impact upon the nature and density of the tenure although the picture varies from state to state with South Australia and Western Australia maintaining higher proportions of public housing from the 1960s onwards (Hayward, 1996). As with similar sales policies exercised through the 'Right to Buy' in the UK since the 1980s, it is clear that the practice not only depleted the stock but also removed much of the better stock, leaving higher proportions of obsolete and poorer quality stock (Lee, 1986).

While sales policies continued unabated through the 1960s there was a brief but important reprise for public housing during the early 1970s. The Henderson Report into poverty found that public housing assistance was poorly targeted and did little to benefit the poorest households (Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, 1975).   Measures were taken to build up public housing stock partly as a response to this and other poverty studies. The 1973 CSHA attempted to focus more on those in greatest need. Federal funding was increased for new developments and broadened to include the purchase and renovation of existing properties (sometimes referred to as 'spot purchase') and stricter means tests were also applied to target provision at those who were in greatest need. There was also an attempt to restrict sales, but a loophole enabled sales policies to continue until the early 1980s (Hayward, 1996).   In NSW, certain 'super lot' estates were, however, effectively excluded from the sales policy by making sub-division difficult through the provision of common services (Woodward, 1997; Randolph, *et al*, 2001).   But while some SHAs continued to build large outer suburban housing estates during the 1970s, this policy had been effectively abandoned by the 1980s, in line with, and reflecting, the emergent neo-liberal political agenda (Hayward, 1996). The net result was that:

By the early 1990s, the face of public housing in Australia had undergone a rapid change. In the space of only two decades, public housing had for the first time genuinely become welfare housing (Hayward, 1996, p27)

It was in this context that concern first appears to have been expressed about the increasing concentration of social disadvantage in public housing estates. Prior to this time, States had expressed apparently paradoxical positions in respect of the social mix of estates. During the 1960s, for example, SHAs chose not to increase the rents of those whose economic position had improved after being allocated a property as they wished to encourage a better 'income mix' in public housing (Hayward, 1996). It was expected, however, that more affluent households would eventually choose to move into owner occupation because of the 'modest' nature of public housing. This position was reflected in the statements of the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) at a Housing Ministers' Conference in 1970:

> … rental houses [are] not unattractive but very modest, and as they are basically in the industrial areas it is usually found that when the family moves up the social scale the attitude is, 'It is about time we moved somewhere else, to be among right-thinking people'. (Jones, 1972, p24)

In fact, the combined pressures of increasing poverty, reduced funding, declining stock, needs based allocations and market forces resulted in an increased concentration of the most marginalised in the least desirable public housing estates.

At the same time, there was a growing awareness that the asset management policies pursued by state housing agencies in the period up to the 1990s had failed to address the increasing problems of maintenance and major repairs. In a period of financial pressure on capital allocations and a declining income base (as a result of greater targeting and income related rent policies), the failure to effectively plan for life cycle costs of managing the stock began to be felt (Commonwealth of Australia, 1993; Mant, 1992). Concern over the value of the asset base also came to the fore, as it became clear that the value of much of the stock was being held back by deteriorating stock

conditions and inadequate maintenance programs, compounded by mounting social disadvantage associated with the larger estates. The push to maintain and enhance the asset base was related to the increased adoption of rationalist perspectives towards public assets promoted by Federal and State Treasuries throughout this period. With a move to market rents as subsidy benchmarks from the mid-1970s, it was only logical that public housing itself would be increasingly viewed as an asset which must be seen to be performing well in a market context. As with any other class of landlord, concerns over asset values among public landlords have become paramount.

In addition, from the early 1990s, with the election of right of centre governments in a number of states, there was a clear political agenda aimed at reducing the proportion of stock held in public ownership. This was seen as not only as a political desirable outcome in itself, thereby reducing public ownership, increasing private sector involvement and encouraging 'choice', but also a way to assist in uplifting the asset value of the remaining stock in the areas where diversification was introduced and generating equity for state treasuries, some of which could be reinvested in diversifying the remaining public stock to better reflect changing demand of public housing tenants (both locationally and demographically). The latter issue has been a particular problem as capital funding has declined further. In these states, the renewal of estates therefore became associated with notions of asset farming and the freeing up of value to assist in stock reconfiguration programs.

The growing awareness during the 1990s of the developing physical and social problems associated with concentrated public housing on ageing larger estates has been charted by Spiller Gibbins Swan (2000). These *estates* varied from broad hectare low-density housing to high-density high rise in the major cities. While the report notes that much of the concern over the larger estates focused on the problems caused by high concentrations of public housing, such as stigma, low satisfaction rates, high levels of social disadvantage and dysfunction, and housing management problems, the main objective of renewal policies, whether based on maintaining or disposing of stock, was seen as enhancing property values.

The report also suggested that there was a desire to maintain and increase stocks in the two most populated states (NSW and Victoria), both with proportionately low levels of public housing while there was a perceived surplus of stock in other jurisdictions. It is notable that diversification policies have recently come to the fore in these two states as asset management polices have emerged as dominant drivers to restructuring the larger estates.

It seems clear, therefore, that in several states from at least the early 1990s, and now, more latterly in nearly all states, tenure diversification polices have been closely underpinned by concerns over the asset base of the sector, and the declining capital resources available to both maintain and restructure the stock. In several states, a clearly political agenda has also driven the policy towards property sales and redevelopment of estates.

Diversification and tenure mix in the UK

Tenure diversification policies have also been adopted, albeit in different policy and housing contexts overseas. Perhaps the most relevant to the Australian context is the evolution of tenure diversification policies in the UK which over the last twenty years has progressively moved from programs aimed at stimulating sales of public housing to individual tenants at discounted market prices (through the Right-to-Buy policy), through sales at market prices and low cost home ownership programs as central components of regeneration activity, to large scale transfers of public housing to other social landlords.

The initial impetus towards what in effect was a tenure diversification policy in the UK public housing sector, although not conceived as such, can be dated to the introduction of the 'Right to Buy' policy in 1980. This is not generally understood to have been a mechanism for achieving social mix. Indeed, evidence from the UK context suggests that 'Right to Buy' policies have had a different effect, ensuring that the more desirable estates or property, often with higher proportions of employed tenants, have achieved high levels of sales, whereas 'lower status' estates have had a more limited take-up. While, Forrest suggests that social polarisation of the public rented stock would have taken place regardless of the 'Right to Buy', it is clear that the policy has facilitated the filtering process resulting in increased homogeneity, rather than heterogeneity, in both the desirable and undesirable remaining public housing estates (Forrest, 2000; Malpass and Murie, 1999).

However, the net effect of this policy has not been to dramatically alter the social composition of the larger estates, as sales were to sitting tenants in the first instance. Increasing social mix, in contrast, requires the inward migration of those who would not otherwise have become residents on the estate. However, this should be distinguished from gentrification *per se* which leads eventually to the displacement of the original population altogether (Cole and Goodchild, 2001). It is rarely the case that whole estates are sold to households with distinctly different socio-economic profiles. A minority of public tenants usually remain in situ. It should be noted that evidence for major social changes over time on public housing estates through on-sales to higher income or different social groups has not been forthcoming.

The real impetus to tenure diversification policies in the UK came later in the 1980s with the switch to housing associations as the major provider for new social housing and the introduction of 'tenants choice' as a mechanism for speeding the transfer of public housing to alternative landlords. This became closely linked to the focus on the renewal of public housing estates using the mixed funding arrangements of the Housing Act 1988 and other competitive urban renewal funding sources (such as the Estates Renewal Fund and Single Regeneration Budget initiatives). Together with shared ownership sales policies which also developed as central government initiatives during the 1980s (King and Randolph, 1995), new approaches to renewing run down estates through a mix of public and private investment, and involving housing associations as the principle renewal vehicles, began to radically transform many disadvantaged estates as the 1990's progressed. Here, renewal typically took the form of redevelopment and refurbishment of the existing public housing stock, with a resulting mix of tenures: housing association rental, public rental, shared ownership and outright market sales. In most cases, however, social rental remained a substantial proportion of the outcome.

The emergence of mixed tenure estate redevelopment as a result of new housing policy interventions was paralleled by national planning policy guidelines that stipulated that quotas be set for the provision of affordable housing in new private sector developments in those areas where a need could be shown. Tenure mix became a mainstream approach to the provision of new and redeveloped housing estates across the UK. The tenure mix effect of these policies were also enhanced by the "Do-it-Yourself Shared Ownership" program (where prospective buyers chose their homes for purchase by shared ownership on the open market) and the spot purchase programs funded by central government to support the construction industry during the housing crash of 1992-93 (the Housing Market Package). Although the latter programs were relatively small, they nevertheless had the effect of dispersing social housing among the general housing stock.

A concern about the need to ensure a more balanced social mix on public housing estates has grown steadily in the UK since it was popularised by the influential Joseph Rowntree Report 'Building for Communities' by David Page (Page, 1993). Writing in a period in which housing associations had become the main new providers of 'social housing', Page noted:

> The development of large new estates which house seriously disadvantaged tenants on low incomes is creating unbalanced communities and the likelihood of expensive social problems in later years (Page, 1993, p4).

Page claimed there should be a greater mixture of housing and household types in order to ensure that vulnerable and disadvantaged people find support. "The aim", he maintained, "should be to achieve a social mix on the estate that reflects, as far as possible, the balance of household types, incomes, numbers of children and people from racial and ethnic minorities found in the wider community" (Page, 1993, p5).

This concern with neighbourhood effects has subsequently emerged in the British New Labour policy agenda. Initially promoted by the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU, 1998), which was established shortly after the 1997 election victory, the principle of 'social mix' is now evident, to varying degrees, in a series of policy documents across the UK. In England, the 2000 Housing Green Paper (UKDETR, 2000a) proposed planning for mixed housing in existing and new developments and recommended that housing authorities should be encouraged to promote greater social diversity by amending their allocation policies. Recent national planning guidance also promotes the creation of 'mixed and inclusive' communities (UKDETR, 2000b). Scottish Homes (the National Housing Agency for Scotland) revised its statement of purpose to include, in addition to the provision of good quality housing, the stimulation of 'self-motivated communities' (Scottish Homes, 1999), implying that the social dynamics of existing communities were at fault (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001a). Scottish planning guidance has, however, remained unchanged (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001a).

4 CURRENT TENURE DIVERSIFICATION POLICIES IN AUSTRALIA

State and Federal administrations have become increasingly aware of the problems associated with the concentration of disadvantaged households in particular neighbourhoods. This has stemmed from a growing body of research aimed at identifying 'communities in need' (Gregory and Hunter, 1995; NIEIR, 1999; Vinson, 1999) and an appreciation of the inter-connectedness of the problems experienced by residents in these neighbourhoods.

The strategies employed by housing departments to address these problems have been diverse, ranging from asset-based approaches involving disposal, sales and physical improvements to the housing stock, through alternative forms of housing management to community development and various attempts at 'whole of government' approaches Randolph and Judd, 2000a). The relative emphasis placed on these different elements has varied; some have been more asset-based and others more community or socially oriented. The trend both here and overseas has been towards holistic solutions with a greater emphasis on cross-departmental collaboration (Alterman, 1995; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000).

However, tenure diversification has largely been associated with predominantly asset-based approaches to the problems of the larger public housing estates associated with investment in the physical infrastructure – housing improvements and environmental work often rectifying design defects and addressing safety and security issues. A major strand in this approach has been the re-modelling of estates through demolition, sales and redevelopment.

Three states have pursued vigorous tenure diversification and estate renewal policies over the last decade: South Australia, Queensland and West Australia. Diversification policy in these states has normally involved the sale or transfer of stock or cleared sites to external developers, often in partnership arrangements with a private project manager who takes the lead in the renewal and marketing process. Unlike the UK where renewal has been primarily conducted with housing associations as the lead agents, in Australia the community-housing sector has only had a limited involvement, and only as recipients of property to manage once the redevelopment has occurred.

Notable examples of this strategy in Australia include various Urban Improvement Programs undertaken by the South Australian Housing Trust since the early 1990s, the New Living Program undertaken by the Ministry of Housing in Western Australia, and the Urban Renewal Program in Queensland (Arthurson, 1998). In New South Wales, where there are currently greater concentrations of public housing, a diversification program comparable to those in the three states being reviewed in this research project are only now being explored (NSWDOH, 2001). Similar policy initiatives are currently also being actively pursued in new regeneration policies in Victoria by the Office of Housing (2002). However, to date, these two states have only just begun an active redevelopment and tenure diversification policy of any scale.

The justification of social mix through tenure diversification

The relationship between tenure mix and social problems was first explored in some of the debates on public housing renewal that emerged during the Commonwealth's Better Cities Program in the early 1990s (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993) and the policy has become something of an established orthodoxy across the country as a whole. Concerns about the concentrations of public housing and the balance of the tenure mix are explicitly raised in the current Bilateral Housing Agreements[2] of

---

[2] The Bilateral Agreements that each State and Territory enters into with the Commonwealth of Australia under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement

South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory. While there is no direct reference to tenure diversification in the other Bilateral Housing Agreements all note the 'neighbourhood effect' problems associated with the concentration of disadvantaged groups such as welfare recipients, the unemployed and single parents (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000). Of those states which moved into tenure diversification at an early stage, only South Australia offers a justification for this policy in their bilateral agreement. This states, for example, that reducing concentrations of public housing and developing a greater mix of tenures avoids "compounding disadvantage through housing decisions" and that involving the private sector increases "opportunities for social and economic participation within disadvantaged areas" (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000).

More recently, the New South Wales Department of Housing (NSWDOH, 2001) has expanded on these arguments and the following two groups of interconnected points, among others, have been presented in support of renewal programs to reduce concentrations of public housing and diversify social mix:

1. The large-scale concentration of residents with severe disadvantage means that they see little of what life might be like in a more socially mixed neighbourhood. Where there are few people in the paid workforce, there are few, if any, models of the benefits of employment, both socially and economically.

2. Access to employment becomes even more difficult where there is little or no stimulus to the local economy from people in the paid workforce. The networks that are often vital to getting a job, do not develop where neighbours are not working. Personal contacts have been shown to be one of the main routes to a job for many people.

This justification of social mix policies resembles the arguments put forward by Page (1993) and others in the UK noted above. The NSW position is the most explicit statement to date of the supposed economic benefits for *existing* tenants of introducing redevelopment to increase the tenure and social mix on estates. This is important, because if redevelopment and tenure diversification policies are to be more than asset management strategies aimed at sustaining asset values, reducing housing management costs and funding stock diversification programs, then much will depend on whether these claims can be justified in reality. As we have already seen, there is some doubt as to whether these assumed benefits of social mix have been achieved in the case of some overseas examples. This is one of the key objectives this research project will test.

State policy review

At this point, we turn to a brief history and review of the main renewal and tenure diversification policies implemented in the four states which have been associated with arguments for greater social mix and that form the empirical focus of this research project: New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and West Australia. The review is necessarily constrained by the documentation that the project team were able to collect from state housing authorities in the time available. The coverage has been variable, with some states able to provide a greater range of material than others. It is hoped a fuller description of these policy interventions will be presented in the final report of the project.

New South Wales

The notion that public housing needs to be better integrated into surrounding communities goes back some twenty years in NSW. As Woodward notes, one of the objectives of the NSW Housing Act 1985 is "to encourage social mix and the integration of different housing [forms] in existing and need communities (Woodward, 2000, p.25)

The emergence of urban renewal activity in NSW since the early 1990s followed from the development of new 'service delivery structures' arising from the 'Mant Inquiry' in 1992 and the establishment of a more locally responsive regional management structure (Mant, 1992) While not mentioning large public housing estates *per se*, Mant recommended the Department consider the following initiatives:

- The redevelopment of Department owned land containing existing housing stock;

- The redevelopment of Department owned land to discreetly provide public/private tenure mix;

- The implementation of face-to-face coordinated management of tenants and the community;

- The initiation of sensitive estate redevelopment to reform the Department's management practices by combining stock and client service delivery.

These recommendations foreshadowed a major push to redevelop stock with a clear focus on a tenure mix. Part of the response to this report, the NSW DoH set up an Estates Improvement Program in 1995, followed closely by an enlarged Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) on 13 estates in 1996 (Randolph, *et al,* 2001; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). However, the move to estate redevelopment was not politically acceptable at the time, neither was it practical. Some of the most problematic estates had been developed as 'superlots' – the whole estate in one title, specifically to inhibit sales of stock. While the NIP focused on social and economic initiatives, it also involved a major investment program to restructure properties on a number of broad acre superlot estates to both reverse the socially disastrous 'Radburn' designed estates and to allow separate titling. In fact, Randolph, *et al* (2001) showed that the bulk of the $107m expenditure achieved under the NIP was employed in the physical reconfiguration activity. It was hoped that this would lead to a sales policy, following Mant's recommendations, but in the event delays in titling meant this was not achieved within the lifetime of the Program. In some cases, separate titling of superlots was identified as cost-prohibitive in some locations. Nevertheless, work to put the Department in a position to subdivide for separate title through "de-Radburning" and the realignment of service lines, when this is appropriate in market terms, continued in a number of estates beyond 1999, and some areas have been successfully re-titled.

However, social mix was not a prominent component of the NIP. In addition, a limited program of stock transfer to community housing associations has also been pursued to explore mixed management options (Darcy and Stringfellow, 2001). A small number of redevelopment sites continue to be used to transfer stock to housing, but while this program has been expanded in recent years, it still only represents a small contribution to mixed management on the larger estates.

The NIP was discontinued in 1999. In its place a Community Renewal Strategy (CRS) was developed which almost entirely focused on social and economic development (NSWDoH, 2001). The CRS sets out a vision for the estates that, among other things, the estates will: look more like the surrounding neighbourhoods; comprise well maintained properties; be managed flexibly at the neighbourhood level; be broken up and diversified to include private housing; and be the subject of agreements with key service providers, such as the Department of Community Services, local government and the police. There was a strong emphasis on 'normalising' estates and making them blend in with other residential neighbourhoods and that in some estates previous policies had created communities that had become isolated and dislocated. The initiatives that were being developed therefore aimed at "building communities that were more like other communities" (NSWDoH, 1999a). Interestingly, the Community Renewal Strategy recognises that the emphasis on physical solutions in the earlier NIP was not "necessarily appropriate and emphasises the importance of integrating employment and community development initiatives" (NSWDoH, 1999a, p7). The CRS

has, in its turn, been replaced and incorporated into a new Community Renewal Unit established in mid-2003. The focus of the new Unit is to develop the community renewal aspects of the DoH's current programs further.

Responsibility for drawing up proposals for the physical renewal of estates has now become a separate focus within the Department's asset management strategy. While the primary responsibility for this process rests with the Housing Services Divisions, in 2000 a new department within the DoH, named the Housing Finance Investment Group (HFIG), was charged with bringing forward plans for the comprehensive redevelopment of estates with the explicit intention of working with private sector partners to sell off land and property in order to fund the renewal of stock. In doing so, HFIG is attempting to do in NSW what the South Australian, Queensland and West Australian housing authorities have been doing for some years. At the time of writing (mid-2002) HFIG is actively engaged in masterplanned renewal plans in several DoH estates in Sydney, including Minto in Campbelltown. This policy was formally launched in mid-2002. The net effect of this strategy will be to break up the estates through sales of land for private sector redevelopment, while retaining some land on which replacement public stock, at higher densities and for smaller households, will be provided. In this way, the public stock renewal process would be self-financing. In effect, the HFIG initiative represents the implementation of Mant's 1992 recommendations on redevelopment and its focus on active asset management.

Queensland

Like other state housing authorities, the switch to an overt asset management approach evolved in Queensland in the early 1990s. Facing a backlog of maintenance and repairs and poor forward works planning, a new asset management approach was introduced in the early 1990s to address these issues. A Housing Improvement Strategy was introduced at this time to increase the appropriateness and distribution of the stock, promote the greater integration of public and private housing, encourage housing diversification and target under utilised land and assets, including redevelopment opportunities. At this relatively early stage, then, aspects of tenure mix were acknowledged in the program (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993).

By the mid-1990s, however, following the policy lead of the then right of centre government, the Queensland Department of Housing (QDoH) formulated an explicit "Social Mix Checklist" which stated that the concentrations of public housing in any one estate should not exceed 20% – although the document stressed that implementation should be interpreted flexibly based on local circumstances (QDoH/LGP, 1994; Arthurson, 2002). The program was specifically aimed to reduce the concentrations of public housing to more "acceptable" levels through active involvement of sales of renovated and redeveloped stock into the private sector.

In Queensland, unlike the NSW NIP approach which had tried to integrate physical and social initiatives in the same program, a clear dividing line emerged between 'Urban Renewal', which sought to achieve physical redevelopment and a targeted tenure mix, and the more recent "Community Renewal" program, launched in 1998, that focuses much more on social and economic development initiatives and is related closely to wider crime prevention strategies (Judd, *et al*, 2002). The QDoH has been the lead agency for both programs, but they have been managed by separate sections within the Department.

The Urban Renewal program was intended to rejuvenate the physical environment of selected public housing estates, principally thorough the upgrading and improving existing dwellings. A major objective was to turn around the negative image of these estates. Launched in 1993 in three estates, the program has grown to include seven other areas, while one of the earliest programs completed in 2001. By 2001, some $54m had been spent on renewal activity with a further $150m expected to be spent over the lifetime of the program (Walsh and Butler, 2001).

Urban Renewal aims to address the physical renewal issues in older housing estates with high concentrations of public housing. Property in these areas was in low demand, stock was ageing and the population was characterised by high levels of social disadvantage.

Specifically, the objectives were to:

- have a positive impact on the visual appearance and physical environment of the suburb and create an aesthetically pleasant and desirable residential environment;

- apply principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) in improvement process;

- reduce public housing ownership in the area by offering opportunities for home ownership at affordable prices to create a more balanced community profile;

- enhance the physical quality of housing by undertaking appropriate improvement works;

- provide increased choices in housing by realigning current housing stock to meet changing community needs; and

- create employment opportunities for local unemployed people through involvement on the capital works program (www.communityrenewal.qld.gov.au).

The emphasis is clearly on reducing concentrations of public housing, changing the profile of the stock, especially the development of smaller and larger dwellings and away from three-bedroom family homes, and general upgrading. Each renewal project was based around a Project Coordination Group that includes housing staff and local council officers. These groups have been active in managing the program and its rollout. While some of the earlier initiatives involved joint ventures with agencies such as the Defence Housing Authority and local authorities, on the whole they were single agency activities concentrating on physical improvement (QDOH, 2000b).

South Australia

From the mid-1980s onwards there has been a growing focus on urban regeneration in the larger public housing estates in South Australia. Dating from an investigation of the Public Accounts Committee in 1986, the South Australian Housing Trust refocused around a clear asset management strategy. In the first instance, this was primarily orientated towards the sale of land and renovated stock, although renewal programs have moved increasingly to incorporate community renewal activities (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). Renewal activity by the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) has been undertaken since 1987, with obsolescence of the existing stock a primary driving factor. The early initiatives, such as in Mitchell Park, Adelaide, focused on demolition and replacement of existing stock with new stock retained for rental. However, by 1990, the recognition that concentrations of public stock was part of the problem led to a switch to renewal for sale, deconcentration of stock ownership and renewal of public stock at higher densities. In many ways, this represented a return to the building for sale policy that had been an important component of SAHT's programs in the 1960s (Findlay and Bach 1993). In 1991 following senior management changes, the Trust set up an asset management unit charged with developing asset strategies which aimed to enhance asset performance, develop asset management polices, explore new opportunities for alternative financing and a consolidated balance sheet for the housing portfolio (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993).

The subsequent program has been explicitly an asset based one, with 'land farming' (exploiting undervalued land) as an underlying rationale. Projects have been devised to be self-funding – sales of land and stock will fund the overall costs of the renewal program, including the upgrading of remaining SAHT stock. To stimulate sales, mortgages were provided under the SAHT's Homestart shared equity mortgage scheme in which the State government held up to 30% of the equity of the mortgaged property.

A rule of thumb ratio of 3.5 units lost for one new unit gained has been adopted. The program has been largely underpinned by a reliance on market forces to make the redevelopments financially viable. This has led to a loss of units in these areas, only partly offset in some cases by higher density redevelopment. Nevertheless, the early schemes in Adelaide were also seen as a way to intensify land use to support urban consolidation policies. A partnership approach has been developed with private sector companies project managing the renewal and marketing process (for example, the Delphin Property Group has been active since the early 1990s) and local government has been involved in joint partnership arrangements in most cases. (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000).

The role of social mix in the process in these early projects is illuminating. Within an overriding rationale focused on asset farming, it was recognised at an early stage that a vital element in the process would be to ensure there was a change in the social make of the areas in order to sustain a saleable product. In fact, it is clear that changing the social mix was seen as an essential component of making the estates marketable than for any perceived benefit for the communities involved. For example, Findlay and Bach note that a key element in the renewal strategy for the Rosewood Village Demonstration Project in Elizabeth was to create "a fully marketed image with little or no association with public ownership" (1993, p47). They go on to list the benefits from the renewal process at Rosewood:

- A reduced Housing Trust tenant concentration in the area with a more diverse social mix;

- A better range of housing styles, home ownership and the associated benefits of improved area amenity;

- Gains to Trust property value resulting from area improvement and change in social composition, thereby reversing downward capital value trends in the area;

- Reduced maintenance costs on an ageing housing stock with the promotion of greater private ownership;

- The better use of infrastructure through greater urban consolidation, increased patronage of transport an community services; and

- The reduced requirement for welfare services and reduction of area of high concentration of households in stress.

This list does not suggest that the problems the community on this estate faced were to the fore in considerations of the social benefits of the process. However, as with other states, later projects have adopted a more holistic approach with the inclusion of economic development strategies to complement the physical renewal, together with other community and social development initiatives (SAHT/Pioneer Projects, 1996). More recent policy has emphasised tenure diversity and choice as a goal in itself (Planning SA, 1999).

Finally, there is some indication that there has been a notional tenure mix target to which the SAHT has been working. The feasibility study for the Parks Urban Renewal Project notes a target public housing proportion of 25 per cent at the end of the project in 2010, down from 60 per cent in the mid-1990s (SAHT, 1996). The Rosewood Village renewal project was expected to reduce the proportion of public housing from

50 per cent to around 11 per cent, the average for the state (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993). Similarly, in Mitchell Park the aim is to reduce the proportion of Trust stock from 75 per cent to 35 per cent. It does not seem, however, that there has been a formulaic approach to this, as in West Australia (see below). Rather the target mix ratios are set with regard to local potentials and opportunities.

Western Australia

Urban renewal in West Australia also has something of a history, dating back to the mid-1980s. This initial policy focused on the renewal of obsolete stock, much of it with asbestos or in poorly serviced locations without mains sewerage, or in hard to manage medium density blocks. The Redevelopment Strategy of this time aimed to achieve a number of objectives:

- To take advantage of excess capacity in both physical and social infrastructure;

- To reduce concentrations of public housing through sales of land and house and land packages to the private sector;

- To enhance the level of community amenity within and surrounding the redevelopment areas;

- To manage Homeswest's assets more efficiently by replacing older stock with a wider range of house types;

- To utilise well located land more efficiently through the provision of variable lot and unit sizes (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993).

Initially, sales to sitting tenants (aided by a mortgage support scheme) appear to have been a prominent element in the diversification process. An element in the policy was to assist in urban consolidation goals through higher density redevelopment. However, it is also clear from documentation at the time that increased social mix through tenure diversification was seen as one of the benefits of the activity, although not a primary goal, which remained essential one of asset management (National Capital Planning Authority, 1993).

The current urban renewal program in West Australia has been the Ministry of Housing's New Living Program. Developed from what was called the Estate Improvement Program of the early 1990s, the New Living Program was launched in 1995 in two Perth suburbs, Kwinana and Lockridge. The program was to be rolled out over a ten year period with an aim to upgrade and sell off ageing and obsolete public housing stock (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). In this respect, the New Living Program was a much more explicit tenure diversification and stock realignment programs the earlier Redevelopment Strategy of the mid-1980s.

The Program aimed to achieve the following, predominately asset focused, outcomes;

- Create more attractive living environment for tenants and the local community;

- Upgrade the existing stock and improve asset based strategies;

- Reduce the Ministry of Housing's rental presence within redeveloped estates;

- Reduce the stigma associated with estates with high concentrations of public housing;

- Increase property values;

- Encourage homeownership;

- Reduce crime and encourage revitalised community in the estates being renewed.

It is clear from this list that the underlying agenda is one of social mix through tenure diversification by property sales with implicit social outcomes to be achieved from the social heterogeneity this will produce. In addition, a specific target was set to dramatically reduce the public rental presence to around 12% in the suburbs overall – termed the "one in nine" policy.

Eight of the New Living projects are located in Perth and there are a further nine in country areas. In total the Program involves over 10,000 properties, which constitutes about a quarter of the total stock in West Australia (West Australia MoH, 2000). At one stage is was thought to be the largest public housing renewal program in Australia, with the metropolitan component of the program projected to cost some $323m in the period to 2008 (Parry and Strommen, 2001). In 1999 it won the prestigious World Habitat award for innovation and success in a human settlement project.

The New Living projects vary in detail but generally involve the refurbishment of Ministry dwellings for both sale and retention, the "beautification" and enhancement of infrastructure and environmental amenity in the estate, straightforward redevelopment of unwanted stock (including blocks of flats) and tenant relocation strategies to free up stock for renewal and sale. Sales policies have been supported by Ministry of Housing home ownership initiatives, such as Keystart, Right to Buy and the Aboriginal Home Ownership Scheme.

Homeswest has stressed the importance of working with local communities in improving the estates and to foster community involvement (Homeswest, 1999). The projects may, for example, include community development initiatives, the development of community centres, community houses and information offices. In one project a 'community consultative committee' was formed to discuss community development issues.

Public-private and joint venture partnerships have been a key feature of the scheme. These have involved local councils (who have been responsible for many of the environmental improvements), while a series of independent private sector project managers have been recruited to bring the projects forward and manage the renewal process. These have included McCusker Holdings Pty Ltd, Satterley Real Estate, Voran and the Fini Group. The project managers have themselves taken an active role in developing the marketing image and strategies for these estates, developing their own 'vision' as to the expected outcomes. For example, the McCusker-Satterley partnership stated their aim was to:

> ....establish attractive, safe, friendly neighbourhoods with a family oriented environment; where people will choose to live, feel safe and want to pursue local community activities, developing a strong sense of community spirit and pride; and a high level of private affordable home ownership (McCusker/Satterley, n.d.).

Clearly, there is little in this vision that equates with the provision of a social housing in its traditional form, and the public housing component of the final mix does not feature as a positive component.

Summary

In all the four states reviewed here, there has been a noticeable evolution of renewal policy from early schemes which essentially were attempts to get to grips with a situation of deteriorating and inappropriate assets in poor locations, or in locations that were under pressure for greater densities. All the programs of urban renewal reviewed here were basically predicated on asset management strategies in the first instance. In most cases, while there may not have been an explicit policy to redevelop for sale, certainly by the early 1990s this had become a major element of the policy equation. In many ways, this might be considered as simply a resumption of

longstanding build for sale and sales to tenants polices that had been a major component of most state housing authority's activities from the mid-1950s (Hayward, 1996). Sales in renewal areas were simply a continuation of such activity transposed to redevelopment estates. It is also clear that in some of the earlier renewal projects, the associated environmental improvements and 'beautification' strategies were essentially marketing strategies aimed to attract the new home owners who were expected to turn the estates around socially, rather then for the benefit of pre-existing tenants (although those who remained undoubtedly have benefited).

The focus on sales, in the first instance, appears to be predominately in order to realise asset values, to reduce densities of public housing and to implement policies which sought to 'normalise' the tenure mix in public housing estates, often associated with explicit targets to which the stock would be reduced in an area. The link between tenure diversification and social mix, and the assumed social benefits, was not necessarily present in the early formulations of these renewal programs, but has become a prominent theme in recent years. The more or less explicit connection between tenure diversification and the supposed benefit of social mix seems to have accompanied the broadening of renewal strategies to include a wider range of social and community renewal activities, especially since the mid-1990s. This implies that social mix has to been seen more in terms of the positive benefits it may generate for housing management problems on larger estates, than on concerns about 'balanced communities' *per se*. Moreover, it is not at all clear that social mix approaches have been justified on a clear evidence base as to the real benefits from this strategy for either remaining tenants or those displaced to other areas (presumably at lower densities of public housing).

From this review it is possible to suggest that the principle benefits of these strategies for housing authorities appear to fall into three broad areas:

Asset management benefits

- The ability to disinvest from stock that is perceived to be obsolete or with high maintenance costs (stock rationalisation).

- Portfolio reconfiguration, especially in terms of restructuring the stock mix and location to match emerging patterns of demand, often through a process called 'asset farming' where higher value stock is sold to generate revenue for new stock development (stock realignment).

Housing management benefits

- Reduced concentrations of public housing towards much lower 'average' levels across targeted suburbs (dispersing disadvantage).

- Improved housing management outcomes from a reduction of tenant based problems associated with larger concentrations of public housing (managing residualistion).

Social welfare outcomes

- Reductions in wider social expenditures on welfare support in the renewal areas (generating service efficiencies).

- Anticipated positive social outcomes for remaining tenants in communities with a more 'normal' social profile: reduced stigma, stronger social networks, improved access to services and employment (tackling social exclusion).

While all four states reviewed here have identified deconcentration and social mix through tenure diversification as a key asset strategy at some time over the past decade, in some of these, renewal programs have been accompanied by a more or less explicit policy of not only reducing concentrations of public housing, but also reducing the overall stock of public housing (at least up to the recent past). In others, there has either been a policy to use the receipts to reconfigure the public housing stock or to ensure the overall stock does not decline substantially, with a stated intention to reinvest in new housing stock in other locations, although it may not be possible to do this on a one-to-one basis. At this stage of the research, it has not been possible to assess precisely the balance of these approaches (reduction or reinvestment) in the four case study areas, especially given the recent changes in state governments in recent years. It is hoped to explore this issue during the research.

5 RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

The above discussion has highlighted a significant gap between claims for tenure diversification polices and the research evidence as to whether these claimed outcomes have been achieved. At best, it has been argued, that the research has shown mixed results, with some fairly clear benefits (e.g. reduction of stigma, asset farming) but with less clarity as to other outcomes (e.g. employment, closer community ties, social capacity building). From this review, a range of research questions has been identified for the focus of the present study.

As we noted in the Introduction, one of the key aims of the proposed research is to explore the extent to which the issues emerging from the UK and US experience which have been extensively reviewed in this Positioning Paper are applicable to similar developments in the Australian public housing system, and the policy and practice implications that flow from them.

Following from this, the key research questions identified for this project are as follows:

- What has been the extent of tenure diversification in public housing estates across Australia?

- How do these initiatives vary?

- What are the espoused objectives for this activity?

- Have the objectives of diversification been achieved, including the notion that tenure mixing has led to greater social mix and beneficial social interaction on these estates?

- What are the perceived benefits and/or disadvantages of diversification for both stakeholders and residents on estates where the policy has been implemented?

- What are the policy and practice implications that flow from the research findings for current and future diversification initiatives?

Fieldwork

It is proposed that quantitative and qualitative fieldwork be conducted in the four states (New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and West Australia) that have pursued varying approaches to tenure diversification (CSHA, 2000). The quantitative techniques will involve the analysis and comparison of data from the 1996 and 2001 Censuses and from a range of other secondary sources – such as internal state housing monitoring systems and reports. The aim is to secure a clear indication of the overall scale of diversification and the scale of change that has resulted from this activity. The qualitative techniques will include key actor interviews and focus groups in diversified study areas. The aim here will be to clarify the actual nature of any changes that have occurred, to ascertain how local people make sense of these changes and explore the extent to which this change might be attributable to tenure diversification. Importantly, this will clarify how any benefits of diversification have impacted upon images and perceptions.

There are, however, two serious methodological problems that need to be addressed if the particular benefits of tenure diversification are to be tested. First, it is necessary to confirm that a substantive change has occurred and, second, it should be confirmed that any actual or perceived changes might be fairly attributed to diversification rather than to other factors.

A major problem concerns the potential lack of baseline data prior to diversification. While it is anticipated that the state housing authorities will be able to provide some 'before and after' data on stock transfers, replacements and sales, other solutions will be pursued. First, as most of the diversification that has taken place has occurred since the mid-1990s it is proposed that the localities comprise Census Collector Districts (CDs) that had not been diversified at the time of the 1996 Census. This will permit the use of 1996 Census data as a baseline and allows direct comparison with the 2001 Census data. This type of comparison would be supplemented with other local indicators (crime stats and employment data, etc.) where these are available.

In an attempt to overcome the second problem it is proposed that *two* estates are identified in each state – a diversified 'study area' and a 'control area'. The aim will be to ensure that the study and control areas are as similar as possible (other than the level of diversification). This strategy will permit a comparison between study and control areas and will provide a clear indication of the distinct effects of diversification in relation to a range of key indicators derived from the Census and secondary sources for each area. Qualitative fieldwork will also be conducted in both areas to ascertain how current experiences differ in diversified and non-diversified localities.

The study will also examine perceptions of change. This is important as earlier studies indicate that 'images, attitudes and perceptions' of localities have a fundamental effect on the success or otherwise of regeneration initiatives (Forrest and Kearns, 1999; Dean and Hastings, 2000). If for example there has been a real reduction in crime, but this is not perceived, then an image of a locality continues to militate against the renewal initiative and the creation of 'more balanced communities'.

The triangulation of these methods, explained in more detail below, will allow the research questions to be addressed thoroughly and in a methodologically robust manner. A summary of the research methods, and their relationship to the key research questions, is provided in Table 1 below.

Selection of case study and control areas

The selection case study and control areas will be achieved through the careful analysis of Census and other secondary source data and through discussions with key stakeholders in each of the states. As mentioned above, it is proposed that the localities comprise Census Collector Districts (CDs) that had not been extensively diversified at the time of the census. Also, particular care will be taken to ensure that the changes that have occurred over the renewal period have not been clearly influenced by other interventions or by other significant local developments. These will be identified in discussions with local housing managers.

In order to ensure that the study captures the experience of diversification across Australia it is proposed that case studies should be located in the four States where tenure diversification has occurred. This number of study areas should also ensure that a range of examples is included. At this stage, for costing purposes, it has been assumed these will all be located in or near to the main metropolitan centres.

Key actor interviews

Key actor interviews will be conducted with up to four government staff and related professionals at state level in the four case study states. These interviews will also provide an opportunity to fully identify and secure all the documentary and statistical material that is available for each of the study and control localities. Interviews will be conducted with strategic and operational housing staff, involved in the development and implementation of tenure diversification and urban renewal.

The aim is to explore the policy objectives and practice experience of diversification and to establish the degree of fit between perceived benefits and perceived outcomes on the ground. This will aim to:

- clarify the policy objectives of tenure diversification;

- ascertain the scale of activity in each of the states and territories (numbers of estates and units involved and geographical location, sales and stock transfers achieved, dates of implementation and future plans, etc.);

- gain brief descriptions of the nature of diversification and the parties involved in any transfer/redevelopment of stock;

- secure documentary evidence, where it exists, for the objectives, scale and nature of intervention

- gain a perspective on the outcomes (advantages and disadvantages) attributed to the practice in relation to the key 'whole of government' and non-shelter objectives.

- Secure documentary evidence, where it exists, for the outcomes attributed to the practice in relation to the key 'whole of government' and non-shelter objectives.

Census analysis

Analysis and comparison of key socio-economic variables and crosstabulations derived from the 1996 and 2001 Censuses in both case study and control areas will provide a means of assessing the nature and extent of change that may reasonably be attributed to the practice of diversification. UFP already has access to the complete CDATA for 1991 and 1996 and CCD data for previous Censuses to 1981. 2001 Census data will be compared to earlier period for the following variables: individual age and gender, marital status, family type and number, count of dependent children, ancestry, birthplace, citizenship, language spoken at home (as demographic indicators) household income, economic activity and occupation, computer and internet use (as indicators of disadvantage), proficiency in English, highest level of schooling (as indicators of educational achievements) and various household dwelling variables including dwelling structure and tenure type. Comparisons will be undertaken between case study areas, control areas and broader metropolitan averages.

This analysis will contribute significantly to the objective assessment of: the extent of tenure diversification, the degree of tenure mix, the level of social mix and the degree of community 'balance'.

Focus Groups

Two focus groups will be conducted in each of the four case study areas (separate groups for homeowners and renters) and one each in the control areas. The focus groups provide a deeper understanding of the experience of living in a neighbourhood that has been the subject of diversification from the perspective of local residents

A professional market research company will undertake recruitment and arrangements for focus groups. Recruitment for the groups will be conducted by telephone with numbers drawn randomly based on address lists for the estates provided by the relevant housing departments. Project team members will moderate the sessions. Focus group discussions will be recorded and transcribed to facilitate subsequent analysis.

The key actor interviews and focus group sessions will be subject to textual analysis by the UFP research team in order to identify and make sense of emergent themes. The aim is not to make generalisations on the basis of a statistically reliable sample but rather to describe 'authentically', through a rigorous analysis of the text an understanding of the participants' experiences.

Table 1: Summary of fieldwork methods for addressing key research questions

Key Research Questions	Methods[1]				
	PLR	KAI	Census	SS	FG
Reviewing the extent of tenure diversification	X	X	X	X	
Developing a typology of initiatives	X	X	X	X	
Clarifying the policy objectives	X	X			
Policy outcomes:					
Asset management objectives achieved		X		X	
Housing management objectives achieved		X	X	X	
'Whole of Government' objectives achieved:					
Tenure mix		X	X	X	
Stock diversification/dispersal		X	X	X	
Housing management improvements		X		X	
More social mix		X	X	X	X
More interaction		X		X	X
Improved 'community' balance		X	X	X	X
Educational improvements		X	X	X	X
Reduced crime/anti-social behaviour		X		X	X
Reduced stigma		X			X
Improved non-shelter outcomes		X		X	X

[1] PLR = Policy and literature review, KAI = Key actor interviews, Census = Census, SS = Secondary sources, and FG = Focus groups

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper has highlighted the emergence and prominence of tenure diversification strategies in state housing authorities in recent years. It has noted the attraction of the associated notion of social mix in areas of high proportions of public housing and the long history of this concept in planning and sociological imaginations, as well as the range of positive social outcomes that are said to flow from greater social mix in lower income areas. However, it has also noted the weak evidence base for the principles upon which social mix policies are based. The literature examined demonstrates that most of the social welfare arguments put forward for tenure diversification lack hard evidence and, where they have been tested abroad, are open to question. It is hoped that some of these arguments, summarised in Table 1 above, will be tested in the current research project.

The review of state housing authority diversification programs has also pointed strongly to the underlying drivers of tenure diversification being essentially financial and based on explicit asset and housing management strategies, rather than for their expected social or community benefits.

A number of policy dilemmas emerge from this review, none of which will be rigorously tested in this research project. The most fundamental is that while tenure diversification polices may contribute to a reduction in stigma of an area and therefore make a positive impact for many residents, the social polarisation that has occurred over the last 30 years within the public housing sector as a whole is likely to continue unless the issues of inequality is addressed at a structural level, regardless of where public housing tenants live or in what degree of concentrations. Whether or not tenure diversification has a role to play in the renewal of the *community* of pubic housing tenants may well largely depend upon the extent to which the process facilitates structural change through local action.   This question is outside the scope of this research to assess.

Second is the issue of the threshold for social mix and the scale at which mix is measured. We have seen that several states have adopted explicit target tenure mixes for renewal estates. But does it even make sense to talk about appropriate threshold targets when there is no evidence to support for such a position and no understanding of the geographic scale this mix is to achieved? The current research does not attempt to examine this question either.

REFERENCES

Alterman, R. (1995) 'A Comparative View of Neighbourhood Regeneration Programs in Nine Countries: Are the lessons transferable?' in *Urban Affairs Review* Vol 30 No 5 749 – 765.

Amin, A., Massey, D. and Thrift, N. (2000) Cities for the Many, Not the Few, Policy Press, Bristol.

Arthurson, K. (1998) 'Redevelopment of Public Housing Estates: The Australian Experience' in *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1 pp. 35 – 46.

Arthurson, K. (2002) 'Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix: A critical relationship or tenuous link?' in *Urban Policy and Research,* Vol. 20 No. 3 pp. 245-261.

Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2000) 'Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts' in *Policy and Politics* Vol. 28 No. 1 pp 93 – 108.

Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2001a) Unpublished Discussion Paper 'Neighbourhoods and Social Exclusion: The Research and Policy Implications of Neighbourhood Effects', Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2001b) 'Disentangling Area Effects: Evidence from Deprived and Non-deprived Neighbourhoods' in *Urban Studies* Vol. 38 No. 12 pp 2277-2298.

Badcock, B. and Beer, A. (2001) *Home Truths: Property Ownership and Housing Wealth in Australia*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.

Bauder, H. (2002) 'Neighbourhood Effects and Cultural Exclusion' in *Urban Studies* Vol. 39 No. 1 pp 85 – 93.

Bell, E. M. (1942) *Octavia Hill,*: Constable, London.

Bell, N. (1983) Icing on the Cardboard Cake: A evaluation of the Mt Druitt Neighbourhood Development Project, 1979-83, Nigel Bell Evaluation, Sydney.

Bournville Village Trust (1956) *The Bournville Village Trust, 1900-1955*, Bournville Village Trust, Birmingham.

Brophy, P.C. and Smith, R.N. (1997) *Mixed Income Housing: Factors for success*, Cityscape, 3, 2, pp 3 – 31.

Bryson, L. and Winter, I. (1999) Social Change, Suburban Lives: An Australian Newtown, 1960s to 1990s, Australian Institute of Family Studies and Allen Unwin, Sydney.

Buck, N. (2001) Identifying neighbourhood effects on social exclusion, Urban Studies, 38, 12, pp 2251-2275.

Burbidge, and Winter, I. (1995) *Urban Housing Report, Australian Living Standards Study*, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Burbidge A and Winter I (1996) Investigating urban poverty: The impact of state intervention and household change. *Urban Policy and Research*, vol 14 no 2.

CDP (1976) *Whatever Happened to Council Housing*, National Community Development Project, Cooperative Press Ltd, London.

Cole, I and Goodchild, B. (2001) Unpublished paper 'Social Mix and the 'Balanced Community' in British housing policy – a tale of two epochs', Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield.

Cole, I. and Hunter, C. (2002) Unpublished paper 'Upsetting the Balance? Social mix, anti-social behaviour and 'vulnerable people' presented at 'Tensions on the Table: Neighbourhood support and Inclusion JRF Seminar, February 2002, Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield.

Commission of Inquiry into Poverty (Henderson Report) (1975) *Poverty in Australia: First main report*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Commonwealth of Australia (2000) *Commonwealth State Housing Agreement – Bilateral Housing Agreements*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Crump, J. (2002) *Deconcentration by demolition: public housing, poverty and urban policy*, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 20 (5) pp 581 – 596.

Darcy, M. and Stringfellow, J. (2001) 'Tenants' Choice or Hobson's Choice: A study of the transfer of tenanted dwellings from public housing to community housing in NSW' *UFP Research Paper No. 4*, Shelter NSW and Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney.

Dean, H. and Taylor Gooby, P. (1992) *Dependency Culture: The Explosion of a Myth*, Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester.

Dean, J. and Hastings, A. (2000) *Challenging images: Housing estates, stigma and regeneration (*Bristol: The Policy Press)

Ellen, I. and Turner, M. (1997) Does neighbourhood matter? Assessing recent evidence, *Housing Policy Debate*, 8, pp 833-866.

English, J. (1976) Housing Allocation and a Deprived Scottish Estate, *Urban Studies*, 13, 319-323.

Eversley, D. (1973) The Planner in Society: The changing role of a profession, Faber London.

Findlay, M. and Bach, D. (19993) South Australian case study: Rosewood Village Demonstration Project, Appendix 3 in *Restructuring Public Housing Precincts,* Occasional Paper Series 1, Paper 4, Report prepared for the National Capital Planning Authority for the Better Cities Program, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Fine, B. (2001) *Social Capital versus Social Theory*, Routledge, London.

Forrest, R. (2000) 'What constitutes a 'balanced' community?' in Anderson and Sim (Eds.) (2000) *Social Exclusion and Housing: Context and* Challenges, Chartered Institute of Housing Coventry.

Forrest, R. and Kearns, A. (1999) *Joined-up places? Social cohesion and neighbourhood regeneration* (York: York Publishing Service)

Forrest, R. and Murie, A. (1983) 'Residualisation and Council Housing: Aspects of the changing social relations of housing tenure', Journal of Social Policy 12 4 pp 453 - 68

Forrest, R. and Murie, A. (1990) *Residualisation and Council Housing: A Statistical update*, Scholl of Advanced Urban Studies, University of Bristol.

Forrest, R. and Murie, A. (1994) 'Home Ownership in Recession' *Housing Studies*, 9, 1.

Galster, G., Quercia, R. and Cortes, A. (2000) Identifying neighbourhood thresholds: an empirical exploration, Housing Policy Debate, 11. pp 701-732.

Granovetter, M. (1972) 'The strength of weak ties' *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 78 No. 6 pp 1360 – 1380.

Gregory, R. and Hunter, B. (1995) *The Macro Economy and the Growth of Ghettos and Urban Poverty in Australia,* Centre for Economic Policy Research, Discussion Paper No. 325, Australian National University, Canberra.

Gribbin, C. (ed) (1979) *Housing Research for Housing Authorities Paper 2. Planning presuppositions: Social Mix, a useful tool?* Proceedings of a Joint CSIRO-AHRC Seminar on Low Income Housing, 31 July 1978, Melbourne.

Gribbin, C. (1979) 'Introduction to Proceedings: Realities vs. dreams in planning residential mix' in Gribbin, C. (Ed.) *Housing Research for Housing Authorities 2. Planning Presuppositions: Social mix, a useful tool?* Proceedings of a Joint CSIRO-AHRC Seminar on Low Income Housing, 31 July 1978, Melbourne.

Hamnett, C. (1984) Housing the two nations: socio-tenurial polarisation in

England and Wales 1961-81 Urban Studies 43: 389-405

Hamnett C. and Randolph B. (1987) "Residualisation in Inner City Local Authority Housing: Camden and Lambeth 1971-81" in Clapham D. and English J. (Eds), The Future State of Housing, Scottish Academic Press.

Homeswest (1999) *Annual Report: 1998 – 1999,* Homeswest, Perth.

Hayward, D. (1996) 'The Reluctant Landlords? A history of public housing in Australia' in *Urban Policy and Research* Vol 14 No 1 pp 5 – 35.

Ife, J. (1995) Community Development: Creating community alternatives – vision, analysis and practice, Longman, Sydney.

Jones, M. A. (1972) *Housing and Poverty in Australia,* Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.

Judd, B., Samuels, B. and O'Brien, B. (2002) *Linkages Between Housing, Policing and Other Interventions for Crime and Harassment Reduction on Public Housing Estates*, Positioning Paper, AHURI, Melbourne.

Jupp, B. (1999) *Living Together: Community life on mixed tenure estates*, Demos, London.

Kamenka (1962) *Ethical Foundations of Marxism,* Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Kearns, A. and Forrest, R. (2000) 'Social Cohesion and Multilevel Urban Governance' in *Urban Studies* Vol. 37 No. 5/6 995 - 1017

Kemeny, J. (1983) *The Great Australian Nightmare*, Georgian House, Melbourne.

Katz, L., Kling, J. and Liebman, J. (2000) *The Early Impacts of Moving to Opportunity in Boston:* Final Report to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development..

Khadduri, J. and Martin, M. (1997) *Mixed Income Housing in the HUD Multifamily stock*, Cityscape, 3, 2, pp33 – 55.

King, N. and Randolph, B. (1995) *A Review of Shared Ownership in the UK*, Council of Mortgage Lenders, London.

Kleinman, M. (1998) 'Include Me Out? The new politics of place and poverty' CASE Paper 11, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.

Lambert, D. (1979) *Some practical difficulties of implementing social mix* in Gribbin, C. (ed) (1979) *Housing Research for Housing Authorities Paper 2. Planning presuppositions: Social Mix, a useful tool?* Proceedings of a Joint CSIRO-AHRC Seminar on Low Income Housing, 31 July 1978, Melbourne.

Lee, T. (1986) Public Sector Contributions to Home Ownership – The Role of the State Housing Authorities, *Urban Policy and Research, 4, 1.*

Leventhal, T and Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000) *Moving to Opportunity: What about the kids?* US Department of Housing and Urban Development research paper.

Ludwig, J., Duncan, G. and Pinkston, J. (1999) *Housing vouchers and Economic Self-sufficiency: Evidence from a randomized experiment*, US Department of Housing and Urban Development research paper.

Malpass, P and Murie, A. (1999) *Housing Policy and Practice,* Macmillan, London.

Mant, J. (1992) *Inquiry into the Department of Housing: Report of the Commissioner John Mant*, NSW Department of Housing, Sydney.

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

McCusker/Satterley, (n.d) *The New North: Building Better Communities, Perth,* McCusker/Satterley*.*

Morris, W. (1884) *A Summary of the Principles of Socialism,* The Modern Press, London.

Murie, A. (1991) Divisions of home ownership: housing tenure and social change, *Environment and Planning A*, vol 23, pp. 349-370

Murray, C. (1994) *The Emerging British Underclass*, Institute for Economic Affairs, London.

National Capital Planning Authority (1993) *Restructuring Public Housing Precincts*, Occasional Paper Series 1 Paper 4, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

NSWDOH (1999a) *Community Renewal: Building Partnerships Transforming Estates into communities,* NSW Department of Housing, Sydney.

NSWDOH (1999b) *Asset Management Plan 1999 – Edition 1*, NSW Department of Housing, Sydney.

NSWDOH (2001) *Community Renewal: Transforming Estates into Communities Partnership and Participation*, NSW Department of Housing, Sydney.

NSW Office of Community Housing (1999) in association with the Argyle Community Housing Inc. and the Department of Housing, *Home and Housed: Making Housing Management Work,* Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, Parramatta.

Page, D. (1993) *Building for Communities: A study of new housing association estates*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Page, D. and Broughton, R. (1997) *Mixed Tenure Housing Estates*, Notting Hill Housing Association, London.

Peel, M. (1995) Good Times, Hard Times: The Past and Future of Elizabeth, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.

Planning SA (1999) *A Better Place to Live: Revitalising Urban Adelaide. A Green paper on urban regeneration*, Department for Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts, Adelaide.

Popple, K. (1995) *Analysing Community Work: Its theory and practice,* Open University Press, Buckingham.

Power, A. and Tunstall, R. (1995) *Swimming Against the Tide: Polarisation or progress on 20 unpopular council estates, 1980-1995*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Putnam, R. (1995) 'Bowling Alone: America's declining Social Capital' in *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 6 No. 1 pp 65 – 78.

Queensland Department of Housing (2000a) *The Challenge to Lead and the Opportunity to Learn Through Community Renewal*, Occasional Paper 6, Queensland Department of Housing, Brisbane.

Queensland Department of Housing (2000b) Annual Report 1999-2000 Queensland Department of Housing, Brisbane.

Randolph B. (1991) "Housing Markets, Labour Markets and Discontinuity Theory" in Allen J. and Hamnett C. (eds) *Housing and Labour Markets: Building the Connections*, Unwin Hyman, London.

Randolph, B. (1999) 'Social residualisation and housing association tenants', Chapter 1 in *Tenant Profiles,* The Housing Corporation, London.

Randolph, B. (2000) *Community Renewal in Disadvantaged Areas*, paper presented at the Creative Approaches to Urban Renewal Conference, Shelter WA, Perth, 15 June 2000.

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000a) 'Community Renewal and Large Public Housing Estates' in Urban Policy and Research Vol. 18 No. 1 pp. 91-104

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000b) *Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*, Urban Frontiers Program for the South Australia Housing Trust and City of Salisbury, University of Western Sydney.

Randolph, B., Judd, B. and Carmichael, C. (2001) *Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program: Final Report*, Urban Frontiers Program for NSW Department of Housing, University of Western Sydney.

Rex, J. and Moore, R. (1967) Race, Community and Conflict: A study of Sparkbrook, O.U.P, London.

Robson, B. (1969) Urban Analysis: A study of city structure, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rosenbaum, J., Stroh, L. and Flynn, C. (1998) 'Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed-income housing' in *Housing Policy Debate* Vol. 9 No. 4 pp 703 – 740.

Sarkissian, W. (1976) *The Idea of Social Mix in Town Planning : An Historical Review*, Urban Studies, 13, 231-246.

Sarkissian, W. and Heine, W. (1978) Social Mix: The Bournville Experience, Bournville Village Trust, UK.

Saunders, P. (1979) Urban Politics: A Sociological Interpretation, Penguin Books, London.

Schwartz, A. and Tajbakhsh, K. (1997) *Mixed Income Housing: Unanswered questions*, Cityscape, 3, 2, pp 71- 95.

Schoon, N. (2001) *The Chosen City*, Spon Press, London.

Scottish Homes (1999) *Assessing the impact of tenure diversification: the case of Niddrie,* Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.

Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Bringing Britain Together: A national strategy for neighbourhood renewal* Cm 4045, The Stationary Office, London.

South Australian Housing Trust (1996) *The Parks Urban Renewal Project: Investing in People, Housing and Land,* South Australian Housing Trust, Adelaide.

South Australian Housing Trust (1998) *Draft Asset Plan 1998-99 to 2002-03*, South Australian Housing Trust, Adelaide.

South Australian Housing Trust (2000) *Annual Report 1999 – 2000,* South Australian Housing Trust, Adelaide.

Spiller Gibbin Swan (2000), *Public Housing Estate Renewal in Australia*, Australian Housing Research Fund, Brisbane.

Stegman, M. (1998) *The Challenge of Revitalising Social Housing in the United States*, Paper presented to the National Urban Renewal Seminar, Adelaide.

Stroder, M. (2001) *Moving to Opportunity: An experiment in social and geographical mobility*, Cityscape, 5, 2, pp 57 – 67.

Stubbs, J. and Storer, J. (1996) *Social Cost Benefit Analysis of NSW Department of Housing's Neighbourhood Improvement Program*, Prepared for the NSW Department of Housing South West Sydney Region.

Tarlin, R., Hirst, A., Rowland, B., Rhodes, J. and Tyler, P. (1999*) An evaluation of the New Life for Urban Scotland Initiative,* Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.

UK Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions (2000a) *Quality and Choice for all: The Housing Green Paper,* DETR, London.

UK Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions (2000b) *'Housing' Planning Policy Guidance Note 3*, DETR, London.

Victorian Office of Housing (2002) *Neighbourhood Renewal: Growing Victoria Together.* Victorian Government Department of Human Services, Melbourne.

Vinson, T. (1995) *Waterloo Community Survey: Preliminary Findings,* School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, Kensington.

Vinson, T. (1999) *Unequal in Life: The distribution of social disadvantage in Victoria and new South Wales,* Jesuit Social Services Inc., Melbourne.

Walsh, P. and Butler, K. (2001) *Transforming Places, Engaging People: Community Renewal Evaluation Main Report,* Queensland Department of Housing, Brisbane.

Webster, D. (2000) Targeted local jobs: the missing element in Labour's social exclusion policy, *New Economy*, 6, 4, pp 193-198.

West Australia Ministry of Housing (2000) *Annual Report 2000,* Ministry of Housing, Perth.

Wilson, W.J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Winter, I. (2000) 'Social Capital and Public Policy in Context' in Winter, I (Ed.) *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia,* Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Winter, I. and Stone, W. (1998) *Social Polarisation and Housing Careers: Exploring the interrelationship of labour and housing markets in Australia*, Working Paper No. 13, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Winter, I. And Stone, W. (1999) Social polarisation and housing careers: Exploring the interrelation of labour and housing markets in Australia, in O'Connor K. (ed) *Houses and Jobs in Cities and Regions*, University of Queensland Press for The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Brisbane.

Wood, M (2002) Resident Participation, AHURI, Melbourne.

Wood, M. and Vamplew, C. (1999) *Neighbourhood Images in Teesside: Regeneration or Decline*, York Publishing Service, York.

Wood, M. (Forthcoming) 'A Balancing Act? Tenure diversification in Australia and Britain' Accepted by *Urban Policy and Research*.

Woodward, R. (1997) Paradise Lost: Reflections on Some Failings of Radburn, Australian Planner, 34 (1).

Woodward, R. (2000) *Community Renewal in South Western Sydney: Social Inclusion, The Quiet Revolution in Public Housing*, paper presented at the Creative Approaches to Urban Renewal Conference, Shelter WA, 15 June 2000, Perth.

Wulff, M. G. (1979) *The location of public hosing estates and the social integration of residents*, in Gribbin, C. (ed) (1979) *Housing Research for Housing Authorities Paper 2. Planning presuppositions: Social Mix, a useful tool?* Proceedings of a Joint CSIRO-AHRC Seminar on Low Income Housing, 31 July 1978, Melbourne.

AHURI Research Centres

Sydney Research Centre
UNSW-UWS Research Centre
RMIT-NATSEM Research Centre
Swinburne-Monash Research Centre
Queensland Research Centre
Western Australia Research Centre
Southern Research Centre

Affiliates

Northern Territory University
National Community Housing Forum