

Governing through Community?

A Comparative Study of Changing Management Practices in Mixed Tenure Housing Development

Conference paper to be presented at:

Comparative Housing Research –

Approaches and Challenges in a New International Era

TU Delft, Netherlands

23-25 March 2010

Nick Bailey and Tony Manzi

University of Westminster

Architecture and the Built Environment

35 Marylebone Road

London, NW1 5LS

baileyn@westminster.ac.uk

manzit@westminster.ac.uk

Please do not quote without the authors' permission

Introduction

In the past two decades there has been a gradual shift in the dominant style of housing management from a regulatory, rule-based approach to a more flexible community-orientated style which is predicated on the engagement and support of local residents. This trend is particularly evident in the UK where there has also been an increasing emphasis on creating mixed tenure, socially diverse sustainable communities. Thus instead of large, mono-tenure housing estates of social or owner-occupied housing, national policy increasingly favours full integration of well designed housing to meet the needs of all income groups and household sizes. In response to this trend, new forms of housing and estate management are emerging which provide a single set of standards for all tenures and which increasingly encourage social interaction and community engagement as essential elements of more responsive management processes. Evidence is emerging of similar approaches in a variety of advanced economies such as the Netherlands, USA and Australia, although a full comparison, taking into account different national policy contexts, has yet to be carried out.

This paper explores the conceptual underpinning of 'community governance', the process by which the social life of areas and neighbourhoods is managed and enhanced through both directly engaging local residents and by applying the techniques of community development. The paper considers how these processes have been applied to the management of mixed tenure developments in the UK drawing on three main case studies prepared by the authors for a series of reports (Bailey et al, 2006; Bailey et al, 2007; Urbed, 2007). The paper then conducts a scoping exercise of relevant literature from other advanced economies to see how far these common themes can be applied on a broader comparative scale. The conclusions discuss how far a convergence is developing in relation to the management of mixed tenure developments in different countries and whether the social science concepts identified provide a sound base to explain current trends and likely outcomes.

Theoretical framework: Communitarianism, social capital and governmentality

The concept of community governance draws extensively on several theoretical debates in the social sciences, as well as a long history of experimentation in policy making and professional practice. It is not possible to go into these debates in any great detail here except to outline three fundamental concepts, which have particularly informed the construction of sustainable communities. These are: *communitarianism*; *social capital* and

governmentality. All three concepts have proved particularly attractive to policy-makers because they appear to offer straightforward prescriptions about how to achieve balanced, stable, cohesive and harmonious communities. Yet all three are contested and lack clear measureable definitions.

Communitarianism has been highly influential in shaping approaches to contemporary housing practice, in placing a strong emphasis on the responsibilities of citizens as much as rights of residents. Individual interests are subject to collective norms based on mutually-agreed value-systems. Based on the work of Etzioni (1993) communitarianism has proved attractive in its appeal to the importance of moral conduct, challenging the methodological individualism of classical liberalism whilst simultaneously rejecting appeals to centralised state intervention. Communitarian welfare policies stress the importance of conditionality and the necessity of communal interdependence founded upon joint co-operative principles founded on reciprocity, trust and 'co-production' (Boyle and Harris, 2009). According to this approach, rather than relying on 'top-down' administrative organisational structures, neighbourhood governance is more effectively delivered by those with day-to-day practical, hands-on experience. This approach has exercised a profound influence in shaping strategies to tackle neighbourhood anti-social behaviour; community members are encouraged to act as 'eyes and ears on the street' as they are better placed to identify and report incidents, as well as identifying possible solutions and preventative strategies.

The influence of communitarianism has led to considerable debate about its implications for urban governance (see Flint, 2004). For example some have commented on the implications of 'enforcement-led' policy approaches which have led to: the criminalisation of minor infringements; the advent of a surveillance culture; initiatives which are particularly 'tough on youth'; certain accountability deficits, in particular the view that anti-social behaviour 'only occurs on social housing estates'; 'folk devils' and 'moral panics' (Cohen, 2002) about certain forms of behaviour and the notion of 'deviancy amplification' (Cooper, 2005) which exaggerates the behaviour of 'outsider' groups. Notwithstanding these criticisms, these resident-led principles have underpinned much contemporary housing practice.

The second main influence upon community governance is that of *social capital* which has variously been described as 'slippery' (Johnson & Percy-Smith, 2003: 322) and subject to 'conceptual stretch' (Putzel, 1997: 940). Bourdieu (1997) defines social capital as 'the

aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to a durable network of more or less institutionised relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition' (1997: 51). While Bourdieu sees social capital as a benefit accruing to individuals who engage in social relationships, Putnam (2000) sees social capital 'as a property of communities, cities and even nations' (Johnson and Percy-Smith, 2003: 324). On the other hand, Fukuyama (1997) locates the origins of social capital within human behaviour as demonstrated by reciprocity. Thus while social capital has much currency as a concept its origins, distribution, and means of development are hotly disputed by scholars. Not surprising therefore that politicians and policy-makers in different tiers of government (Halpern, 2005: PIU, 2002) often overlook these differences and argue that 'social capital should be seen as giving policy makers useful insights into the importance of community, the social fabric and social relations at the individual, community and societal level' (p.73). Hence, building social capital is often an essential ingredient in plans and strategies advocating regeneration, community development and stronger, more cohesive communities, such as in new housing development. Those on the right tend to accentuate the importance of the family and 'a collective moral order....around traditional values' (Johnson & Percy-Smith, 2003: 332) while those adopting a neo-liberal 'third way' see social capital as 'the key to effective citizenship, enhancing participation in public deliberation, reducing social exclusion and revitalising civil society' (p.332).

The third main influence upon contemporary community governance is that of *governmentality*, based on Foucault (1979) but subsequently developed by Dean (1999), Rose (1996), Flint (2002) and others. Governmentality refers to government as the 'conduct of conduct', or the various ways in which agencies attempt to direct the behaviour of individuals and groups for specific ends (Foucault, 1982). It is a concept that is interested in identifying the distinctive 'rationalities of government' (Foucault, 2007), that is the systematic ways of thinking about problems to be addressed, means by which they can be solved, actors and identities involved and goals sought in so doing (Dean, 2009, p.188). Rose argues that governments have exploited the language of community politics and the active citizen to refigure the practices of government away from the 'social' in favour of 'community' (Manzi & Jacobs, 2009: 275). Governmentality implies that there are limits to government and part of its purpose is now to encourage others, such as the private sector, citizens and community groups, to play a more active part in the delivery of programmes for regeneration and renewal.

Governing is therefore achieved through 'indirect mechanisms' (Miller and Rose, 1990) that instrumentalize individual capacity for self-governance (Cheshire et. al., 2009: 657). Governmentality can be seen as 'an exercise of power that seeks to shape a specific form of freedom by means of close supervision and detailed administration of the individual, rather than through freedom itself' (Dean, p.180); this can be seen as representing an emergence of authoritarian liberalism, manifested through emerging identities incorporating active, entrepreneurial consumption and responsibilized, duty owning community membership (Flint, 2003: 625).

The above concepts can help to explain the way in which community governance has been appropriated by politicians and policy-makers to develop an agenda of responsibilities, to develop new forms of social capital and to exert more effective indirect control over urban areas. Thus the changes in practice in the delivery of housing development and management can at least in part be explained by more structural shifts in the role of the state and governance practices. The top down, bureaucratic approach has largely been replaced by a greater emphasis on the rights and responsibilities of residents, building more cohesive communities and the state promoting resident-managed initiatives to improve living conditions and to promote 'moral' and ethical codes of behaviour. These notions have a particular bearing on the management of mixed communities as will be shown below.

Managing Mixed Tenure Housing: The UK Context

Whilst the intention to ensure neighbourhood diversity is not a new departure in UK housing policy – it can be dated back at least to Housing Minister Nye Bevan's post war vision of creating 'the living tapestry of a mixed community' (Foot, 1973: 78) – the objective was given fresh impetus in the late 1990s with the development of policies based on the notion that 'communities function best when they contain a broad social mix' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000: 53).

More recently the concept of integrated mixed tenure developments have been strongly advocated by the Urban Task Force (Urban Task Force, 1999, 2005), the Urban White Paper (DETR, 2000), the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (SEU, 2001), the Sustainable Communities Strategy (ODPM, 2003) and the Local Government White Paper (CLG, 2006). The latter recommended that local authorities act as strategic enablers and 'place-shapers';

applying land-use planning mechanisms to achieve sustainable outcomes often interpreted in housing terms as socially, economically and culturally mixed communities. The Urban Task Force in particular advocated building new housing developments on brownfield land, at high densities and with the full range of community facilities in such a way that they would be aesthetically pleasing, environmentally sustainable and support cohesive communities. These principles were gradually incorporated into government policy statements (DETR, 2000; ODPM, 2003) until by 2006 the creation of 'sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas – both urban and rural' was one of four overriding aims of planning policy (CLG, 2006: 2). In the period of economic growth and rising house prices up to 2008, a significant number of mixed tenure developments were constructed through consortia of private developers and registered social landlords (RSLs), or through social and affordable housing negotiated through section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. In addition, it soon became apparent that effective management systems, covering all tenures and based at the local level, are required from the start of the development to ensure long-term sustainability (Urbed, 2007: 56).

Over time, the policy has shifted from meeting the basic objective of providing high quality housing in places people wanted to live to the much wider role of community building: creating resilient communities based on extensive community involvement as well as addressing social problems that in the past had been the responsibility of housing managers and community development workers. It is often argued by private housebuilders and RSLs that if new housing developments are to remain attractive to all social and income groups they should demonstrate all the attributes of sustainable communities and that problems of community care, anti-social behaviour and ethnic and racial tensions should be eradicated or at least managed to minimise their impact. There is also substantial evidence that various filters are employed to ensure that potentially disruptive tenants are excluded from mixed developments (Flint, 2006; Manzi, 2010).

These changes have been manifested most clearly in a neighbourhood agenda which has two specific goals: firstly, to develop democratic voice, scrutiny and power for local people and secondly to improve neighbourhood service delivery and the local public realm (The Young Foundation, 2005, p.1). This agenda is often portrayed in the notion of 'neighbourhood management' (rather than traditional housing or estate management) (Power and Bergin,

1999). The idea of neighbourhood management incorporates a range of principles including: Someone with overall responsibility at local level; community involvement from the outset; a systematic, planned approach to tackling problems; effective delivery mechanisms and commitment from service providers (Taylor, 2000; Duncan and Thomas, 2001). Central to the model is the emphasis on 'joined-up' partnership working and effective, 'holistic' coordination of mainstream service delivery. Equally important is an emphasis on community governance, through effective caretaker services, systems for inclusive resident involvement in decision-making, mechanisms to extend the influence of community groups, capacity building initiatives and effective communication structures. Neighbourhood management commonly involves features such as: an 'on-the-spot' presence; neighbourhood wardens and 'super-caretakers'; neighbourhood or community forums; community-led management boards; neighbourhood agreements; area coordination initiatives; service level agreements and devolved service budgets.

In the UK this neighbourhood management system has been promoted by writers such as Power (1999) who argued that a model of successful change required a 'varied patchwork of solutions, a local focus, community involvement, collective provision, outside support and strong links with the city' (p.402). These approaches are seen as particularly significant in new mixed tenure developments, where there is a need to exert effective control over a range of income groups and tenancy types. However, the notion of community governance is not specific to UK housing policy. It has emerged in both continental Europe, the US and Australia as an effective means to manage contemporary housing, particularly within the context of mixed community initiatives, as the later case studies will show.

Case Studies: Managing Mixed Tenure Developments in the UK

This section briefly discusses some of the informal approaches to community governance in three recent developments in England and Scotland and illustrates how the conceptual categories of communitarianism, social capital and governmentality have influenced housing management practice through the development of different mechanisms to consult and engage residents in decision-making, to informally 'police' the neighbourhood and utilise a variety of community-based activities to address the needs of particular sections of the community and improve the management of their neighbourhoods.

The case studies discussed here have all been planned and constructed by consortia of public and private stakeholders, were all constructed in the past 15 years and involved a wide range of public and private stakeholders. Many of these cases involve the regeneration of large council housing estates, but the same approach can be applied in other locations (as the example of Caterham Village demonstrates). Stakeholders felt it important that these partnerships continue to work together and provide a consistent and uniform management system throughout the area. In particular there are clear responsibilities for management and maintenance, a set of shared objectives for the estate and full involvement of service users and residents were seen as important to success.

Caterham Village is a former military barracks, which lies a few miles south of London in Surrey. A private developer (Linden Homes) was successful in purchasing the site on this basis, and engaged in a process of consultation that resulted in a proposal to increase the housing stock while retaining a range of community facilities. The 23 hectare site was bought by Linden Homes in 1997 and architects were appointed the following year to carry out a community participation process and to prepare a master plan. Guinness Trust was selected as the RSL and the local authority ensured that certain protected features of the area were transferred to the Caterham Barracks Community Trust. By 2003 366 housing units had been completed of which 27.5% was for social renting. Many of the historic buildings have been restored for residential use and the Trust has ensured that they provide immediate benefits to local residents.

The planning process began in 1998 when 1000 people attended a planning weekend organised by Linden Homes. This led to a revised masterplan, which included more housing, the restoration of some of the buildings and the provision of community facilities. This willingness to listen to local opinion meant that residents felt a sense of ownership from the beginning. Planning permission was eventually agreed in 1999 for 345 houses (subsequently increased to 396), of which almost a third was for social renting and special needs provided by the Guinness Trust. The council negotiated a 'Section 106' agreement, linked to the planning permission, which ensured that substantial land and buildings were retained for community benefit. The Caterham Barracks Community Trust was established in 2000, whose brief was to create and manage a wide range of sports, leisure and recreational activities are available, as well as an enterprise hub for small businesses. All residents pay a service charge

based on the value of their property and this is used to provide a consistent level of service, particularly for landscaping and parks.

The site now includes a number of community facilities and services, alongside the housing and health and fitness centre developed by Linden Homes. Examples include: a youth project with skateboarding facilities; a nursery; a General Practitioners' (GP) surgery and pharmacy; a veterinary service; office facilities; and an Arts and Recreation Centre. There is also a care home and sheltered accommodation, both privately owned, and a supermarket. Open space was also built into the design, incorporating many original features such as the village green and cricket pitch. This development can be used as a model for sustainable development for the future.

Ardler Village lies on the outskirts of Dundee in Scotland and was constructed in 1965-74 as a council estate of 3000 dwellings including six high-rise blocks of one and two-bedroom flats and several four-storey blocks and inter-linked maisonettes. A number of shops, schools and community facilities were provided in the centre but by the mid-1990s the whole estate had deteriorated. The city council carried out a wide-ranging consultation exercise with local residents and in 1998 consortia of architects, RSLs and developers were invited to submit proposals for the redevelopment of the Village. In December tenants voted to transfer the estate to Sanctuary Scotland Housing Association (SSHA).

From the beginning and throughout the development phase there was a strong commitment to consultation. The Ardler Village Steering Group was made up of tenants and residents who participated fully in the development of the masterplan. Tenants and Residents of Ardler (TARA) continued to represent all tenures and maintained regular consultative meetings with SSHA. TARA's meetings are open to all residents and it regularly campaigns on local issues and runs social events for groups such as pensioners. A key objective for the association is the integration of new residents regardless of tenure. In 2003 the Ardler Village Trust (AVT) was set up with the aim of promoting social, economic and community regeneration. Funding for the trust was secured from the European Union, the Scottish Government and the SSHA. Membership is open to all residents over the age of 16 and six residents are appointed as directors on the Trust's board. AVT promotes and engages in all aspects of community life: it organises job fairs, develops sports provision, arranges social and community events, has created apprenticeships and full-time posts, helps provide commercial and retail space and is actively engaged in managing and improving the environment (Bailey et al, 2007: 73). A

healthy living initiative has been running since 1998 and this provides a valuable link between healthy eating, stress management and the provision of community-based health services.

The third example is Craigmillar, which is a large council-owned peripheral estate to the south east of Edinburgh. It is currently undergoing a major regeneration project led by a special purpose vehicle called PARC (Promoting and Regenerating Craigmillar). A major partner is the EDI Group, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Edinburgh City Council. Approximately 1000 new homes are planned of which about 20% will be for social renting in addition to existing flats and houses which are being refurbished. Residents are actively involved and consulted at all stages.

The Craigmillar Housing Area Board was established in 2004 and included representatives from residents' organisations, local councillors and officers from service providers. In addition an allocations agreement was drawn up and signed by the Craigmillar Regeneration Forum, the Craigmillar Neighbourhood Alliance, the City of Edinburgh Council and local RSLs. The agreement aimed to identify issues and recommended solutions which all could sign up to. These included: up-to-date information, lettings plans, involvement in allocations, vetting and probationary tenancies, and anti-social behaviour. The result was a 'sensitive lettings' policy which avoided inappropriate lettings, for example to those with disorganised lifestyles which might challenge their neighbours. Through this process residents were consulted about the standards which incoming residents would be expected to achieve.

An important innovation in Craigmillar is the appointment by the city council of community safety concierges. These assist with a range of management duties including: noting breaches of tenancy conditions; carrying out estate inspections; monitoring empty properties; and undertaking minor repairs. They also patrol estates, refer repairs to housing offices, assist with crime prevention measures and observe and report low-level anti-social behaviour. They play a valuable role in community development and in managing common areas as their responsibilities are not limited by tenure or ownership. They are seen as the 'eyes and ears of the community' and are usually able to resolve minor issues of anti-social behaviour (2006: 62). In addition, Kids in the Street (KITS) provides a five-a-side football pitch which is moved around to different locations during school holidays and is also used at events and festivals. Volunteers provide training and referee matches and it receives funding of approximately £56,000 from charitable sources and was used by 633 young people in 2008 (KITS, 2008). It is

also developing new facilities for badminton, basketball and softball. The project is seen as very successful in engaging young people and providing sports activities during holidays. Local police report a significant decrease in youth disturbance when the pitches were being used.

Case Study Analysis

The three case studies illustrate ways in which the conceptual categories can be applied to the management of mixed income developments. Communitarianism emphasises rights and responsibilities and this principle was evident in the use (in all the developments) of mutually agreed neighbourhood or estate agreements which defined appropriate standards of behaviour; such agreements applied equally to all tenures. Moreover, in many cases these agreements led to the provision of a common set of standards and a unified service for all tenures (although this could lead to disputes about how charges were allocated). These neighbourhood agreements in many cases attempted to fully engage the private developer in the long-term management of the area.

Social capital was developed through a variety of methods of consultation relating to the masterplanning and development of the estate as well as community-based activities often managed by charitable organisations, of which residents were often in the majority. These participative approaches were seen as contributing to the development of more effective neighbourhood associations (such as Community Development Trusts); These structures both avoided the traditional disadvantages of top-down, bureaucratic local authority institutional structures and assisted in creating higher levels of community ownership in decision-making and therefore greater interest in long-term success and sustainability. The third concept, governmentality, followed from the other two. This notion was evident in the use of indirect forms of governance, on the importance attached to self-management and the practice of a higher level of control over norms, values and acceptable standards of behaviour. In practical terms this led to the construction of a particular consensus about how to behave, what should be valued and how responsibilities were exercised. Significantly these processes can also be identified within mixed community initiatives in a range of other countries as will be shown below.

Housing and Community Governance in a Comparative Perspective

The concept of mixed communities has played an important role in a range of comparative locations, pointing to considerable policy convergence in this area, despite substantial differences in approaches to housing provision. What the programmes have in common is an

acknowledgement that long-term social sustainability requires committed and effective community governance based on communitarian principles, social capital development and governmentality. Hence, programmes have included area-based policies such as: the *Big Cities Policy* in the Netherlands (Andersson and Musterd, 2005); the *Contrats de Ville* initiative in France; the *Social City Programme* in Germany; the *Flanders Social Impulse Fund* in Belgium, the HOPE VI programme in the USA (Cisneros and Engdahl, 2009; Popkin et al, 2009) and the *Community Renewal Programme* in Australia (Arthurson, 2002). These models have included ensuring sustainable improvements through devolved political arrangements, participatory budgeting, neighbourhood working and resident-led community activism. This section considers some of the various ways in which these community-based strategies have been developed as a means to ensure effective management of mixed income communities.

US experience: HOPE VI and the New Urbanism

In the US a number of comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) have been developed and the HOPE VI Urban Demonstration Program is often presented as a pioneering mixed communities initiative (Berube, 2005); partly due to the high levels of social segregation association with US public (or 'welfare') housing. Introduced in 1993 under the Clinton administration the HOPE VI initiative aimed to encourage 'New Urbanist', mixed income developments to create viable communities and to reduce the social, economic and spatial isolation of public housing. Described as 'one of the most successful urban redevelopment initiatives of the past half-century', the programme 'reflected the bold notion that public housing needed not merely to provide affordable shelter but also to generate broader community revival and to alleviate poverty' (Katz, 2009: 15). A Community and Support Services division was established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to 'research and disseminate community building practices that centered on developing resident leaders and linking residents to resources' (Cisneros, 2009: 11). The programme is claimed to have 'triggered a broader – through still incomplete – transformation of the public housing system from a rule-bound realm controlled by federal bureaucrats to an investment in the nation's future managed by market-savvy local leaders' (Katz, 2009, p.15). Initially focused on reconstruction and resident empowerment the programme was transformed into one 'reaching for economic integration, deconcentration of poverty, and neighbourhood revitalization' (Katz, *ibid.*).

Whilst ideas about the benefits (and costs) of community mix can be traced back to the work of Gans (1961), contemporary programmes have been strongly influenced by Oscar Lewis' (1996) debates about 'cultures of poverty' and Wilson's (1987) notion of 'concentration effects', policy makers expressed concern about the increasing isolation of inner-city residents from 'mainstream behaviour' and the existence of an urban underclass'; these problems were particularly acute in the 'federal enclaves' of public housing and exacerbated by the phenomenon of 'middle-class flight' from deprived urban areas. By the 1980s these public housing schemes or warehouses for the very poor (Katz, 2009: 19) were in practice racially segregated, located in isolated of cities, containing inadequate services and restricted to lowest income groups. The consequence was the existence of high crime, highly stigmatised neighbourhoods, dominated by gangs and with few (if any) opportunities for work or self-improvement for young people in particular.

In the 1990s initiatives were developed such as the Moving to Opportunity programme (MTO) designed to enable low-income groups to lower-poverty areas, assisted by the 1969 'Gautreaux' case against Chicago Housing Authority. These programmes specifically focused on the concept of poverty deconcentration, mainly through processes of outward dispersal or vouchering systems. The philosophy was expressed by one of the founding participants in the HOPE VI project: 'Having worked in distressed urban areas for thirty years we knew that concentrating low-income families in high-density developments created an untenable management situation. The extraordinary difficulty of sustaining housing restricted to occupants at the lower end of the income scale had been demonstrated repeatedly in large public housing sites' (Baron, 2009: 31). One example of an effective community-building initiative can be found in the NewHolly scheme in Seattle, Washington which provided community gardens, block clubs and activity clubs (Kleit, 2005).

The key principles of the HOPE VI programme were community building and self-sufficiency, but the initiative has been criticised for enabling the gentrification of urban areas by exacerbating 'rent gaps' and facilitating high house prices which in practice promote the involuntary displacement and containment of low income groups. Such groups thereby are excluded from neighbourhoods that they had grown up in, in favour of more affluent urban residents, in the process appropriating public housing for market driven development (Lees et. al., 2006). Moreover, it is not clear that community-driven models are necessarily beneficial as they can 'reinforce rather than break down divisions among different kinds of

residents' by subjecting neighbourhoods to market imperatives and shaping 'expectations and demands...in ways that sometimes place residents in tension with one another' (Chaskin and Joseph, 2009: 328).

Such divisions have also been exacerbated through the growth of private forms of governance, often through the emergence of privately organised Common Interest Companies (CICs) with responsibility for the management of local functions that were previously the responsibility of municipal authorities (McKenzie, 1994).

Neighbourhood arrangements in Australia

Initial tenure diversification strategies in Australia in the 1990s were justified on the basis of asset 'asset sustainability': reducing management costs; reconfiguring tenure and promoting home ownership and providing alternative options for public housing tenants (Wood, 2003: 45). More recently these policies have been justified on the basis of preventing social problems, increasing social cohesion and therefore reflecting neighbourhood effects arguments (ibid: 46).

As a consequence of the neighbourhood effects discourse Australia has witnessed the emergence of mixed-income, master planned estates which cater to a growing 'lifestyle consumerism' (Cheshire et. al., 2008: 653), providing 'affluence, aspiration and security' (Randolph, 2008) that will appeal to middle class households. These estates have incorporated community development principles alongside urban design and place making innovations. This 'growing privatisation of contemporary forms of governing' (Cheshire et. al., 2008: 654) includes (as in the UK) a significant expansion of the role of private property developers and appropriation of previously publicly accountable processes. However, in Australia the role of social landlords tends to be more limited (Wood, 2003: 47) and the consequence has been property developers gaining responsibility for managing as well as developing new residential communities (Cheshire et. al., 2008: 654). Master planned estates are therefore governed by private developers who determine standards of behaviour that residents should follow (see for example Gwyther, 2005). In Australia this has created significant tensions once property developers have sold their interest in the scheme (Cheshire et. al., 2008: 654).

At the same time a neo-liberal (or Anglo-Saxon) policy trajectory in housing has gone hand-in-hand with a recognition that tenure diversification, asset management and investment strategies also require systems to enable resident participation (Wood, 2003; Wood et. al., 2002; Randolph and Judd, 2000). Examples of these approaches to community governance include *Urban Improvements* undertaken by the South Australian Housing Trust (from the 1990s) the *New Living Programme* in Western Australia and the *Urban Renewal* programme in Queensland. The Commonwealth's *Better Cities Programme* has been seen as part of an established orthodoxy in attempting to tackle problems of tenure mix and its relation to social problems (Wood, 2003: 47).

The Bridgewater Urban Renewal Programme (BURP) in Tasmania has been described as a 'mature model' of community renewal, representing an organic and unstructured approach to community building (Jacobs et. al., 2005: 12). Such initiatives represent a form of 'community ethic' (Gwyther, 2005) incorporating informal covenants, determining acceptable and unacceptable forms behaviour and involve developer-led projects that determine aesthetic design standards. Residents are therefore encouraged to assume responsibility for the governance of their neighbourhoods voluntarily and are inculcated with a community ethic from the planning stage of developments and throughout (as shown by Cheshire et. al., 2009). In this sense social sustainability is achieved through a process of self-governance. As the process becomes increasingly governed by private sector interests

the desire to protect the pecuniary and aesthetic value of the Estate is already embedded in residents' aspirations. In light of such values, the desire to engage in aestheticised acts of consumption relating to one's home and garden becomes a voluntary and self-rewarding ethic, rather than something residents must be mandated to do (Cheshire et. al., 2009: 665).

In many ways it is not surprising that debates about community mix have assumed such importance in the US, UK and Australia. Neo-liberal welfare states tend to have a strong relationship between having a job and social indicators like education, income and quality of housing and as there is often a causal link between these the neighbourhood effects argument has assumed considerable importance. In contrast continental welfare states have greater intervention in market processes and a weaker relationship between residential segregation, work and income (Ostendorf et. al, 2001: 372). Nevertheless, the neighbourhood effects debate has also influenced policy in European welfare states.

Community governance in the Netherlands

The provision of mixed residential environments has been described as constituting the 'dominant principle' of Dutch housing policy since the end of World War II (Musterd, 2002; Galster, 2010: 20) and housing 'diversification' has been seen as the 'core of urban renewal policy' (Kleinhans, 2004: 368), albeit commonly referring to mixed use developments rather than mixed income neighbourhoods. Dutch social rented housing has traditionally been accessible to a range of income groups and therefore income mixing has not generally been seen as a particular problem, at least until the introduction of more market-oriented housing policies of the 1980s (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009).

In addition Dutch housing policy has been described as comprising a mixture of both strong (government) control and a culture of 'deliberation'; the latter attribute has proved increasingly significant as witnessed by the 1998 Landlord-Tenant Deliberation Act (Kruythoff, 2008: 638). Moreover, there has been increased emphasis on reforming governance systems to empower communities (throughout Europe), rather than (as in the US) more individual attempts to improve life chances (Kearns, 2002: 146).

Despite relatively low levels of poverty and social segregation in the Netherlands (Musterd, 2002), new larger-scale developments are required to provide minimum levels of social housing and in attempt to reduce residential segregation and promote integration, Dutch urban regeneration policies have aimed to replace affordable rented properties by more expensive, larger owner-occupied property. The Big Cities Policy (introduced in 1994) has attempted to integrate economic activity and improve urban residential areas (Kleinhans, 2004: 371) and this approach was developed in a National Urban Renewal Policy in 1997 aimed at increasing the variation of residential environments. From 2001, the debate on social mix focused on spatial concentrations of minority ethnic groups rather than socioeconomic segregation, heralding an 'assimilation' discourse (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009: 464; Robinson, 2005). In 2007 a '40 cities programme' was introduced to provide decentralised, area-based, urban regeneration models to create 'powerful', 'safe' and 'liveable' cities (van Gent et. al., 2009).

At the same time some local authorities (as in Rotterdam) have sought to main improvements by limiting the eligibility of low-income groups into rented housing, providing strict measures

to prevent neighbourhood nuisance in order to improve liveability and ensure that neighbourhoods are more attractive to middle income residents (Kleinhans, 2004: 373).

A commitment to neighbourhood governance can be illustrated by case studies: one such in Cool-South, Rotterdam demonstrated that community building policies in the Netherlands (particularly in Rotterdam) have placed a high value of the development of organised social activities to persuade people to mix together and 'to secure, if not celebrate, a sense of community' for example through providing small grants for parties (Blokland and van Eijk, 2010: 324). However, the study also found that within mixed neighbourhoods, although people live together they still move in networks divided by class, ethnicity and education' (p.328).

Conclusion

A focus on area-based initiatives has been a core feature of US, Australian and European housing and regeneration policies; the range of examples considered in this paper illustrate how pervasive policies of community mix have become and the emergence of cross-national trends linked to housing consumption processes. In particular there is considerable evidence of communitarian-influenced governance models and management improvements through developing social capital. The benefit of such models is that they are able to avoid excessive intervention but still maintain a measure of tacit social control. In this way governmentality is exercised through a varied range of agencies, a reliance on self-governance, indirect mechanism, which ultimately result in a greater level of management control over urban areas, that is a form of authoritarian liberalism. There is considerable convergence around these approaches to housing practice, despite significant policy differences in housing provision. Nonetheless, it seems clear that there are certain patterns of orthodoxy in housing management. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that these approaches have a number of limitations.

Firstly, arrangements for community governance and coproduction have a tendency to be set within a managerial set of arrangements that ignore the wider political context. In particular they tend disregard the inherent conflicts of differential power relationships in neighbourhood governance. As Chaskin and Joseph (2009) comment moves towards self-sufficiency are 'necessarily limited in the context of shifting economic opportunity and other structural constraints that low income people face' (p.328). The exercise of practices that

exclude particular groups (both explicit and implicit) can only serve to heighten structural power differentials.

A second (and related) limitation relates to promoting reasonable expectations in the development of mixed communities: 'social cohesion, social interaction and the development of social capital are all much more easily facilitated in contexts of relative homogeneity and stability' (Chaskin and Joseph, 2009, p,327). Studies have shown that residents tend to have modest expectations about their communities and this needs to be acknowledged by policy-makers in creating expectations about what mixed communities can achieve.

Third, the potential for inherent conflict in relation to normative expectations about behaviour and the use of public space means that both the management and governance of mixed communities is necessarily problematic and needs to be given careful attention. Studies in the UK and Netherlands have shown that despite community mix, there remains considerable social segregation on the basis of class, ethnicity and education (Butler, 2003; Blokland and van Eijk, 2009). Consequently, assumptions about consensus-building, about shared objectives, norms and assumptions need to be qualified in the light of extensive neighbourhood diversity.

Finally, it is clear that in all the countries reviewed here an increasing emphasis is being placed on encouraging residents in mixed housing developments to engage with each other and to display a range of behaviours which are directly and indirectly 'managed' by the stakeholders. These behaviours can range from the passive restriction of anti-social activities to positive measures to engage in social and community activities and to live 'sustainable' lifestyles. The various stakeholders place different emphases on these moral and ethical expectations and have different priorities. The private sector, as discussed by Cheshire et al (2009) for example, sees 'community' as little more than a means of marketing the estate. In addition, it raises important questions about what happens to households who do not wish to conform to these norms and expectations, or are excluded from social rented housing because of their previous record.

This paper has taken tentative steps towards identifying the trends in the management of mixed tenure in developed economies and has explored some of the underlying social theory which helps to explain them. Clearly community governance strategies have advantages and

disadvantages for residents and stakeholders. A number of important research questions follow: Do these strategies result in stronger, more cohesive communities? What are the underlying interests of the stakeholders? Do they result in more sustainable housing developments in the long term? What are the range of responses from residents of different tenures to the various social and behavioural expectations encapsulated within the strategies? To answer these and other questions, further comparative research is needed.

References

- Andersson, R. & Musterd, S. 2005. Social mix and social perspectives in post-war housing estates, in R. van Kempen, K. Dekker, S. Hall & I. Tosics (eds.) *Restructuring Large Housing Estates in Europe* Bristol: Policy Press
- Arthurson, K. 2002. Creating inclusive communities through balancing social mix: A critical relationship or tenuous link? *Urban Policy and Research*, 20 (3), 245-261.
- Atkinson, R. 2003. Addressing the urban social exclusion through community involvement in urban regeneration. In Imrie, R & Raco, M. (eds) *Urban renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Atkinson, R and Kintrea, K. 2002. Area effects: What do they mean for British housing and regeneration policy? *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 2(2), 147-166.
- Audit Commission. 1986. *Managing the Crisis in Council Housing*. London: HMSO.
- Bailey, N, Haworth, A, Manzi, T, Roberts, M and Paranagamage, P. 2006. *Creating and sustaining mixed income communities: A good practice guide*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Bailey, N, Haworth, A, Manzi, T, and Roberts, M. 2007. *Creating and sustaining mixed income communities in Scotland: A good practice guide*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Baron, R. 2009. The evolution of HOPE VI as a development programme, in H. Cisneros, H. and L. Engdahl (eds) *From Despair to Hope: HOPE VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 31-48
- Berube, A. 2005. *Mixed Communities in England: A US Perspective on Evidence and Policy Prospects*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Blokland, T. and van Eijk, G. 2010. Do people who like diversity practice diversity in neighbourhood life? Neighbourhood use and the social networks of "diversity-seekers" in a mixed neighbourhood in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol.36, no.2, 313-3332.
- Boyle, D. and Harris, M. 2009. *The challenge of co-production*. London: NESTA.
- Butler, T. 2003. Living in the bubble: Gentrification and its "others" in North London. *Urban Studies*, vol.40, no.12, 2469-2486.

Chaskin, R. 2003. Fostering neighbourhood democracy: Legitimacy and accountability within loosely coupled systems. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32, 2, 161-189.

Chaskin, R. 2005. Democracy and bureaucracy in a community planning process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, 4, pp.408-419.

Chaskin, R.J, and Joseph, M.L. 2009. Building "Community" in mixed income developments: Assumptions, approaches and early experiences. *Urban Affairs Review*, 45(3), 299-335.

Cheshire, L, Rosenblatt, T, Lawrence, G and Walters, P. 2009. The governmentality of master planning: Housing consumption, aesthetics and community on a new estate. *Housing Studies*, 24(5), 653-667.

Cisneros, H. (2009) 'A new movement for people and cities' in H. Cisneros, H. and L. Engdahl (eds) *From Despair to Hope: HOPE VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 3-14.

Cisneros, H. and Engdahl, L. (eds) (2009) *From Despair to Hope: HOPE VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

Cohen, S. 2002.[1972] *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: Creation of Mods and Rockers*. London: Routledge.

Cole, I. and Furbey, R. 1994. *The Eclipse of Council Housing* London: Routledge.

Communities & Local Government (CLG). 2006. *Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing*. London: CLG.

Communities & Local Government (CLG). 2008. *Neighbourhood management pathfinders – Final evaluation report*. London: CLG.

Cooper, C. 2005. Places, "folk devils" and social policy, in P. Somerville and N. Springings (eds.) *Housing and Social Policy: Contemporary Themes and Critical Perspectives* London: Routledge.

Dean, M. 1999. *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.

Dean, M. 2009. 'Three conception of the relation between power and liberty', in S. Clegg and M. Haugaard (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Power*, London: Sage: 177-193.

Delanty, G. 2003. *Community*. London: Routledge.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) 2000. *Our towns and cities: The future*. White Paper, cm 4911. London: The Stationery Office.

Duncan, P. and Thomas, S. 2001. *Neighbourhood Management: a Good Practice Guide*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.

Dunleavy, P. 1981. *The Politics of Mass Housing in Britain 1945-1975: a Study of Corporate Power and Professional Influence in the Welfare State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Dunleavy, P. and Hood, C. (1994). From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money and Management* (July/Sept.) pp. 9-16.
- Flint, J. 2002. Social housing agencies and the governance of anti-social behaviour. *Housing Studies*, 7, 619-37.
- Flint, J. 2004. The responsible tenant: Housing governance and the politics of behaviour. *Housing Studies*, 19 (6), pp.893-909.
- Flint, J. 2006. Maintaining an arm's length? Housing, community governance and the management of 'problematic' populations. *Housing Studies*, 21(2), 171-186.
- Foot, M. 1973. *Aneurin Bevan 1945-1960*. London: Paladin.
- Foucault, M 1979. Governmentality. *Ideology and Consciousness*. 6, 5-21.
- Fukuyama, F. 1997. Social capital. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol 19, 375-484.
- Halpern, D. 2005. *Social capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Galster, G. 2007. Neighbourhood mix as a goal of housing policy: a theoretical analysis, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, vol.7, no.1, 19-43.
- Gans, H. 1961. The balanced community: Homogeneity or heterogeneity in residential areas? *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 27 (3): 176-184.
- Gwyther, G. 2005. Paradise planned: community formation and the master planned estates. *Urban Policy and Research*, 12, 1: 57-72.
- Hills, J. 2007. *Ends and means: The future roles of social housing*. CASE Report 34. London: London School of Economics.
- Hoggett, P (ed) 1997. *Contested communities: Experiences, struggles, policies*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Johnson, G and Percy-Smith, J. 2003. In search of social capital. *Policy & Politics*, 31(3), 321-34.
- Katz, B. 2009. The origins of HOPE VI' in H. Cisneros, H. and L. Engdahl (eds) *From Despair to Hope: HOPE VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, pp.15-30.
- Kearns, A. 2002. Response: From residential disadvantage to opportunity: British and European policy and research. *Housing Studies*, vol.17, no.1: 145-150.
- Kearns, A. and Mason, P. 2007. Mixed tenure communities and neighbourhood quality. *Housing Studies*, vol.22, no.5: 661-991.
- Kids in the Street (KITS). 2008. *Annual report 2008*. Edinburgh: KITS.

- Kleinhans, R. 2004. Social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: a review of recent literature, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19: 367-390.
- Kleit, R. 2005. HOPE VI new communities: Neighbourhood relationships in mixed-income housing. *Environment and Planning A*, vol.37: 1413-1441.
- Kruijthoff, H. 2008. Tenant participation in the Netherlands: The role of laws, covenants and (power) positions. *Housing Studies*, vol.23, no.4: 637-659.
- Kullberg, J. 2002. Consumers' responses to choice-based lettings mechanisms, *Housing Studies*, vol.17, no.4, 549-579.
- McKenzie, E. 1994. *Privatopia: Homeowner associations and the rise of residential private governance*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Manzi, T and Jacobs, K. 2009. From a 'society of fear' to a 'society of respect': The transformation of Hackney's Holly Street estate. In Imrie, R, Lees, L and Raco, M. *Regenerating London: Governance, sustainability and community in a global city*. London: Routledge.
- Manzi, T. 2010. Promoting responsibility, shaping behaviour: Housing management, mixed communities and the construction of citizenship. *Housing Studies*, 25(1), 5-19.
- Mead, L. 1997. 'The rise of paternalism' in L. Mead (ed.) *The New Paternalism: Supervisory Approaches to Poverty* Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. 1990. Governing economic life. *Economy and Society*. 19, 1: 1-31.
- Musterd, S. 2002. 'Response: mixed housing policy: a European (Dutch) perspective', *Housing Studies*, vol. 17, no. 1: 371-380.
- Musterd, S. 2002. 'Response: mixed housing policy: a European (Dutch) perspective', *Housing Studies*, vol. 17, no. 1: 371-380.
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) 2003. *Sustainable communities: Building for the future*. London: ODPM.
- Ostendorf, W., Musterd, S. and de Vos, S. 2001. Social mix and the neighbourhood effect. Policy ambitions and empirical evidence. *Housing Studies*, vol.16, no.3: 371-380.
- Performance and Innovation Unit (PIU). 2002. *Social capital: A discussion paper*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Popkin, S, Levy, D, and Buron, L. 2009. Has HOPE VI transformed residents' lives? New evidence from the HOPE VI panel study. *Housing Studies*, 24(4), 477-502.
- Power, A. 1982. *Priority Estates Project 1982: Improving Problem Council Estates* London: Department of the Environment.
- Power, A. 1987. *Property Before People: the Management of Twentieth-Century Council Housing* London: Allen and Unwin.

- Power, A. 1999. *Estates on the Edge: The Social Consequences of Mass Housing in Northern Europe* Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Power, A. and Bergin, E. 1999. *Neighbourhood Management*, CASE paper 31, London: Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Power, A and Houghton, J. 2007. *Jigsaw cities: Big places, small spaces*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Putzel, J 1997. Accounting for the 'dark side' of social capital: reading Robert Putnam on democracy. *Journal of International Development*, 9(7), 939-49.
- Randolph, B. 2008. The changing Australian city: New patterns, new policies and changing research needs. *Urban Policy and Research*. 25 (1): 481-493.
- Randolph, B. and Judd, B. 2000. Community renewal and large public housing estates. *Urban Policy and Research*. 18 (1): 91-104.
- Rose, N. 1996. The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *Economy and Society*, 25, 327-56.
- Rowlands, R, Murie, A and Tice, A. 2006. *More than tenure mix: Developer and purchaser attitudes to new housing estates*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Social Exclusion Unit (SEU)2001. *A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: National strategy action plan*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Taylor, M. 2000. *Top-Down Meets Bottom-Up: Neighbourhood Management* .York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Urban Task Force. 1999. *Towards an urban renaissance*. London: DETR.
- Urban Task Force. 2005. *Towards a strong urban renaissance*. London: Urban Task Force.
- Urbed. 2007. *Mixed communities: Good practice guidance for management and service provision*. (Unpublished: Available from Urbed, London).
- Van Gent, W., Musterd, S. and Ostendorf, W. 2009. Bridging the social divide? Reflections on Dutch neighbourhood policy. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24, 357-368.
- Van Kempen, R. and Bolt, G. 2009. Social cohesion, social mix and urban policies in the Netherlands. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*. 24: 457-475.
- Wood, M. 2003. 'A balancing act? Tenure diversification in Australia and the UK'. *Urban Policy and Research*, 21(1), pp.45-56.
- Wood, M., Randolph, B. and Judd, B. 2002. *Resident participation, social cohesion and sustainability in neighbourhood renewal: Developing best practice models positioning paper*. Melbourne: AHURI.

The Young Foundation. 2005. *Seeing the Wood for the Trees: the Evolving Landscape for Neighbourhood Arrangements*. London: The Young Foundation.