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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The dynamics of physical and economic transformation of major cities and the recent change in urban housing markets have intensified problems encountered with social segregation and particularly social exclusion. Residualisation of public housing and entrenchment of resources, growing affordability gaps and wider social trends including international migration are contributing to a spatial division and a wealth disparity of social groups (Dekker and Rowlands, 2005). Residential inequality – the difference in the quality of housing and neighbourhoods amenities – is largely characterized by urban disparities and is directly related to concepts of racial, social, income and wealth inequality. Therefore, housing should have a very high priority in the public policy arena, the focus being to rebuild community and promote social cohesion.

What is the role housing policies play in meeting social objectives? How the built environment can contribute to and help overcoming segregation and exclusion? And how polices for urban renewal can deliver different social, spatial and economic outcomes in urban areas?

Among the policies enacted for stimulating social mobility, social cohesion and integration in society, housing mix policies are one of the major stakes, suggesting that well-being of individuals may also depend on the social mix (or social balance) of the neighbourhood in which they reside. This theory is based on the assumption that space has a deterministic effect on those who live in a specific area. Over the years, academic and policy debates on the population composition of neighbourhoods have been fuelled by the presumed negative effects of residential segregation (Doff and Kleinhans, 2011). Concepts of ‘social mix’ and ‘balanced community’ have grown around the opinion that as homogeneity is the problem, therefore its opposite, heterogeneity, is believed to be the answer.

A socially and spatially balanced city structure has been perceived as a basis for a just and equal society. Planners and housing officials have strived to create mixed neighbourhoods through policies of tenure and social mixing, as they are thought to promote and sustain social cohesion, prevent the accumulation of social problems and enhance living conditions for less affluent groups (Ostendorf et al., 2001; Musterd, 2003). Housing mix policies, including housing allowances as well as the production and allocation of affordable, decent-standard dwellings, are perceived as one of the means to pursue this mix. Tenure mix, in particular, is thought to have positive social and economic outcomes for the entire city (Dhalmann and Vilkama, 2009).

The rationale for mixing policies is rooted in the national ethos of egalitarian welfare politics. But how does the role of social mix feature in the new policies? Apparently nobody seems to question positive effects of social mix. The main underlying motive is the idea of a tight link between social mix and social cohesion (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). This idea relates to an even broader issue: the relationship between physical environment and social effects (Harrison et al., 2005).

In the two last decades social mix has become an explicit goal for several countries’ housing policies – i.e. the Netherlands, the UK, Germany, Sweden, Finland (Musterd and Andersson, 2005) and of course the United States (Crump, 2002; Kirsbaum, 2008), where these issues entered political agenda already some decades ago. Similarly, the emphasis on built environment: we can observe a shift from sociocultural and socioeconomic objectives of urban renewal interventions during the ‘90s, to physical and economic objectives in France, UK and the Netherlands in the following years (Verhage, 2005). A similar ‘spatial turn’ also occurred in the US (Crump, 2002). And yet, urban renewal policies in other countries still accord a certain attention to social and local development: for example social measures still have an important place in Dutch urban renewal policies (Kruythoff, 2003; Premius, 2004; Musterd and Ostendorf, 2008), as well as
in certain US policies defined by a ‘holistic’ approach, i.e. addressing physical, social and economic issues together (Gilbert, 2010).

Both in the US and in Europe, poverty concentrations—often in conjunction with ethnic minority concentration—have been identified as the key segregation related problem. The response in Europe has been to try to counteract such concentrations by way of introducing either housing mix policies (Musterd, 2002) or area-based programmes (Kearns, 2002), while in the US different types of dispersal programmes (Moving to Opportunity programmes) have been launched (Goering and Feins, 2003): the deep differences in local context and history between Europe and the US brought to the decision to focus this research only on European case studies.

1.2 THE NEED TO STUDY THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL MIX ON NEIGHBOURHOODS

The causal relationship between urban structure and health of residents or health inequalities is currently strongly supported by a considerable amount of studies and literature reviews (Yen and Syme, 1999; Pickett and Pearl, 2001; others), which aim to explore empirical nexus between urban planning, housing policies, social structure and health.

Housing policies aimed at increasing the social mix in neighbourhoods are supposed to build social capital, modifying the exposition of people to health risk factors and resulting in better health outcomes in a different way (quantitative) in different social groups. However, the meaning and implications of social capital are not clearly defined by policy makers, and the achievement of this objective through housing and urban renewal policy interventions is likely to remain fraught with problems.

Thus, the extent to which housing-type diversification and socially mixed neighbourhoods are devices for alleviating deprivation and reducing health inequalities needs to be proved: this review aims at collecting evidence to clarify this question.

A logical framework (Figure 1) to head this review has been developed, in order to explain the mechanisms acting in the relationship housing policies $\rightarrow$ health inequalities.

The meta-review of Egan et al. (2008) was a starting point for us; it collected a broad range of so-called psychosocial risk factors associated with population health and health inequalities. Therefore, in this review we have considered risk factors only related to behaviours, as smoking, drinking alcohol, practicing physical activity and so on.

The framework underwent to a process of review and improvement on the basis of the evidence progressively found and appraised. This process of inductive elaboration of a conceptual map is considered fundamental in realist methods of research (Wong et al., 2013), as well as its reiterative process. The result is not an exhaustive interpretation of the problem but a conceptualization of the main links explored.

The framework shows the influence of area-based policies on social mix (tenure, income, ethnicity, etc.) which might be able to modify social relationships and consequently behaviours of residents in a neighbourhood. The direct effect of behavioural risk factors on health and health inequalities is well known from the medical and health prevention literature, thus won’t be further explored in this review. Black arrows show the possible influential links, while lines of research investigated here are represented in red.
1.3 Objectives of the Review

This review aims to assess the social and health impacts of housing policies promoting ‘social mix’ for strengthening social and community cohesion and for minimizing ethnic and socioeconomic disparities. Main objective of the review will be to investigate the effects of mix policies on health inequalities.

Firstly, we will identify housing policies that affect social mix in urban environments. We will discuss origins and rationale of social mix policies in Europe and present the current debate and evidences on desirability and usefulness of social mix as policy goal.

Then we will evaluate the potential impacts of the identified policies on health outcomes and inequities, investigating the association between social mix and social cohesion and assessing the effect of mixed neighbourhoods on social interactions and networks within an intervention area.

We question the basis on which social mix policies are promoted and justified, such as the assumption that middle-class can have benefitting influences on ‘problematic’ residents (disadvantaged), thus reducing ‘neighbourhood effect’, with a focus on the way the debate on social mix and disadvantaged communities is currently framed.

Finally the review will try to outline some policy recommendations about the possible role of social mix policies in improving health and reducing health inequalities.

The review will be structured according to the mechanisms identified in the framework, that will help refining the review questions.

1.4 Research Questions

The present literature review focuses on the issues outlined in the previous paragraphs by attempting to answer the following questions, corresponding to theoretical nexus in the plausible causal chain (Figure 1):
1. Do housing policies aimed at increasing social mix affect social interactions within a neighbourhood? Which ones? Does creating a mixed neighbourhood improve social cohesion by increasing social interaction?
2. Which are the effects of social mix on health and health inequalities? Does social cohesion have any effect on behavioural risk factors? Through which mechanisms?

2. METHODOLOGY FOR LITERATURE SELECTION

2.1 Methods for searching literature

We started this review with a ‘snowball’ literature research aimed at identifying relevant keywords used by authors writing on the current aspects of the research topic. We examined works from different disciplines, such as urban studies, sociology, political science and epidemiology. The results of this initial work formed the basis for the second step: a scoping literature research.

Bibliographic databases

In order to guarantee a comprehensive access to relevant publications from various disciplines, different research catalogues were used. Relevant articles were identified by means of a computerized search in the bibliographic databases:

- Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals (1934 to May 2013) (CSA)
- Social Services Abstracts (1979 to May 2013) (CSA)
- Sociological Abstracts (1952 to May 2013) (CSA)
- Art & Architecture Complete (1937 to June 2013) (EBSCO)
- Art Source (1929 to June 2013) (EBSCO)
- Urban Studies Abstracts (1973 to June 2013) (EBSCO)
- RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architecture) Library Catalogue (1980 – to June 2013)
- MEDLINE OvidSP - Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (1966 to July 2013) (PubMed/Ovid)
- Embase - Biomedical Database (1980 to July 2013) (PubMed/Ovid)
- CINAHL - Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (1982 to July 2013) (PubMed/Ovid)
- EconLit - American Economic Association (1969 to June 2013)
- ICONDA International Construction (1976 – present) (Dialog/Ovid)

Research strategy: identification of the studies

The strategy and combination of terms used was amended as required for each database. The search strategy was not limited with respect to population characteristics such as age, gender, language, or race. The search terms were related to housing policies and urban planning interventions that promote ‘socially-mixed’ residential neighbourhoods, trying to counter segregation and favour social cohesion.

Grey literature - project reports, dissertations, press briefs, policy documents - was not considered in this review.

The detailed search strategy for each bibliographic database can be found in Annex 1. Here after (Errore. L’origine riferimento non è stata trovata.) details of the full searches illustrating the search results, divided for database, are shown.
The review did not exclude any participants on the basis of family type, socio-economic status, or other equity indicators such as race or ethnicity, occupation, education, or religion, but only on location criteria.

Both in the US and in Europe, poverty concentrations — often in conjunction with ethnic minority concentration — have been identified as the key segregation related problem. The response in Europe has been to try to counteract such concentrations by way of introducing either housing mix policies (Musterd, 2002) or area-based programmes (Kearns, 2002), while in the US different types of dispersal programmes (Moving to Opportunity programmes) have been launched (Goering and Feins, 2003): the deep differences in local context and history between Europe and the US brought to the decision to focus this research only on European case studies.

The choice was to concentrate only on Western European evidence base. It is certainly the case that the scholarly investigations of neighbourhood effects in the US have dramatically expanded in number and scope over the last decade (Sampson et al., 2002). And is worth to note that much of the evidence that informs policy prescriptions in Europe comes from multivariate analysis and experimental studies carried out in the US (Kearns and Mason, 2007).

Nevertheless, authors considered important to go in depth inquiring the European set of studies, in order to increase the external validity of the review’s results and to better orient housing policies of EU member States. Several authors recognized that the degree to which evidence based on US context is applicable to Western European countries is, arguably, quite circumscribed (Musterd, 2002). According to Wacquant (2006) there are too many significant differences between the residential segregation phenomenon in the two contexts. He argues that ‘the European ghetto is a sociological nonsense’ for three reasons: the US hyperghetto is racially homogeneous while European suburbs are ethnically mixed; the US hyperghetto is in a run-down inner city, while in Europe large social housing estates are usually at the periphery. However, the political context is the most important difference: the US hyperghetto suffers from ‘a Welfare State atrophy and a penal State hypertrophy’ (Wacquant, 2006), whereas all Western European nations have, to varying degrees, a more comprehensive social welfare ‘safety net’ in stigmatised suburbs and a wider variety of substantial national programs for reducing inter-neighbourhood variances on many
indicators compared to the US (Blanc, 2010; Galster, 2007). Differences and similarities between US and EU housing mix policies will be further investigated in paragraph 3.3.

**Inclusion criteria**

Publications were included in this review if they met the following selection criteria:

- papers published as scientific article, peer reviewed;
- topic relevant to the guiding questions of this literature review;
- based on all research methods (both qualitative and quantitative);
- published from January 1990 to July 2013;
- geographical area: studies concerning EU15 cities (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom);
- studying an intervention/policy.

**Screening and selection of the studies**

A strict systematic approach was not appropriate for this literature review, however the review did adhere to the ethos of a systematic review in terms of being repeatable, consistent, and using defined parameters. Once the documents from each bibliographic database were searched and collected, the first step was to eliminate duplicates, which may show up conducting the same research on different sources. A total of 1080 potentially relevant articles were identified, 223 of which were duplicates.

The first screening phase on abstract and title was then started, which followed few clear criteria:

- Exclude on date: exclude if pre 1990
- Exclude on country: exclude if not from EU15
- Exclude on topic: exclude if the topic is other than: housing policies → social mix/social cohesion or social mix/social cohesion → health
- Exclude on intervention: for question n.1, exclude if neither intervention nor policy is described
- Exclude on measure: for question n.2, exclude all articles not showing any measure of phenomena;
- Include based on title and abstract: cannot be excluded, so is marked as INCLUDED. Will require retrieval of full report.
- Include for second opinion: features of the study are not clear from title and abstract, and a more in depth reading on full paper is needed before inclusion.

The literature search on 12 different databases resulted in 857 titles. Based on their titles and abstracts (first screening phase), 717 of 857 (84%) articles were excluded. Most were excluded because of the geographical criteria of exclusion, or because the study was not relevant in terms of topic addressed. From the remaining 140 articles, full-texts were obtained from potentially eligible titles, but full report were not available for 10 items. 130 full-text reports were divided into their 2 research questions for the second screening.

During subsequent analysis of the full-text articles (second screening phase), 60 out of 130 (43%) articles were excluded. The analysis for Question 1 followed a narrative approach, excluding 20 of 74 (27%) articles. Question 2 went through a second systematic approach screening: from the remaining 56 articles information was collected using a data extraction form. Based on this, 40 of 56 (71%) full-text articles were excluded. In the end, 16 publications met the inclusion criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. This group of studies underwent critical appraisal according to their research design.

Process of studies selection has been summarized in the diagram in Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.
The results of the searches were independently screened and critically appraised by the three review authors to identify studies which met the review’s inclusion criteria. Where there was disagreement or ambiguity about inclusion, the full reference was obtained to allow further scrutiny of the full text of the paper to assess the eligibility of the study. In case of doubts or disagreement over inclusion or exclusion of a study, a discussion was held among the authors.

Figure 3. Flow chart describing the inclusion trajectory of the studies (elaborated with EPPI software)
The studies considered for the review were managed using EPPI-Reviewer 4\(^1\). Citations were stored and organized here through all stages of the process from bibliographic management, screening, coding and right to synthesis. EPPI-Reviewer is a multi-user web-based application for managing and analysing data in literature review. It supports many different analytic functions for synthesis including meta-analysis, empirical synthesis and qualitative thematic synthesis.

### 2.3 QUALITY ASSESSMENT

This chapter includes a general overview on the studies included, which allows us to make some considerations.

As shown in Figure 4, the majority of the studies was edited in the years from 2006 to 2010. Only very few were published during the ‘90s, with an increasing trend which shows the growing interest for the subject. Those published after 2011 are not a significant data as this last class only covers less than 3 years instead of 5 as the others (2011-2013).

![Year of report](image.png)

Figure 4. Year of report of included studies

Also the country where the studied policy/intervention was set gives some hints about how lively is the debate and how much attention is given to this issue among EU countries: as we can see in Figure 5, almost 75% of the studies come from Netherlands and UK. The rest are from France and Sweden, with only few coming from other countries. Eight publications were comparative studies of different countries.

---

\(^1\) Software for research synthesis: http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/
For what concerns study design, even if we didn’t proceed to a strict classification according to evidence based medicine criteria, studies were grouped in 4 main categories (see Figure 6): an overwhelming majority of descriptive studies came out (including also empirical research), followed by a consistent number of Policy analyses, 4 literature reviews, and only 3 Outcome evaluation.

Figure 7 presents a classification of the data sources and data collection tools used in the studies: interviews, questionnaires and observation, that’s to say qualitative methods, cover nearly half of the studies, while an important quantitative data source is represented by housing surveys and census data. Only few (6) were using Longitudinal studies, which is recognized to be the most appropriate data source for measuring outcome before and after an intervention. In the majority of the studies this doesn’t happen, and normally surveys are conducted at one point and rely on asking retrospective questions. Also control
areas are not very used, as a lot of studies focus on one neighbourhood only, without carrying out comparisons with neighbourhoods where social mixing policies were not implemented.

![Data sources](image)

**Figure 7. Data sources used in the included studies**

**Critical appraisal and level of evidence**

In the group of published articles three methodological aspects correlated one to each other have become evident:

1) a broad approach to the study is desirable, in order to describe the general quality, aim, data collection and ethic aspects of the research (which led to considerations reported in previous paragraph);

2) study design evaluation adopted by evidence based medicine or prevention is clearly inadequate to this kind of papers;

3) a tool to evaluate the model of analysis implemented should be found.

Thus, according to general principles of empirical research, we attempted to assess the internal validity of the study, the presence of bias, confounding and modification effects, the external validity; the last criterion has been of special relevance for us, implying a strong selection of papers according to the context they had been developed into.

The CASP tools series\(^2\) have been identified as the best instrument available to satisfy the first need of evaluation (1). According to study design (2) the only tool available has been a classification of studies in a field where randomization is not possible (policies) elaborated by the Network of Evidence Based Prevention (NEBP) active at national Italian level to develop health prevention guidelines\(^3\) (see Annex 2). We couldn’t find an instrument to evaluate in a shareable way the model of analysis (3): generally speaking

---

\(^2\) Critical Appraisal Skills Programme UK - http://www.casp-uk.net/

\(^3\) Epi Centro Il portale dell'epidemiologia per la sanità pubblica - http://www.epicentro.iss.it/default.asp
we consider more valid the wider number of independent variables the model adopts; all studies included controls for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of people included in the sample of analysis. Obviously the wider the source of information the slower the bias of omitted variables is. The neighbourhood level of analysis has been preferred.

A score has been attributed to each study/review on the basis of 10 questions of CASP instruments for assessing Qualitative studies; for impact evaluation studies this judgement integrates the level of evidence given according to NEBP.

For what concerns Question 1, a CASP score has been attributed (from 1 to 10): none of the studies scored less than 5 points, thus all of them have been considered sufficient, and out of these 48% were very good (score 8), and 33% excellent (score 9-10).

We refer to Annex 3 for Question 2 scores, which were given according both to CASP and NEBP methods.

2.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW

This review is structured in 6 chapters, plus References and Annexes.

Following these first introductory remarks (Chapter 1 – Introduction and Chapter 2 – Methodology), the third chapter presents how articulated are social mix policies within the context of socio-spatial integration policies. This section looks at the situation in Europe and tries to determine whether and how housing policies and area-based integrated programmes are effective in tackling residential segregation. There are many similarities between social mix policies in Western European countries, though, we have also stressed some important differences in the policy focus and in the implementation strategies used (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009). This has been shown in a brief overview of recent urban policy practices.

The fourth chapter brings together and summarizes knowledge presented in the selected articles on Question 1: it introduces first some key concepts and definitions which constitute the base for the debate; an overlook of sociological theories underlying the presumed beneficial effects of social mix is given; then positions in the debate are reported, in order to frame the issue and present evidence collected from reviews and empirical studies. A final paragraph presents key findings showing how complex and controverted is the issue.

Chapter 5 then is presenting results from data-extraction of the selected studies for Question 2, analysing impacts on behaviours and health.

Discussion and summary of main findings, comments on further research and recommendations for further policy development conclude this review (Chapter 6).

References of selected studies and extended bibliography can be found at the end of the document.

3. HOUSING IN EUROPE: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SOCIAL MIX POLICIES

The European Union is characterised by a wide diversity of national housing situations, conceptions and policies across member states (Pittini and Laino, 2011). Countries weight or select their policy concerns differently. Further, they choose different means to achieve similar goals, and both objectives and means changed markedly over time. It is important to summarise the variety of approaches implemented across
the EU, in terms of tenures, providers and beneficiaries, in order to understand present patterns of housing policies.

In this section the overall framework for social mixing policies is set at EU level, and then brief overviews are provided of then main methods and recent major trends across EU countries.

3.1 Historical Perspective and Legislative Framework

The history of European housing policies illustrates the full range of housing policy instruments.

By the end of nineteenth century, Western European governments had already undertaken demolition programmes and introduced building standards legislation to address public health effects of low quality housing. However, demolition and higher standards do little to improve access and affordability for low income households (EU DG, 1997).

Measures that were proposed for implementing the policy were mainly financial - state subsidies, loans and housing grants - and would influence what was being built (Ekbrant, 1979). Rent controls introduced in some countries during World War I, were extended more widely in the 1930s, and became nearly ubiquitous throughout Europe after 1945. The suspension of rental market mechanisms for low income housing provision led, in many countries, to the displacement of market provision by non-market housing, or social housing. The sector grew steadily throughout the first half of the century, and then expanded markedly with reconstruction and welfare state provision from 1950-1980 (EU DG, 1997). Unit quality was ensured by building standards (though neighbourhood quality was often disastrously, de-emphasised) and accessibility for low income households was ensured by below market rents and housing allocation according to social priorities (Priemus, 1997).

Mixing policies have been introduced in most of the countries first and foremost as a strategy to combat residential segregation and decrease the spatial concentration of disadvantaged households (Sarkissian, 1976). Internationally, several different methods have been used in order to achieve social mix. In the post war period two distinctive implementation approaches have evolved, one that targets deprived households, and another that targets the housing structure. The first approach aimed at decreasing negative neighbourhood effects through the dispersion of deprived households. The second social mix approach aimed at creating a mixed housing structure (in terms of housing type, tenure and/or apartment size) through the construction of new urban developments (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

There was concern that targeting specific disadvantaged groups might lead to discrimination. Thus, the means to achieve social mix were indirect, since freedom of choice - every individual's freedom to choose where to settle - was valued highest by politicians. The choice-based letting system was developed in the late 1980s, in contrast with traditional housing allocation systems. The only way to promote social mix that would not violate the free choice principle was to build a more enabling housing structure. Then social mixing would not be imposed to anyone, but would be offered as a new alternative in the housing market (Andersson et al., 2010; van Ham and Manley, 2009).

In the last decade or so, issues involving social mix and social cohesion have been prominent on many urban policy agendas. The predominant approach to neighbourhood regeneration over the lifetime of governments since the 1970s has been the area-based initiative (ABI): additional short- to medium-term central government grants targeted at recuperating specific areas in economic, urban and social decline (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008). Since then, many countries in Europe and North America have experimented with a variety of specific anti-poverty and neighbourhood improvement initiatives, targeting both inner-city sectors and suburban housing estates, reflecting differences in the distribution of high-poverty neighbourhoods (Rose et al., 2013). Today, politicians and other actors who are concerned with urban
social issues prefer area-based interventions expressed in so-called mixed housing strategies to come to a social mix of the population at the neighborhood level (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

### 3.2 Origin and rationale of social mix policies in Europe: an overview

In several European and North American countries, lively political debates are currently developing, dealing with the idea that individuals, especially the poorer among them, will be significantly supported in their efforts to improve their life chances and to realize upward social mobility, if they would get the opportunity to live in a socially mixed environment.

Therefore, politicians tend to use housing policy tools to reach their goals. In short, the idea is that housing (type and tenure) homogeneity creates social homogeneity (concentration of poor people), which reduces social opportunities for those who are living there. Accordingly, **housing mix (a mix of housing types and tenure types) will create social mix (a mix of households according to their socioeconomic position), and this will ensure better social opportunities for individuals** (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

Apart from this general aim, a number of expected positive outcomes have been associated with the policy (table 1) – such as social inclusion, greater aesthetic diversity, reduced economic polarisation and improved local services to cite some: several of these outcomes can be found at the basis of social mix policies in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the US, France, Sweden among those many other Western countries experimenting with tenure diversification projects (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic &amp; Service Impacts</th>
<th>Community-Level Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Better quality public services</td>
<td>• Increased social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved quality &amp; quantity of private services</td>
<td>• Enhanced sense of community and place attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced local economy</td>
<td>• Reduction in mobility and greater residential stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased rates of employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social &amp; Behavioural Effects</th>
<th>Overcoming Social Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction in anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>• Reduction in area stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better upkeep of properties and gardens</td>
<td>• Increased connectivity with other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Raised aspirations</td>
<td>• Enhanced social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced educational outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The expected benefits of greater income mixing (Kearns and Mason, 2007)

Although the expected outcomes are relatively similar, locally grounded agendas can shape policies in different ways in different places, and the interplay of dynamics set in motion by local systems of actors can create varied and not always predictable outcomes (Rose et al., 2013). Major differences can be found in the policy focus, policy structure and targets, as well as in the measures (instruments and strategies) used in the implementation of the policy (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

Although authors have written about many Western countries, **the bulk of the literature on social mixing has focused on the UK, France, Sweden, the Netherlands and the US** (Lees, 2008). Therefore we will focus mainly on these countries, trying to explore deeply their similar but different ways of promoting social mixing (summarized in Table 2) as part of their urban renaissance agendas.
The United Kingdom

The concept of ‘social mix’ was first introduced in the UK in the 1800s, in the “old style liberalism of utopian experiments” seeking to reverse the class-based spatial segregation produced by capitalist urbanization. It used to refer to a mix of different social classes, following the principle of spatial propinquity. The common belief was that the better-off would take more of an interest in the problems of the poor, while the poor would be encouraged to emulate ‘respectable working-class’ behaviours (Sarkissian, 1976).

The early twentieth century garden city prototypes, while drawing on the utopian ‘social unity through diversity’ concept, espoused a more egalitarian vision in which the rationale for social mix was essentially to grant people of backgrounds from the poor to the middle classes equality of access to decent housing and good quality urban amenities (Rose et al., 2013).

Community cohesion was later incorporated into the British urban policy agenda both as an aim as an expected outcome. Although it involved extensive slum clearance from the 1950s to the early 1970s, in the past decade the central government allocated large sums of money to local agencies for delivering local development initiatives in the most deprived areas in England.

Such area-based programmes about ethno-cultural integration and social mix have often involved housing renewal into the broad field of economic development and social welfare.

The British approach to urban planning and regeneration is distinct from the emphasis on dispersal that is found in many other European urban policies, as it seeks to improve the life chances of poor urban households in situ (Brooks, 2005; Busch-Geertsema, 2007; Imbroscio, 2008).

Recent British urban policy aims to increase social diversity within deprived neighbourhoods, without any major displacement of poorer households (Atkinson, 2008, SEU, 2001; ODPM, 2003a, 2005a, 2005b; HM Government, 2006; Bailey et al., 2006; Hills, 2007). Policy is posited on the assumption that, if spatial concentrations of poverty can be avoided, the area effects associated with deprived neighbourhoods should not arise to the same extent. Unemployment, substance misuse, crime and other social problems will still exist, but once they are not spatially concentrated, the strain on public services, risks to public order and other negative neighbourhood effects should be less (Bretherton and Pleace, 2011).

In the past two decades British urban policy has consistently sought to create diverse, cohesive and attractive urban space where people want to live, ‘opening up’ underdeveloped areas to new residents and developments (Atkinson, 2008; Koutrolikou, 2012). Through producing more socially balanced neighbourhoods via gentrification, the British government has expected to increase the stocks of social capital in disadvantaged neighbourhoods (Lees, 2008). One example of the strategies used by the British government has been tenure diversification through ‘Right to Buy’ programs, where the tenants in public housing areas have been given the opportunity to buy their dwelling at a low cost, in order to turn public housing into owner-occupation. Berube (2005) states that this policy has played a key role in decreasing the share of social housing in some smaller estates. However, despite some encouragement, it has tended to result in only minor change to the mix of housing tenure and incomes.

Sweden

In the decades following the II World War, Sweden has experienced a large labour immigration that has turned it into a multicultural nation. The restructuring of Swedish labour market following the recession in the mid-1970s negatively affected the immigrants’ employment opportunities (Therborn, 1981). The introduction of a policy for social mixing in the mid-1970s was a reaction to the resulting increased socioeconomic segregation in the housing market, particularly salient in the metropolitan areas. In the 1980s labour migration was replaced by refugee migration. The level of labour market integration was poor, which also affected their housing conditions (Essén, 2002). The large housing estates produced in
the 1970s to overcome housing shortages in bigger cities often housed in a majority of foreign-born people originating from a range of different refugee-producing countries in the Middle East, Africa, and South America (Musterd and Andersson, 2005). In the 1990s the living conditions of immigrants, especially newly arrived immigrants, deteriorated due to yet another economic recession, reducing employment opportunities even more (Andersson, 2003). On top of that, it became more difficult to find adequate housing for the new arrivals, due to an increasing housing shortage, which in turn resulted in even higher concentrations of immigrants to certain housing estates (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009). This has given the idea of housing and social mix a new meaning: since then, politicians often referred to the ethnic dimension when demanding an improved mix of residents in Swedish cities (see Andersson, 1998). Even though, the Swedish social mix policy has remained a general policy for countering socioeconomic segregation, rather than ethnic segregation. This is an important difference compared to other mixing strategies in Europe and North America where ethnic mix has been, and still is, at the top of the agenda (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

In comparison with similar policies applied in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, which are focused on disadvantaged neighbourhoods and/or groups, the Swedish policy is general in its scope, and it is expected not only to decrease segregation and increase integration, but also to establish equality and social justice, aiming at a mix in all neighbourhoods (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

It could therefore be argued that the Swedish social mix policy is directed towards enabling social mixing in all parts of the city, rather than directly creating it through relocation or allocation of households to other neighbourhoods (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009). Actually, removal or replacement of selected individuals or households is almost regarded as politically unfeasible in the Swedish political context (Borevi, 2002), as also the demolition of existing rental housing in order to make way for a greater mix. This can partly be explained by a fear of violating the individual right to choose where to live, as demolition could force some households to relocate. The assumption is that if there is a greater housing mix in all parts of the city, the population will have greater opportunity to choose where they want to settle, which in turn will create a greater population mix. If the housing structure is sufficiently mixed, a mixed population will follow automatically.

Sweden has strongly acted to counter cultural and ethnic differences by limiting spatial concentrations, but with few positive results so far. Therefore, the attention is currently shifting to other policies against exclusion and deprivation. The national government has reserved extra funding for programs aimed at improving the conditions of immigrants in underdeveloped neighbourhoods. It has encouraged job and language training, activities stimulating interaction, and measures to combat racial discrimination (Jederlund, 1998; Musterd et al., 1998). Critics point out that this special attention could lead to stigmatization (the danger of blaming the victim), and to increasing dependence on social assistance and unemployment benefits (Andersson, 1999; Jederlund, 1998; Veldboer et al., 2002).

Sweden’s housing policy also reflects its egalitarian tradition. Unlike many other countries, public housing is not distributed according to socioeconomic position and household status, but is accessible to everyone (Borgegard and Dawidson, 2000). Today Sweden has approximately 4.3 million dwellings and three dominant forms of tenure. The private rental sector (both small independent landlords and bigger companies) accounts for 20% of the total stock; public municipal housing companies are responsible for the 20% share of (non-profit) rental dwellings; about 40% of the total stock is owner-occupied; and the remaining 20% consists of cooperative housing, an ownership arrangement in which apartments in a building are owned by a corporation of all rent. What makes housing and social mix an important issue in Sweden is the perceived clear relation between housing type, tenure, and the socioeconomic position of households (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).
France

In France the quest for ‘balance in the social composition of neighbourhoods’ has been an explicit public policy objective from the 1980s onwards, though at that time its application was left to the judgement of local actors (social landlords, municipalities). Since the 1990s, several laws have been passed on social mix and housing diversity, and these undoubtedly represent one of the current specific features of the French context (Bacque et al., 2011). Until the end of the 1990s, these measures were characterized by their diversity: they were meant to address social, economic and urban dimensions together. At the very beginning, the emphasis was placed on local social development, with measures designed to support neighbourhood associations and local economic development. Minimal urban intervention complemented this policy, with minor refurbishments and the occasional demolition of empty buildings in certain areas affected by major depopulation. At the end of the 1990s, the general feeling in the political field was that previous policies had failed to solve the problems of the banlieues (suburbs) – especially social measures promoting neighbourhood development – and that more radical action had to be taken. Social action focusing on the population was progressively replaced by material action focusing on architecture and urban structure (Lelévrier, 2004). According to this new doctrine, the problem is deemed to be essentially spatial and concerns the concentration of a specific population.

A new stage was reached in 2000, within the framework of the Solidarity and Urban Renewal Act (Loi Solidarité et de Renouvellement Urbain, or SRU Act), that addresses the issue by determining a compulsory goal of a minimum percentage of public housing in each municipality, with a financial penalty for those who will not take the necessary steps to reach such a goal (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

As comparative studies show, French urban policy has a ‘top-down’ tradition and tends to be dominated by the State, whereas British or Dutch urban renewal are based far more on cooperation with local partners (Hall and Hickman, 2002; Verhage, 2005a, 2005b). Although French urban renewal shares some trends with other countries and has been considerably influenced by other European experiences, the implementation of urban renewal laws has reduced the diversity of tools used (and thus also the holistic character of urban renewal operations) compared with those found abroad, excluding its social dimensions while largely retaining its spatial character: housing demolition and reconstruction (Le Garrec, 2006). The adoption of such a spatial approach in France therefore means that caution should be exercised when making European comparisons (Gilbert, 2010).

France has 4.5 million social housing units (17% of the total housing stock), funded by state subsidies and loans and governed by rent controls. This statistic makes it average within Europe, falling halfway between the Netherlands (34%) and Spain (5%). With a private rental stock that is only slightly larger (20%), and despite a significant proportion of owner-occupied housing (55%), social housing plays a major role, since about 70% of French households are eligible for it on the basis of their incomes. It caters for the general public, aiming to include disadvantaged households but excluding those whose incomes are too high. This contrasts with both the residualist view that gives social housing a safety-net role on the Southern European model and the universalist perspective of general access (Ghekière, 2007; Bacque et al., 2011).

The Netherlands

The idea of mixed neighbourhoods in the Netherlands dates back to the first years after the II World War. At that time the idea of the district as a relevant entity for its inhabitants was prominent. However, the main mantra was not the idea of mixing groups but rather of mixing functions (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). There were also some notions in Dutch urban policy about the advantages of mixing social classes in order to reduce the inequalities between them (Goodchild and Cole, 2001).
By the end of the 1980s a new market-oriented housing policy had become dominant and stated explicitly that, especially in the large cities, the (extensive) social-rented sector should only provide accommodation for below-modal incomes. The Dutch social-rented sector had always been a mixed sector, providing housing for all kinds of income groups. In contrast with the UK, for example, the processes of the residualisation of the social-rented stock were unknown at that time, precisely because the social-rented sector was attractive and accessible to groups other than the low-income. With the new housing policy, the mismatch of the housing market (that is, the fact that indeed many social-rented dwellings were not inhabited by the groups for which these dwellings were built) was considered as one of the principal problems of the Dutch housing market. The number of more expensive dwellings (mainly in the owner-occupied sector) should be increased, aimed at housing people with modal to high incomes, coaxing them to leave the social-rented stock. There were no arguments behind the formulation of this new policy to create mixed districts or more social cohesion. The idea was basically one of money and availability: those with higher incomes could afford to move, leaving the less expensive dwellings vacant for low-income households. The switch in policy was however, immediately followed by warnings from almost all housing researchers in the Netherlands: the new policy would create homogeneous housing segments (residualisation) and thus also homogeneous districts in terms of income (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009).

In the 1990s the idea that the homogeneity of poor urban districts and neighbourhoods in terms of the low socioeconomic status of the population had to be countered gradually became more dominant (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009): the call for dispersal of the poor inhabitants and the creation of mixed and more diversified neighbourhoods started around 1996 (Bolt et al., 2008; Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

The policy of urban restructuring that followed was focused on attracting new inhabitants from outside the district (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). To achieve diversification of the housing supply in "unbalanced areas", part of the social rental housing had been demolished and replaced with more expensive dwellings, preferably owner-occupied. Furthermore, social rental homes were sold, and relatively expensive rental homes restored.

Since 2001 the debate on social mix changed in tone. Until then the policies had been conducted and expressed in socioeconomic terms. After 2001, the problems associated with spatial concentrations of minority ethnic groups were featured explicitly (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). The present Dutch urban policy aims to reduce the spatial concentration of low-income households in urban neighbourhoods and to combat the negative effects of the concentration of minority ethnic groups on their integration (Ministerie van Justitie, 2005). In Dutch public debate the widely accepted credo is to live together regardless of cultural and social background. The Netherlands has also enacted policy that regulates new developments by requiring mixed occupancy as a condition for planning approval and/or funding (Lees, 2008). The regulation of the influx of low-income-groups is the most heavily debated anti-segregation measure in the Netherlands. Following the initiative of the city of Rotterdam, a national law gives cities the opportunity to implement a divergent allocation policy for certain deprived parts of the cities. Persons from outside the city without a paid job (except students and retired persons) are not granted a residence permit in these designated neighbourhoods (Bolt, 2004). Nevertheless, the law can be criticised for several reasons. First of all, people without a job (of whom a high proportion are members of minority ethnic groups) are held responsible implicitly for the problems in concentration neighbourhoods. Instead of creating opportunities for social mobility, urban policy is aimed at excluding people without a job. Also, it should be questioned if the designated neighbourhoods will benefit from this policy. The fact that a neighbourhood is picked out as a ‘hot spot’ is most likely to harm its reputation (Bolt et al., 2008). However, although mixing income groups in neighbourhoods is still seen as an important instrument to revitalize cities, pragmatic Dutch policy-makers are gradually starting to realize that this ambition is unrealistic. Mixed housing is less decisive for socioeconomic and sociocultural integration than was expected. #
The gradual liberalization in the housing sector (by reducing rental subsidies and privatizing housing corporations) has led to a slight increase in residential inequality, but social rental houses (36% of the total stock) remain relatively attractive and affordable for people with a low income. Although the Netherlands now have more owner-occupied (52%) than rental houses, the rental sector, generally managed by housing corporations, is still by far the most important element of the local housing market in the major cities (Veldboer et al., 2002).

**Finland**
In contrast to prevailing desegregation policies of many other European countries, mixing policies in Finland are more of a preventive nature. Immigrants and associated housing issues were not on the political agenda until the beginning of the 1990s. The discussion on ethnic mixing and the consequences of residential segregation was first raised back in the early 1990s as a result of the rapid growth in immigration. The aim of ensuring socially and ethnically balanced urban development was included on the agenda of the national immigration policy in 1997.

Combating residential segregation, stigmatisation and potential marginalisation of vulnerable ethnic minorities, namely refugees and other low-income immigrant groups, has therefore been highly emphasized, even if positive aspects of clustering are also acknowledged.

In Helsinki, tenure mix has been implemented by enforcing area-based tenure quotas for the production of new dwellings. Mixing of tenure types has taken place mainly at the neighbourhood level, but also within blocks and housing estates. Urban renewal programmes have also been used to diversify a homogeneous housing stock in some older residential districts. In addition, mixing policies have been implemented through practices of social mixing in council housing allocation. Low-income households are dispersed among the better-off when council dwellings are allocated. Those with the most urgent need for housing are given first priority. On the other hand, attempts to generate social mixing do not override people’s own freedom to choose where they want to live. Since the mid-1990s, council housing applicants have been able to specify the areas in which they wish to live, which means that council dwellings in other districts are not offered to them (Dhalmann and Vilkama, 2009).

**Belgium**
Belgium's immigration policy reflects its political structure. Regulation and entrance of foreign immigrants is the responsibility of the federal state, whereas local authorities are responsible for accommodation and integration of foreigners into the host society. The influence that lower-level governments have gained over the last years does not include the housing market. This is mainly because of the housing tenure structure (Boelhouwer and van der Heijden, 1992). The owner-occupied sector is dominant, with a market share of 71%. The second most important segment is the private rental sector (20%). The social rental sector is limited in size (about 6%) and usually also in quality. This tenure distribution reflects the ideological preference for home ownership. Given this context, it is difficult to apply physical restructuring measures to influence the composition of the population in certain areas. Therefore, spatial concentration is considered a natural occurrence that cannot easily be reversed (de Winter & Musterd, 1998). However, a Social Impulse Fund founded to facilitate urban renewal represents the core of Flemish urban policy: special assistance for the underprivileged, emphasis on the population's participation, administrative innovation, and an extensive and integral budget (Stouthuysen, Duyvendak and van der Graaf, 1999). The focus is on improving social and economic conditions in underdeveloped neighbourhoods. This spatially oriented policy aims to increase public investment in the social rental sector, to stimulate private investment in the redevelopment of derelict buildings and areas, and, finally, to improve public spaces and develop initiatives for social cohesion in the population (Musterd and de Winter, 1998; Veldboer et al., 2002).
### Table 2. Characteristics of country-specific social mix strategies (Atkinson, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy target</th>
<th>SELECTIVE (targets certain areas or groups)</th>
<th>GENERAL (targets entire cities and their urban population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of social mix</td>
<td>&gt; increasing social diversity in deprived neighbourhoods without any major displacement of poorer households</td>
<td>&gt; improving the life chances of all citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIOECONOMIC MIX</strong> (targets primarily a mix regarding income, education and occupation &gt; social class status)</td>
<td>United Kingdom / France / Belgium</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNIC MIX</strong> (targets primarily a mix of different ethnic groups or aims at a de-concentration of minorities)</td>
<td>United States / Netherlands</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Policies in the USA: a comparative perspective

As we have seen in the previous paragraph, several North-western European welfare states, particularly the Netherlands and Scandinavian countries, show strong intervention in market processes through a variety of subsidies and benefits. In these redistributive contexts the relation between a person’s (un)employment, income and housing situation (including residential segregation) may be relatively weak (Musterd, 2002).

In contrast, in neo-liberal and strongly market-oriented states such as the US, exists indeed a strong relationship between having a job and social indicators like income, education and quality of housing. In such situations, unemployment often results in low incomes and poor housing. There is a great risk that such an unemployed person will, together with others like themselves, end up in a specific low quality segment of the urban housing market (Ostendorf et al., 2001).

One important consequence of this is that income inequality is much greater in the US than in European countries. Although food and shelter are basic human needs, housing is not a fundamental right in the US. It is primarily a consumer item, susceptible to the rules of the market. The government’s limited influence on the housing market is also one of the main reasons for persistent segregation and for the social problems this causes (Burgess, 1998).

For most of the country’s history, the private sector has built housing (Veldboer et al., 2002). The public sector (both the local and federal government) has generally regulated size, architectural style, and location of new houses, but has not built many by itself (Burgess, 1998). Consequently, most of the US housing supply is privately owned, inhabited by the owner, or rented to others. Public housing is very limited (3% of the total housing stock) and primarily concentrated in a few cities.

Segregation in US inner cities is often a matter of race. In cities more than a third of the Black inhabitants live in ‘hypersegregated’ areas, meaning that they seldom have contact with other population groups. The spatial distance is so extreme that living in these neighbourhoods can become an autonomous cause of deprivation and poverty (Wilson, 1987; Deurloo et al., 1997).
Like the US, Western European countries deal with increasing congruence between (under)class and race. Signs of (ethnic) concentrations often provoke references to the situation in the US. However, unlike the US, the welfare state avoids large-scale segregation in most European cities. Remarkably, the fear for American ghettos has been particularly outspoken in countries where government influence on the housing sector used to be strong, and where neighbourhoods are balanced compared with the US (Veldboer et al., 2002).

In both contexts, the majority of politicians believe that mixed housing will be a benefit of the whole population, or at least to the relatively less well-off in society. Both the United States and Europe aim at more social spatial mix because it is believed that this will enhance people’s opportunities to enter society in full swing. The only difference is that in Europe, the typical way to reach that goal is to create or re-create mixed neighbourhoods through housing restructuring processes, whereas in the United States, programs that move people to opportunity seem to be dominant (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

The US mixing policy aims to affect the composition of neighbourhoods simply by moving households: several programmes have been launched (as the Gautreaux, Sect. 8, Hope VI, and the MTO programme) in which individuals and households have been moved, or been offered a voucher enabling them to move, from deprived neighbourhoods to more diverse areas with higher income levels (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

The current trend in US housing redevelopment is to replace existing high-density social housing “projects” with new lower-density mixed-income communities. This is the central thrust of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development’s HOPE VI programme which has been used to socially mix and gentrify, public housing. The reduction of densities from the demolition of units and the ‘vouchering out’ (for example, where residents were given vouchers for mainly private rented accommodation) of public housing tenants led to significant displacement of low-income tenants and gentrification (Smith, 2001). By ‘manufacturing’ a socially mixed community in areas of poverty concentration, US policy-makers think that gentrification can ameliorate the social isolation of the poor. New more affluent residents will rub shoulders with poorer existing residents on the streets, in shops, and within local institutions, such as public schools. Such newcomers may exhibit possibilities of social mobility and a determination to secure adequate public services. However it has not aided the revitalisation of depressed neighbourhoods, it has rather reduced affordable housing and caused spiralling rents and prices (Cunningham, 2001).

On the rare occasions when poor people have been moved to wealthier neighbourhoods - for example, the pilot programme Moving to Opportunity (MTO) in the US - the social and economic mobility expected did not happen. The MTO programme was set up in 1992 to assist low-income families to move out of areas with high concentrations of poor people into areas with low concentrations of poor people. Like HOPE VI, it was premised on the notion that introducing the poor to the more affluent will be beneficial to the poor. The policy was not a success, it did not bring the social and economic benefits claimed (such as increased economic and social mobility) and was not a cost-effective programme either (see Kling and Liebman, 2004; Kling et al., 2005, 2007). This evidence is important because, if poor people’s lives do not improve as a result of being moved into more affluent areas, it is unlikely to say the least that their lives would be improved by an influx of middle-income people into their neighbourhood (Lees, 2008).

A review of research into the effects of the main housing mobility or dispersal programmes in the US, (Atkinson, 2005) highlights evident gains to poor households from relocation to non-poor, socially mixed areas in terms of neighbourhood quality and residential satisfaction, feelings of safety and improved educational outcomes (both in terms of school performance and college entrance) (Kearns and Mason, 2007).
However it is far from evident that the American programs really are effective. Even though successes could be shown, there still are substantial doubts about the effectiveness of this neo-liberal formula of social mix policy (Lees et al., 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing stock</td>
<td>Owner-occupation; little public housing; vouchers for low incomes</td>
<td>Owner-occupation; little public housing;</td>
<td>Owner-occupied and rental housing; financing by central government</td>
<td>Owner-occupied, private rental and strong public housing with unlimited access</td>
<td>Owner-occupied and relatively strong social rented sector, managed by housing corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(main sector)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>Influx +/- 1.1 million annually; mainly in metropolitan areas</td>
<td>+/- 8.4% of total population; mainly in cities</td>
<td>+/- 7.4% of total population; mainly in cities</td>
<td>+/- 20% of total population has at least one foreign-born parent; mainly in cities</td>
<td>+/- 17% of total population has at least one foreign-born parent; mainly in cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/racial</td>
<td>+++ (Monoethnic)</td>
<td>++ (Multiethnic)</td>
<td>++ (Multiethnic)</td>
<td>++ (Multiethnic)</td>
<td>++ (Multiethnic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Limited praise of cultural differences</td>
<td>Colour-blind</td>
<td>Colour-blind</td>
<td>Multiethnic interaction</td>
<td>Multiethnic interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-concentration</td>
<td>Small-scale attempts for mixing of areas (MTO: class focus)</td>
<td>Area-based policy to improve social and economic conditions</td>
<td>Area-based policy of diversification (class focus)</td>
<td>Dispersal policy until 1995; now class and cultural focus</td>
<td>Urban diversification policy (class and prevention of involuntary concentration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Overview of dimensions of diversification policies (Veldboer et al., 2002)

3.4 A SPECTRUM OF INTERVENTIONS: STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE SOCIAL MIX

As we have seen, in both Europe and North America, national governments have adopted proactive ‘spatial rebalancing’ measures seeking to improve poor people’s lives through social mix policies. This thrust has taken several programmatic forms: mixing policies have taken place mainly at the neighbourhood level, but also within blocks and housing estates (Murie and Musterd, 2004).

Creating mixed neighbourhoods requires government intervention through housing policies by either influencing neighbourhood tenure mix - mixing owners and renters - or by influencing the ethnic and socio-economic mix of tenants in social housing through the allocation system of social housing (Bolt et al., 2008; van Daalen and van der Land, 2008). Ethno-cultural segregation (in deprived neighbourhoods) is primarily seen as a negative feature that needs to be addressed at state, city or neighbourhood level (Koutrolikou, 2012). Often governments use policies aimed at creating a socio-economic mix in an attempt to indirectly create ethnically mixed neighbourhoods (see Bolt et al., 2008). By targeting socioeconomic segregation, an ethnic mix is supposed to follow, since ethnic segregation is explained mainly by the immigrants’ socioeconomic position, which is generally weaker (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).
The response in Europe has been to try to counteract such concentrations by way of introducing either housing mix policies (Musterd, 2002) or area-based programmes (Kearns, 2002), both targeted at certain groups and/or specific areas (i.e. disadvantaged estates), facing several problems at the same time (Andersen, 2001; van Kempen and van Beckhoven, 2006, van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). As a rule, these integrated policies tend to focus on improving both the physical and the social environment, including housing, economic and social measures (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009). The first objective involves ridding these neighbourhoods of their negative image through urban measures that are intended to make the stigma – and its effects – disappear. As the negative image of these areas is commonly associated with features typical of social housing schemes, urban renewal tries to erase these specificities. To make the areas more attractive for more affluent tenants - but still affordable for those with low incomes - the physical environment usually goes through cosmetic changes, such as re-painting buildings, improving green areas, restructuring public spaces with traditional streets, squares and spaces with dedicated functions (instead of housing estates with empty, undefined spaces) and ensuring urban continuity in order to link these neighbourhoods with city-centre areas (Gilbert, 2010). The social exclusion of the disadvantaged social groups is counteracted through interventions that policy makers hope would increase the employment rate and the civic participation, the main intervention being improvement in the level of education among residents in the areas (Blanc, 2010; Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIM of housing intervention</th>
<th>Improve housing conditions</th>
<th>Open-up choices</th>
<th>Cease-segregation through urban renewal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING MEASURES (for social housing, private rental and owner-occupied housing)</td>
<td>Housing demolition, New construction, Building standards, Housing rehabilitation, renovation and maintenance of existing units, Purchase of apartments for social housing</td>
<td>Support access to housing through: Re-housing, Housing allocation according to social priorities, Enhanced housing supply</td>
<td>Neighbourhood regeneration, Social development, Economic revitalization, Skills development, Infrastructure improvement, Public utilities supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Housing aims and measures (elaborated by the authors)

Across housing policy, urban policy and neighbourhood renewal policy, a government has three broad strategies and a range of policy instruments available in order to try to create communities that are more mixed in housing tenure terms. These three strategies, which are not always mutually exclusive, are defined below.

- Dilution: This represents an attempt to reduce marginally the significance of social rented housing within an existing neighbourhood or locality. This may be done by the sale of rented homes to tenants or by the development of homes for market sale, allowing higher income households to
move into social housing area even if normally not qualify to live there. The latter is often done at below-market prices through the sale of spare land on social housing estates to private developers during regeneration programmes.

- Diversity: This strategy aims to ensure that all new housing developments or new communities have a reasonable proportion of social rented homes included within them. This is often referred to as ‘planning gain’ and involves a negotiated outcome between planning control officers and developers.
- Dispersal: An alternative approach to dilution, this strategy consists of using a variety of policy instruments to relocate residents of deprived areas to non-poverty neighbourhoods, increasing the options and the chances for poor and disadvantaged people to find housing elsewhere. Some programmes combine elements of more than one of the above (Kearns and Mason, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE SOCIAL MIX (Busch-Geertsema, 2007)</th>
<th>to move wealthier people into poorer areas (Dilution)</th>
<th>to move poorer people into wealthier areas (Dispersal)</th>
<th>to ensure a mix of wealthier and poorer groups in new developments, including a certain percentage of affordable housing (Diversity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENEFICIARIES OF THE POLICIES (Galster, 2007)</td>
<td>the advantaged (well-being improved in absolute sense)</td>
<td>the disadvantaged (well-being improved in absolute sense)</td>
<td>society in general (positive sum outcomes for the society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES (Bolt et al., 2008)</td>
<td>differentiation of the housing stock in ‘concentration neighbourhoods’</td>
<td>extension of the housing opportunities for low-income-groups outside the city</td>
<td>regulation of the influx of low-income-groups into certain concentration neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Social mix strategies, measures and beneficiaries (Busch-Geertsema, 2007; Galster, 2007; Bolt et al., 2008)

City governments see the facilitation of social mix as a way of attracting both higher-income residents - who will improve the tax-base, support local businesses, improve the governability and play an active part in neighbourhood revitalisations (Lees, 2008) - and those who are considered key actors by virtue of their social position and/or their function in running the city: teachers, nurses and even refuse collectors. This is because, through their value system, people working in the arts, healthcare, the social services and even education, who have more cultural than economic capital, are inclined to value and develop links with the working classes (Launay, 2010; Bacque et al., 2011).

For this reason, rather than attempting to regenerate neighbourhoods only by investment in the existing housing, services and facilities, the idea is to transform them by changes in the housing stock that will attract new, better-off residents. Thus, urban restructuring become the key words to achieve a social mix. Places will be improved, and residents on low incomes will benefit because they will no longer live in areas of concentrated poverty, and will have access to a wider range of resources and to more beneficial social networks (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008). This implies that all neighbourhoods both in new residential areas
and in existing homogeneous neighbourhoods, both well-off areas as well as deprived areas, need a mix of housing types, tenure forms and apartment sizes (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

A wider variety of means have been used within the aim of promoting a diverse housing structure: there have been widespread, large-scale investments in many Western European countries aimed at restructuring large, homogeneous, post-war neighbourhoods and housing estates (through selective demolition, infill construction, and sale of social housing) so that they contain a greater diversity of housing types by price range and tenure (Galster, 2007).

Housing re-differentiation is a policy of adding more expensive dwellings to low-income areas by removing inexpensive dwellings through demolition, together with the sale and upgrading of existing social rented dwellings. The new dwellings are almost always in the owner-occupied sector or in the relatively high-priced segments of the rented sector; these dwellings are more attractive for the middle classes than the existing stock of cheap social- or public-rented accommodation (Bolt and van Kempen, 2011). In cases of new housing construction, this is done by mixing different tenures and price levels within the same development (Ostendorf et al., 2001). In some countries it is required that newly constructed, larger-scale residential developments set aside a minimum share of the dwelling units for social housing (Galster, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING STOCK</th>
<th>OWNER-OCCUPIED SECTOR</th>
<th>RENTED SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF TENURE FORMS</td>
<td>Full homeownership</td>
<td>Shared ownership (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TYPE OF PROVIDERS | Private-for-profit developers | (*)&Intermediat

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6. Housing tenure forms and providers (elaborated by the authors)

4. SOCIAL MIX AS A POLICY RESPONSE

4.1 CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY AND THE ‘NEIGHBOURHOOD EFFECT’

In order to frame the issue of urban interventions aimed at social mix, it’s important to highlight and understand the logical framework underlying it.

The starting point, which acts as justification for every consequent action taken by policy makers, is whether or not a ‘neighbourhood’ or ‘area effect’ is appreciable in areas of concentrated poverty, which should therefore be avoided.

In fact the existence or not (and magnitude) of neighbourhood effects is recognized as important not least for judging whether or not segregation should be on the political agenda (Andersson et al., 2007; Galster et al., 2008, Musterd et al., 2008). ‘Neighbourhood effects’ thesis maintains that a concentration of poor households in certain areas produces disadvantageous social effects (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993; Ellen and Turner, 1997; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001; Goodchild and Cole, 2001; Musterd et al., 2003; Brännström, 2004), including social isolation (Wilson, 1996) or weak networks and declining social capital (Putnam,
1995), influencing individual’s ability to move out of poverty or disadvantage (Randolph and Wood, 2003). Previous reviews of the Western European neighbourhood effects literature have focused on ascertaining whether there are sizeable, independent effects of neighbourhood social context on any individuals’ behaviours or outcomes (e.g. Berube, 2005; Friedrchics, 1998; Friedrchics et al., 2003; van Kempen, 1997). Galster (2007) states that “it must be possible to distinguish between neighbourhood effects that occur because of social interactions within the neighbourhood and those that occur because of the perceptions and actions of those outside of the neighbourhood.[...]. The intra-neighbourhood mechanisms that could produce neighbourhood effects are well known, and include socialization, peer effects, role models, competition and relative deprivation (Atkinson et al., 2001; Duncan et al., 1997; Friedrchics, 1998; Gephart, 1997; Haurin et al., 2002; Jencks and Mayer, 1990; Sampson et al., 2002). The extra-neighbourhood mechanism of relevance here is stigmatization/resource restriction: when important institutional, governmental or market actors negatively stereotype all residents of a neighbourhood and/or reduce the flows of resources flowing into it because of its population composition.” Concentrations of deprivation thus suffer problems such as that of social stigma and isolation (Roberts, 2007).

Not all the researchers agree on this vision; the neighbourhood effect itself is questioned by Bretherton and Pleace (2011) and Bolt and van Kempen (2011), thus mining the fundamentals for taking action towards mixed areas. They report that there is evidence that the effects of spatially concentrated deprivation can be inconsistent and that in some instances they do not actually seem to be present (Buck, 2001; Forrest and Kears, 2001; Kears, 2002; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004; Brannstrom, 2004; Murie and Musterd, 2004; Andrews and Reardon-Smith, 2005; Middleton et al., 2005; Ritchie et al., 2005; Cheshire, 2007; Fletcher et al., 2008; van Ham and Manley, 2010). In addition, some research has suggested that the life chances of poorer households in socially diverse neighbourhoods are not necessarily any better than in deprived areas (Kears, 2002; Andrews and Reardon-Smith, 2005; Robinson, 2005; Cheshire, 2007; Graham et al., 2009).

According to Gilbert (2010), in the last decades Western societies, on the basis of these major social concerns coupled with a general sentiment of discontent, promoted the stigmatization of ghettos: political debate, especially far-right ideology, pointed to immigrants and the spaces they lived in as the scapegoats for the nation’s difficulties. Locally and nationally, political attention focused on immigrants and their spatial gathering. For example in France, during the 1990s, with the rise of ‘national republicanism’, immigrants started to be held responsible for socio-economic difficulties, and the banlieues were perceived as a ‘threat’ to national unity (Dikeç, 2007).

Even when taking distances from extremisms, in the public debate there is an emphasis on ‘neighbourhood effects’ (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008): ‘the additional disadvantages that affect poorer people when they are concentrated in poor neighbourhoods’ (ODPM 2005b, 52) highlight that the problem is that poor people live together, not their poverty per se nor the economic re-structuring that has left some areas with insufficient secure, meaningful and well-paid work. Emphasis is given to the spatial ordering of problems, not as a manifestation of structural deficiencies, but in terms which appear to emphasise the spatial behaviour of people: ‘concentration’, ‘clustering’, ‘pockets of poverty’, ‘segregation’.

Also Musterd (2002) agrees in recognizing that while social processes may become manifest in a certain residential stock in a neighbourhood, as rising levels of social segregation or as local spatial concentrations of poverty, that does not necessarily imply that they are also caused by or being problems of the housing stock or of the neighbourhood composition.

Nonetheless it is evident that the spatial segregation and concentration of immigrants are determined by a large number of factors and developments. On the one hand are the variables which relate to the wishes of households and individuals, which should not be undervalued, and on the other hand are their opportunities and limitations. The opportunities are determined by an interaction between the means of
households and individuals and the supply-side factors. On the supply side, the availability and accessibility of dwellings have important roles (Bolt et al., 2008).

During the past decades, a lot of attention in academic literature was paid to issues of segregation in cities (e.g. Castells and Mollenkopf, 1991; Fainstein et al., 1992; Massey and Denton, 1993; Musterd and Ostendorf, 1998; O’Loughlin and Friedrichs, 1996). Segregation is described as the uneven distribution of the population with respect to certain characteristics (Ostendorf et al., 2001).

Research has shown that deprivation in a neighbourhood can have many negative consequences, such as: the occurrence of teenage pregnancies (Anderson, 1999); low socioeconomic position (Galster et al., 1999); school dropout (Overman, 2002); poor educational achievement; retarded child development (Crane, 1991; Duncan et al., 1994); limited transfer from unemployment to work (van der Klaauw and Ours, 2003); deviant behaviour (Friedrichs and Blasius, 2003); social exclusion (Buck, 2001); victimisation (Sampson et al., 1997); and poor access to the labour market (Ihlanefeldt and Sjoquist, 1998).

4.2 Diversity and integration in modern societies

Urban policies nowadays often recall the definition of sustainable communities, which includes not only “sufficient range, diversity, affordability and accessibility of housing within a balanced housing market” (DCLG, 2006) but also that such communities are “fair, tolerant and cohesive” with “tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different cultures, backgrounds and beliefs”.

Heterogeneity, even if its meaning differs from one country to another depending on their specific context (such as economic circumstances, population structure etc.) (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009), is embedded within the transformation of contemporary cities.

According to Lawton (2013), the precise role of diversity can vary, and can include the diversity of shops and services (Montgomery, 1998), an array of architectural styles, or the promotion of social and cultural diversity (Fainstein, 2005; Blokland and van Eijk, 2010). However, picking up on the work of Jacobs (1961), it is possible to view the search for diversity within official approaches to urban transformation as being predominantly driven by desire to enliven urban space.

From this perspective, much has been made of the direct connection between the diversity of functions, urban form and the resulting social life of urban space. As commented by Montgomery (1998): ‘...the key to sustaining diversity lies in there being, within easy travelling distance, relatively large numbers of people with different tastes and proclivities. In other words, a relatively high population density’. Over the last decade the centrality of ‘diversity’ within urban strategies has received a further boost through the work of Florida (2002, 2005), with a ‘vibrant’ and ‘active’ street-scene increasingly seen by practitioners as an essential feature of contemporary urban life and a means of attracting ‘talent’ and industry. Moreover, the means by which this is achieved is perceived to be through the promotion of higher-density urban settings where there is a mix of different activities and social groups, at various scales throughout the city, including the level of individual neighbourhoods.

4.3 Social cohesion, social networks, social capital

Social cohesion can be identified as “a kind of glue holding society together” (Malouts and Malouta 2004; see also Dekker 2006). According to the influential work of Kearns and Forrest (2000), social cohesion comprises shared norms and values, social solidarity, social control, social networks, and a feeling of belonging to each other through a common identity and a strong bonding with the place where one lives. In fact, social cohesion cannot be seen as a single concept, but as a domain of causally interrelated phenomena or as a class of causal models. The focus, in the context of mixing policies, is often restricted to
the level of the neighbourhood. The idea is that social cohesion is a bottom-up process: the quality of social integration at the neighbourhood level is the basis for social cohesion at higher scale levels (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Morrison, 2003). Two dimensions of social cohesion are normally taken into account when trying to identify its effective presence: sense of community and the number of neighbours in one’s social network. While sense of community is a more abstract concept, not easily identified and measured, social network is the aspect most of the sociological studies focus on when attempting to measure social cohesion. Figure 8 summarizes the main components of social cohesion.
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**Figure 8. The components of social cohesion (OECD, 2011)**

**Social relations** form an important source of information and social support (Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1995; Lin, 1999). Who we know determines what type of social resources are available to us to shape, change and improve our lives (Pinkster and Volker, 2009). Some relations help us to get by and cope with everyday problems, by babysitting our children or lending money to pay the rent. Others are more useful to ‘get ahead’ in life by providing information and new opportunities and connecting us to formal institutions or structures, such as the housing or labour market. This is also referred to as the distinction between expressive social resources and instrumental social resources (Lin, 2001; Wellman, 1992). Expressive resources confirm social positions and are generally more abundant than the instrumental resources that are thought to facilitate upward social mobility (van der Gaag and Snijders, 2005). This is related to the fact that expressive resources are generally provided by family and friends from similar backgrounds with access to similar information, while instrumental resources are provided by people with different backgrounds who have access to different information and institutions. Often, similar ties are strong, while dissimilar ties are weak (Granovetter, 1973).

A more diverse or heterogeneous personal network with more weak ties is thought to provide better instrumental resources or ‘**bridging**' social capital than a homogeneous personal network dominated by strong ties that provide ‘**bonding**' capital (Gittell and Vidal, 2005; Halpern, 2005; Portes, 2000; Putnam, 2000, 2004; Blokland and Savage, 2008). In the case of low-income families, a social network existing of network members of similar socio-economic background is therefore expected to bear an instrumental disadvantage.

In general, **social networks** describe the spatial extent, density, diversity and quality of information and resources conveyed by social interrelationships among people and groups. The character of social networks conditions opportunities to get attached to the wider society (Musterd, 2002).
4.4 Social mix: theories, hypothesis and evidence in public debate

As debated in the previous chapter, in recent decades neighbourhood transformation in many European countries has increasingly involved a focus on the promotion of social mixing between different social and ethnic groups (Bauder, 2002; Musterd and Andersson, 2005; Lees, 2008).

Social mixing is based on the premise that the spatial concentration of deprived groups, as typically associated with post-war urban developments of large-scale housing estates, leads to social problems, and the mixing of people from different backgrounds, such as by ethnicity or social class, will therefore help to alleviate such problems (Aalbers, 2011).

There is no unconfutable evidence that neighbourhood effect takes place in Western cities, and a set of beliefs, justifications and reasons underlies both positions in favour or against social mixing policies. We’ll try to go through them in order to explain the current debate.

Rationale for housing policies aiming at social mix

The social rationale for providing mixed income residential areas has been outlined in a study by Berube (2005). He points out that neighbourhoods of concentrated deprivation display the key aspects of disadvantage, namely high unemployment and limited employment horizons, schools struggling to deal with a preponderance of poor people, high levels of crime and disorder, health inequalities and higher prices in shops for those that can least afford them. Such concentrations of deprivation place excessive pressure on public services and are associated with a reduction in private sector activity (Roberts, 2007).

Social mixing is therefore expected to lead to a range of positive outcomes, like social cohesion, social mobility opportunities, more social capital, better services, less crime, an improved neighbourhood reputation, and more residential stability (see e.g., Arthurson, 2002; Bolt and van Kempen 2008; Kleinhans, 2004; Tunstall, 2003).

In a wider perspective it was also believed mixing would equalise housing and social opportunities. It was seen as a measure for countering exclusion or ghettoization (Dansereau et al., 2002; Maurin, 2004). In fact it is believed that in some neighbourhoods, where one-sidedness can occur or already dominates, increasing the diversity of the housing stock can facilitate physical, social and cultural improvement of living and working environments in these neighbourhoods: according to Bolt et al. (2008), “ethnic segregation is the result of socioeconomic segregation and socioeconomic segregation is the consequence of the spatial distribution of affordable housing”. Thus housing policies are seen as the means to counteract ethnic segregation as well as socioeconomic one.

Low-income-groups (and the members of minority ethnic groups amongst them) are expected to benefit from social mix in several ways (Joseph et al., 2007; Kleinhans, 2004; Uitermark, 2003): social interaction between residents of different background leads to social mobility; higher incomes and homeowners may act as positive role models for lower incomes; social mix leads to an increasing social control; and, the presence of affluent residents contributes to more collective action and will therefore have a positive effect on the quality of (public) services in the neighbourhood, as reported by Koutrolikou (2012).

The major issue is therefore the claim that social mix provides opportunities for social interaction between residents of different income levels and ethnic backgrounds. In this way, residents may accumulate more social capital, which is expected to have a positive impact on their social mobility.

Looking behind these expected benefits, it is possible to identify a number of potential mechanisms at work within mixed communities to bring these benefits about. The paper by Kearns and Mason (2007) describes four types of effect on which policy makers appear to be relying.
• **Transformation effects:** The image of poor areas has been difficult to change because such places not only have poor reputations, but the problem is compounded by the stigma attached to social housing (Dean and Hastings, 2000). In order to change the future destiny of communities that have been stuck at the bottom of the heap for some time, there is a need for wholesale transformation, rather than incremental improvements. This has to be real, tangible and visible for both residents and outsiders (visitors and observers). Only in this way will residents acquire a sense of change and a degree of optimism about their own and their neighbourhood’s future, and will outsiders begin to talk about and treat certain areas differently. Housing tenure mixing is seen as a key element in convincing people that areas are changing, visibly in terms of the quality of the built environment, socially in terms of the type of people who live there, and economically in terms of the viability of the local housing market.

• **Resource effects:** One of the anticipated consequences of providing neighbourhoods of mixed tenure is a result of broadening the class base of the residential population, in contrast to the situation where a residualized state housing sector has increasingly accommodated only residents of the lowest social classes. A more middle-class resident group would bring income into the local area and thus help to sustain a better range of private retail outlets and services. In addition, these middle-class residents are also expected to contribute to the raising of standards of public service provision by their stronger ‘voice’ and advocacy skills.

• **Role model effects:** Again, the mixing of tenures is expected to bring benefits via the diversification of the resident group, in particular through the provision of role models for deprived, excluded groups to follow. Behavioural changes might be seen in several areas: in social behaviours, i.e. in how one relates to others and in whether one engages in anti-social behaviour; in personal behaviours, i.e. in how one exercises control over one’s own family members and in how one cares for one’s own property; and in aspirational behaviours, i.e. in what one seeks to achieve, for example, in employment, education or leisure pursuits. These role model effects might arise through peer pressure influences, emulation or as a result of a higher expectation of reprimand and sanction following unwelcome behaviours in a mixed tenure situation.

• **Community effects:** Communities may change as a result of tenure mixing and any compositional changes may result in due course in cultural changes, such as placing greater value on employment or on living a healthy lifestyle. It is expected that tenure mixing will enhance a community’s social capital, embracing all three components of networks, norms and trust (Putnam, 2001). By this means, there should be better local outcomes, for example, in terms of reduced anti-social behaviour (Wilson, 1987; Joseph et al. 2007; Uitermark et al. 2007) as a result of a shift in norms, and through enhanced well-being via strengthened community social networks (Gilchrist, 2004). But there should also be wider benefits due to a shift from relying mainly on bonding social capital, towards a greater utilisation of both bridging and linking social capital (Woolcock, 2001). In this way, communities will be ‘getting ahead’ through wider networking and accessing influence and opportunity, rather than just ‘getting by’ through solidaristic emotional and material support (see Briggs, 1998).

**Positions against social mix**

Those pronouncing against forced or “engineered” social mix, often refer to it as a rhetoric belief, without proven effects. Why social mix is a “good thing” is in many instances not clear. Social mix has become a kind of mantra and policy-makers seem averse to questioning it (van Kempen and Bolt, 2009). Critiques, as those related by Lawton (2013) bring in to question the extent to which social-mix promotes a diversity of social groups across lines of class, ethnicity and race, and instead highlight the bias of such policies towards the attraction of predominantly white middle-class groups (Butler and Robson, 2001). Some of the reasons are that social mix tends to make the middle classes the reference point for the ‘social
bond’, imposing their cultural and social norms within a logic of ‘integration’ where the working classes remain conned in a situation of domination. The ‘social mixing’ that residents say they like is the coming together ‘through commonly shared social networks of like-minded individuals and which, in reality, is largely exclusive of non-middle-class people’, and not a mixing across racial, ethnic and class boundaries (Butler and Robson, 2001: 2150). The social dynamics created in this way include a strong dimension of **conflict between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’**, connected as much with living alongside people one has not chosen, with feelings of downward social mobility and with forms of social and racial rejection, as with the opposition between different social norms. So, for the working classes, the eagerly awaited social cohesion and the school effects of the spatial proximity of the middle classes have not materialized (Bacque et al., 2011).

Also other authors warn that a large degree of heterogeneity at a low scale may have unwanted consequences, such as coolness or even **tensions** between neighbours (Gans, 1961; Goodchild and Cole, 2001; Kleinhans et al., 2007). A number of authors have focused on the tensions arising when groups from divergent social and ethnic backgrounds are mixed in close proximity (Beekman et al., 2001; Smets and den Uyl, 2008; Arthurson, 2010). As summarized by Lees (2008) ‘...socially mixed neighbourhoods are just as likely to engender social conflict as social harmony, due to the clash of different cultures, classes and socioeconomic groups’. Blanc (2010) stresses this position, and advocates that spatial propinquity may exacerbate conflicts among neighbours instead of smoothing exchanges. He defines social mix as an ‘Apollonian utopia’: as it presumes society is made of ‘average’, anonymous and exchangeable individuals. They can be displaced into a space, which is also ‘average’ and without qualities, for implementing a harmonious balance. Real society is far from this vision as it is fragmented and divided by conflicts. Individuals are attached to groups and territories.

On **equity grounds**, social mix means equality of access for all and rejection of apartheid, but in doing so, it undermines the right to choose with whom one wants to live. ‘Self-segregation’, valued by the rich, is forbidden to the poor. Equality and freedom are two principles of equal legitimacy, but incompatible in this context (Blanc, 2010).

Also Lupton and Tunstall (2008) agree with the fact that a policy of mixing communities that have become un-mixed often sits uncomfortably with a social justice perspective: she distinguish that “while creating a brand new mixed community involves reserving a certain amount of the new housing for people who could not afford to buy it on the open market, creating a mixed community in an existing area could mean the opposite: removing some social housing to make room for market-rate homes (although this is not necessarily the case) and/or displacing some existing residents. Other services also need to become geared more towards the advantaged, rather than orienting themselves to the needs of the existing population.

Social mix policies take no account of the very rich; they are left untouched. The aim is to mix popular and middle classes. On efficiency grounds, it sounds reasonable, but the very poor are not accommodated (Lapeyronnie, 2008). And, most of the times, the usual effect of creating more expensive dwellings in a district is that ethnic and disadvantaged groups have to look elsewhere for a home, because they cannot afford the more expensive dwellings on their low incomes. There are serious doubts whether urban restructuring is an effective means to combat segregation. Of course, demolition and upgrading of the housing stock will bring about a decrease in low-income (minority ethnic) households in certain neighbourhoods, but these households **have to move to other places** in the city, especially towards neighbour-hoods where affordable housing is still available. There is a large ‘risk’, therefore, that the idea of creating more socioeconomically mixed communities in one area engenders socio-cultural concentrations in another area, because only in those areas unaffected by the policy of urban restructuring is affordable housing still available (Crump, 2002; van Kempen and Priemus, 2002). Musterd (2003) adds to that criticism that urban restructuring does not address the causes of segregation. Differentiation of the
housing stock cannot change the tendency that people choose to associate themselves with like-minded people (Musterd, 2003). Briggs (1997), for example, points to possible negative effects of mixing in terms of a loss of social support. For decades, researchers have pointed to the importance of ethnic and other ties in creating networks of social support, which often depend on close contacts with similarly situated individuals... In some new neighbourhood contexts, housing mobility programmes may actually leave the poor with less of this social support dimension of social capital—the kinds of resources that help individuals and families get by or cope with chronic poverty. The same programmes may leave the same people with more of other types of social capital, including ‘social leverage’—social resources that help change people’s life chances or help them get ahead. (p. 202). The question then is whether the benefits of social mixing through urban renewal outweigh the drawbacks of forcing people to move away from their support network. The argument is that living in a homogeneous neighbourhood might provide the type of social resources that form a springboard for residents to improve their social positions, for example, in the case of ethnic communities (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993; Portes, 2000). Low-income residents in mixed neighbourhoods might miss these types of social resources.

Critics on policies’ motivations

Lees (2008) contends that social mix as a policy driver for ‘developing sustainable communities’—a major feature of the British ‘Urban Renaissance agenda’—is rather a masked gentrification process accompanied by extensive demolitions or transfers of working-class housing estates. Both Lees (2008) and Randolph and Wood (2003) consider policies that rely on social mix for achieving greater social interactions to be rather weakly based; as Koutrolikou (2012) observes, the forms of interactions urban policies support are mainly fleeting. As mixed-tenure policies do not address poverty directly, but rather its spatial distribution, it has been noted that these policies often amount to nothing more than problem dilution (Kleinhans, 2004). Finally, the idea that differentiation has an effective means of combating segregation disregards the fact that spatial segregation is determined by a large number of factors, many of which are unrelated to the housing stock characteristics of neighbourhoods (Musterd, 2003; van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998).

Lupton and Tunstall (2008) summarize these positions by saying that ‘Neighbourhood effects’ tend to be spoken of as ‘people effects’ (out-of-work role models; anti-social peer groups; lack of bridging social capital; lack of resources to support neighbourhood shops and so on), implying that it is the characteristics and interactions of the poor themselves that account for limited individual outcomes in areas of concentrated poverty (Joseph et al., 2007). It is a short step from there to the assumption that the solution is to reduce the proportion of poor people, rather than to address structural inequalities or inject additional resources to provide the services that people need.

More recently, several studies have questioned the relevance of new urban renewal policies by considering their social outcomes (Crump, 2002; Kleinhans, 2004; Kruythoff, 2003; Premius, 2004) and focusing on the effects of housing demolition for relocated households (Lelévrier, 2010; Kleinhans, 2003; Kleinhans and van der Laan Bouma Doof, 2008; van Beckhoven and van Kempen, 2003).

Musterd and Andersson (2005) underline another factor, related to the role of the market: the government and the state may formulate ideas and guidelines concerning what is believed to be a wishful trajectory, but they do not control (or wish to control) the means of achieving this under normal market conditions where a range of actors affect what is to be built, where, and for whom. And even if a certain mix of housing types and tenures is realized, the actual mix of households is contingent on a series of factors such as local economic development, migration in and out of the city, the level of service provision in the initial stages.
In addition, in his analysis of the role of property developers in developing socially-mixed neighbourhoods in the UK, Tiesdell (2004, 198) discussed the reality of the market as follows: “Although policy may support the notion of mixed communities, it may be incompatible with the real world, where residential patterns are determined in large part by residential preferences and the market power of individuals”. This, as he continued, more often than not results in social housing being located in the less sought after part of a development site or neighbourhood, such as that which is more prone to noise pollution. Thus, in combination with factors related to perception of forms of behaviour of different social groups, the influence of market forces has an over-riding impact upon the development of social-mix policies, even where policy formation is orientated towards the development of integrated solutions (Lawton, 2013).

Societies, cities, and neighbourhoods are all interrelated systems, and policy responses to neighbourhood problems, should therefore, take these various levels into account simultaneously. The welfare state at the national level, the labour market and economy at the regional—and global—levels, and the social networks at the local levels: probably they all play a role in understanding what is happening at the very local level. Therefore, individual, neighbourhood, and wider context variables should be incorporated simultaneously.

**Gentrification**

Gentrification is a particular aspect of social mixing policies, mainly occurring in inner city areas, which appear to be a place concentration of poverty and diversity where middle-class start to move in, voluntarily or induced by policy interventions. As Blanc (2010) explains, gentrification began in the 1960s in inner-city run-down areas at individual gentrifiers’ initiative: they purchased a dilapidated building at a low price with the purpose of improving its condition afterwards. This process led to a massive arrival of owner-occupiers in formerly deprived neighbourhoods. Housing costs start to go up, which can drive out welfare-benefit-dependent households who are not in social housing, then the lower-income working households who could previously have rented privately or bought homes (Atkinson, 2006 and 2008), starting a process of displacement in the worst cases.

Current policies on social mixing often seek to use gentrification as a ‘positive public policy tool’ to revitalise inner urban neighbourhoods (see Cameron, 2003, on gentrification as a ‘positive public policy tool’; and Lees et al., 2008, on state-led ‘positive’ gentrification). Schoon (2001) identifies three distinct rationales in policy debates for social mixing, all already explained in previous paragraphs. First, the ‘defending the neighbourhood’ argument, which recognizes middle-class people as stronger advocates for public resources, thus producing benefits for every resident. Secondly, the ‘money-go-round’ argument, claiming that tenurially and socioeconomically mixed neighbourhoods are able to support a stronger local economy than areas of concentrated poverty. Finally, the ‘networks and contacts’ argument draws on Putnam’s (1995) influential account of bridging and bonding social capital to promote social mixing as the way to generate social cohesion and economic opportunity.

State supported gentrification has been on the increase since the mid-1990s as local state actors seek to boost the competitiveness of their city’s economy and their tax bases, which are further stretched in some cases by retrenchment in national state assistance to cities for infrastructure and social welfare programs (Lees, 2008; Rose, 2010).

The types of programs that have attracted the greatest research attention are those involving the demolition of entire low-income social housing complexes on land with the potential to dramatically escalate in value, in favour of higher income or mixed-income/mixed-tenure development in which the returning low-income tenants are selected on the basis of their ‘compatibility’ with the newcomers and
their demonstrated capacity to escape economic dependency on social welfare payments (Chaskin and Joseph, 2011). That’s one of the processes which, according to Blanc (2010) could lead to the eviction of the poor from the neighbourhood: increased segregation at a later stage remain a risk.

The gentrification literature suggests that a ‘new middle class’ may be more inclined to find a diverse neighbourhood attractive than do other people with middle and higher incomes, and therefore be willing to move there (Bloklan and van Eijk, 2010). Florida (2003) suggests that a ‘creative class’ consists of considerably more- tolerant people who enjoy diversity.

Sociocultural diversity is a leitmotif in the new tastes for central city housing and neighbourhood (Lees, 2008). One of the great amenities of dense city living is found in exposure to such social and cultural diversity as ethnicity: a milieu of diversity represents a children advantage over ‘homogeneous suburbs’, because children are exposed to social ‘reality’ and to the give and take of social and cultural accommodation with those who are different; for adults the urban ambience of diversity is a continual source of stimulation and renewal and a reminder of the cultural relativity of one’s own style of life. It is said to be a relief from the subcultural sameness and ‘boredom’ of many suburban communities (Allen, 1984, pp. 31-32).

Coming back to processes of gentrification, where middle classes express their willingness to move into a mixed neighbourhood, there are doubts about the extent to which residents who consciously choose an area because of its diverse character want to engage in their neighbourhood.

May has pointed to the ambiguous position of middle classes in gentrified neighbourhoods: ‘whilst welcoming a world of difference this interest in difference and otherness can also be understood as describing a project of cultural capital’ (1996, p. 196). The presence of working-class residents and ethnic minorities is an opportunity to ‘learn’ about other cultures, which makes these residential groups ‘little more than the object of (...) an “exotic gaze”’ (May, 1996). Butler (2003), too, has shown that middle-class residents living in a gentrified area in London often expressed a ‘narrative of belonging’, but that this narrative did not necessarily translate into actual involvement with other residents and neighbourhood institutions. While gentrifiers ‘celebrated’ the diverse population and the cultural and consumption infrastructure of the neighbourhoods, they separated themselves from other residential groups by taking their children to schools elsewhere, thus ‘perpetuating social divisions across the generations’ (Butler, 2003: 2483). Butler describes a high level of individualism and privatisation within middle-class households. He concludes that there is ‘little evidence of the middle class deploying its resources for the benefits of the wider community’. When middle-class residents become active in neighbourhoods, some ethnic-minority members of lower economic status may begin to see neighbourhood organisations, and eventually the neighbourhood, as ‘not for us’ (cf. Jenkins 1996: 113). Similarly, as Lawton (2013) highlighted, in drawing on work on the connection between social-mix and gentrification by Slater (2004) and Butler and Robson (2001), Uitermark et al. (2007, 137) commented that ‘...relations between different social and ethnic groups in an area are parallel rather than integrative. The ambition to create social cohesion gradually becomes more illusory as lifestyle differences increase’. Social-mix policies, when viewed from this perspective, are perceived as a means of improving ‘liveability’, where neighbourhoods are thought to be safer due to the deconcentration of particular social groups (Uitermark 2003, 2010). Thus, the forms that ‘diversity’ take within urban areas undergoing social and physical transformation become less about integration between different social groups, but about a desire for an image of an acceptable level of difference (Lees, 2008) and social order. From a critical perspective, this viewpoint perceives those who are ‘undesirable’ as being systematically excluded from public space in favour of activities and people who are more economically viable (Aalbers, 2011).

As the focus of this review is not explicitly on gentrification processes, which are a particular case of social mixing policies, we resend to specific studies on the subject. A valuable and quite exhausting one is
the study by Loretta Lees (2008), who offers an evaluation of gentrification as a policy, collecting many evidence-based studies and concluding very critically that gentrification in most of the cases is followed by declining, rather than improving, levels of social mix, ethnic diversity and immigrant concentration within affected neighbourhoods. Citing a study from Walks and Maaranen, she concludes that the lesson for policy-makers is that if they want to intervene to ensure proportionate levels of social mix and retain a more balanced social structure, they should be aiming to limit, rather than promote, gentrification (Walks and Maaranen, 2008, p. 320; original emphasis).

4.5 Residential segregation: neighbourhoods without mix

What happens when social mix is not present at all and no policy action is taken?

The ethnic stratification model (Logan and Alba, 1993; South and Crowder, 1997) features the role of discrimination in the housing market, which makes it difficult even for immigrants with a good economic position to acquire a dwelling in a neighbourhood associated with high socioeconomic status, thus generating ethnically segregated neighbourhoods. There have indeed been many studies in both the US and Western Europe that have revealed discriminatory practices by actors of all kinds in the housing market. We can think of mortgage providers (Aalbers, 2005; Galster et al., 1999), estate agents (Philips and Kearn, 1992), (social) land-lords (Philips, 1998), local (Musterd et al., 1998) and national government institutions (Giffinger, 1998). Van Kempen and Bolt (2009) nonetheless add that a more hidden explanation should be considered as well; the fact that housing diversification is seen as the main measure to address segregation might also be why almost all municipalities see the homogeneous housing stock in the urban districts as the single reason for the existence of concentrations of minority ethnic groups and/or low-income groups (Bolt and Van Kempen 2008). On the one hand this explanation is logical, but on the other hand it is striking that hardly any attention is given to housing preferences or housing allocation systems as factors that might be important for explaining these spatial concentrations.

Dhalmann and Vilkama in their study on Somali ethnic group in Finland (2009), explores factors behind the residential patterns of ethnic segregation which appear much more multifaceted. Housing careers of immigrants, at least where they can have access to it, are entirely made within the council housing sector and therefore the availability of suitable council dwellings has limited their scope of locations. In addition, inadequate knowledge of other housing options and fears of possible racism can play a role in intensifying ethnic spatial concentration.

That’s why Andersson et al. (2010) suggests that “the most efficient class related anti-segregation policy is not to be found within the realms of housing or urban policies but rather in policies affecting the allocation of economic resources among households in society”.

According to Blokland and van Eijk (2010) there are some common believes, not proven, about segregation effects: the first is that residential segregation hampers individual opportunities for the social mobility of migrants because they are disconnected from the resources and networks necessary to get ahead primarily because of the demographic composition of their neighbourhood. The disadvantaged position of immigrants is then explained by a supposed absence of people who are better-off. People who, had they been available, would have provided the disadvantaged with networks rich in resources for getting ahead, or what in social capital theory has been called ‘bridges’ (Briggs de Souza, 1998; Putnam, 2000). Second, a common belief is that segregation threatens cohesion because minority groups keep their distance “in practice and in values” from the mainstream by forming their own communities in their own neighbourhoods.

Bolt et al. (2008) assess that those negative effects can be over gone with time: in fact, according to the spatial assimilation model, the segregation of ethnic groups declines as their length of residence increases
(Lieberson, 1961). The mechanisms that bring about the dispersion of ethnic groups are acculturation and socioeconomic mobility (Charles, 2003; Logan and Alba, 1993; Massey, 1985). Acculturation is the gradual acquisition of the language, norms and values of the host community (Gordon, 1964). The greater the extent to which in the course of time immigrants integrate with the host community, the less is their need to live in proximity to their own group. In addition, in the course of time more immigrants will climb the social ladder and will also want to benefit from their newly acquired status by moving into a qualitatively better neighbourhood. In a geographical sense, spatial assimilation is accompanied by a process of decentralisation. Enclaves surrounding the inner city are exchanged for more mixed neighbourhoods in the suburbs and at the edge of the city (Burgess, 1925). In the literature on ethnic segregation, however, attention is also given to the possible positive effects of ethnic segregation. Spatial concentrations can have an important expressive function, assisting with the maintenance of a group’s cultural traditions (Dunn, 1998); they enable minorities to maintain their language and cultural heritage and provide a feeling of security (Peach, 1996; Tomlins et al., 2002; Phillips, 2006). Relatedly, living in an ethnic enclave makes it easier to maintain ethnic networks (Koutrelikou, 2012), particularly at the beginning of their migration experience (Dhalmann and Vilkama, 2009), through which people are able to derive benefits from each other and offer support to one another (Bolt et al., 1998). Moreover, ethnic neighbourhoods may function as a safe haven in a hostile environment (Boal, 1976) and they may provide alternative channels for social mobility (Portes and Zhou, 1993). The cultural preference approach assumes that the preference for living in a neighbourhood where one’s own ethnic group is strongly represented persists, even if socioeconomic and cultural differences decline. The availability of social ties within the own ethnic group is often seen as an advantage of a concentration neighbourhood (Bolt et al., 1998). For Van Kempen and Bolt (2009), this links to the finding that for people on a low income in particular, a neighbourhood functions more as a source of bonding capital than as a platform for bridging capital (Burns et al., 2001). Bonding capital refers to the strong bonding between people that produces very little new information. This bonding is strong within a particular group, but easily leads to social fragmentation in the broader society. Bridging capital, in contrast, refers to weak ties that do provide information on the wider world, such as the availability of jobs (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). From the individual’s viewpoint, a strong binding within a particular group can be positive; through it, one acquires social contacts, feelings of security and belonging, and the opportunity to exchange goods. But at the same time such a bond can lead, consciously or unconsciously, to the weakening of the bonds with the rest of the urban society (Healey, 1997).

The “other side” of ghetto is the self-segregation of more affluent population.

Bretherton and Pleadse (2011) recognize the tendency of more affluent households to cluster together in large numbers: there is evidence that the middle classes in cities occasionally ‘fort up’ in gated communities (Atkinson and Flint, 2004; Atkinson, 2006; Blanc, 2010), showing the inclination among more affluent owner-occupiers to live in socioeconomically homogeneous suburban enclaves and to resist encroachment by poorer households into those enclaves (Young and Kramer, 1978; Bevan, 2000; Cloke et al., 2002; Atkinson and Flint, 2004; Atkinson, 2006; Burrows, 2008; Mooney, 2008). Maurin (2004) provides detailed evidence on segregation being the consequence of the search of the best neighbours and the best schools for one’s children, excluding other people as ‘not good enough’.

Homogeneous high-income areas are never considered to constitute problems for individuals or policy makers (Musterd and Andersson, 2005). As Andersson (2000) shows in a countrywide analysis on housing segregation in Sweden, the geographical concentration of the rich is much stronger than that of the poor. These considerations have led Bretherton and Pleace (2011) to state that attempting to promote social diversity in urban neighbourhoods goes against the demonstrable preferences of many more affluent households.
4.6 Focus on the impacts

Looking at the rationale for mixing policies, some relevant observations and impacts can be reported.

As the reputation of a neighbourhood is strongly associated with the socio-economic composition of the neighbourhood, as already explained in paragraph 4.1 about extra-neighbourhood effect, it seems reasonable to expect the mixing of poor neighbourhoods to lead to a better reputation. However, in practice it is not easy to overcome place-based stigma (Bond et al., 2011). Hastings and Dean (2003) showed in their study of an English neighbourhood that the current reputation was related to the social class of its original (pre slum-clearance) residents of many years before. This finding indicates that it might be much more difficult to change outsiders’ opinions of an area than to change the view or satisfaction of the residents of mixed neighbourhoods. Gilbert (2010) agrees in saying that “implementing effective means to counter-stigmatization remains quite a difficult task, as area-specific policies tend, paradoxically, to reinforce the idea that the areas concerned are problematic”.

As result of a resource effect, it has been advocated that social mixing, by relying on the civic engagement of middle-class households, can bring to an improvement in local resources and services.

This is an important issue, as it has long been argued that deprived areas, those areas most in need, tend to receive worse services than other areas. In their longitudinal study of 12 deprived areas in the UK the Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, describing the position of these areas in the late 1990s, stated that the problem was not that the [public] services were absent, but more often they were insufficient to keep up with demand, and they struggled to provide the quality of services that was needed and that residents in other areas could expect to receive (cited in Lupton, 2003).

The argument for an improvement in mixed tenure neighbourhoods is that the middle classes would be less likely to put up with this situation, or, slightly differently, that public servants would not try to get away with providing a lower quality of service. Of course, middle classes have better means, through a mixture of social and cultural capital, to bring about resolutions or improvements to problems with services, and to gain the most from existing provision. A new, more prosperous, population could thus lead to a higher quantity as well as higher quality of amenities (Arthurson, 2002). On the other hand, it has also been found in some mixed-tenure regeneration areas that new inhabitants of the area are less prone to shop there and prefer to do so elsewhere (van Beckhoven and van Kempen, 2003; Camina and Wood, 2009). Nonetheless, although there is hardly any research on this issue, there is some indication that social mix produces more effective collective action (Jupp, 1999).

Role model effects theory is not confirmed by evidence: there is every possibility that interactions between neighbours from different housing tenures may be negative rather than positive. Qualitative research among residents of mixed-tenure estates in Scotland, for example, indicated that the closer is the physical proximity between tenures, the greater is the social tensions between residents from different backgrounds (Beekman et al., 2001).

Bolt and van Kempen’s (2011) research on inhabitants’ satisfaction has led to the conclusion that after the intervention, no progress has been made with respect to the neighbourhoods’ safety, reputation or social cohesion, at least not in the eyes of the neighbourhood residents (Kleinhans, 2004; Bond et al., 2011). Another interesting study by Van Kempen and Bolt (2009) addresses questionnaires about neighbourhood problems in mixed-tenure areas: he found out that a greater diversity of tenure was associated with an increase in five of the 10 neighbourhood problems that respondents were asked to identify. The issue that was most strongly related to tenure mix was the incidence of problems with neighbours, which is an indication of the lack of social cohesion in mixed neighbourhoods.
Also according to Bolt and van Kempen’s (2011) findings on case studies, the majority of the population sees the new and renovated dwellings inside a restructured neighbourhood as a positive development. Apparently, the new dwellings have not been able to curb the process of neighbourhood decline yet, but they give rise to a remarkable optimism about the future. This can be read as a promising sign about the future of the neighbourhoods, even if conclusions about the effects of urban restructuring may be taken only after years.

Being community effect the focus of the review, it will be investigated more in depth in the next paragraph..

4.7 IS SOCIAL INTERACTION REALLY TAKING PLACE IN MIXED NEIGHBOURHOODS?

When promoted by functional mix policies, another question rises on whether and how encounters which are promoted by mixed neighbourhoods really take place and translate into durable social ties.

Some results are here presented keeping in mind, as Bacque et al. (2011) wrote, that caution should be adopted when evaluating social effects, as they differ according to the housing trajectories of the households actively or passively affected by the policies and according to local social and urban characteristics.

Does social interaction increase in mixed neighbourhoods?

Most studies on neighbourhood diversification examine the degree of social interaction between several groups within the neighbourhood (see Atkinson, 2005; Joseph et al., 2007; Kleinhans, 2004 for an overview). Several studies in the Netherlands (such as Dekker and Bolt, 2005; van Beckhoven and van Kempen, 2003), the UK (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; Bramley and Morgan, 2003) have shown that social interactions between different categories (in terms of tenure, socio-economic status or ethnicity) do not automatically occur in practice, as confirmed also in the literature review by Blokland and van Eijk (2010).

The general picture is that different groups of people in the neighbourhoods live alongside each other, not together. This, then, confirms the picture put forward by Butler (2003) or May (1996): a taste for diversity means little to social network diversity. As far as diversity is brought into the practice of daily life, using commercial neighbourhood facilities is all that diversity-seekers do more. But actual use of neighbourhood facilities does not contribute to network diversity. Even for those who, whether middle-class or not, come into a mixed neighbourhood with openness to diversity, this openness does not translate in more diverse networks. In its study, Koutrikou (2012) encountered that, contrary to the social mix discourse, new and wealthier residents tended not to use the same facilities as the rest, striving primarily to create their own—and more expensive—infrastructure while displacing locals. Studies in impoverished neighbourhoods also tend to show that middle-class households avoid educational social mix for their children, instead adopting different kinds of strategies (van Zanten, 2001). More in general, Robert Putnam (2007) recently underlined that ethnic diversity within neighbourhoods tends to produce individual behaviours of retreat in private spaces.

This leads to the conclusion that spatial proximity is not a sufficient condition for social interactions (Kleinhans, 2004, Atkinson, 2006; Blokland 2003, 2008; Butler, 2003). Differences in lifestyle make it not very likely that people with different characteristics will develop social relationships. People like to live among people with similar characteristics (van Ham and Feijten, 2008), as they generally prefer to interact with those of similar backgrounds, such as education, occupational status, age and ethnicity (Fischer, 1977; Verbrugge, 1977).

There is no straight interpretation about how to encourage social interaction: cities are complex environments, which simultaneously become the laboratories for governing ‘living together’, the places of
its contestation and the terrains where integration is transformed from ideology to lived practices (Koutrolikou, 2012). The debate is still very lively, and models of integration (such as multiculturalism, assimilation, separatism) include concerns about immigration, rights and responsibilities, welfare provision, control and conflict, national identities, inequalities and social justice. The benefits and limitations of contact and interaction are also associated with the spatialities of intergroup relations through discussions about bridging or twinning activities, celebratory events, public spaces and everyday places.

There are some indications that social interactions between income-groups occur when there is a moderate degree of income heterogeneity (Brophy and Smith, 1997; Rosenbaum et al., 1998), which will be examined in paragraph 4.8.

Does social cohesion increase in mixed neighbourhoods? Is it an effect of social interactions?

Social cohesion is a multidimensional concept, which includes not only social networks, but also shared norms and values and place attachment (Kearns and Forrest, 2000; Dekker and Bolt, 2005). Case studies of urban restructuring report mixed results. While Brown et al. (2004) found a relatively strong attachment of the residents in new dwellings in Salt Lake City, the opposite was the case for two Dutch cities: Utrecht and The Hague (Dekker and Bolt, 2005). On the basis of more quantitative studies, it seems justifiable to refute the widely-held claim that mixing leads to more social cohesion. Using the nationwide Survey of English Housing, Kearns and Mason (2007) assessed the impact of tenure mix (as a proxy for social mix) on a variety of neighbourhood problems. A greater diversity of tenure was found to be associated with the incidence of problems with neighbours, which is an indication of a lack of social cohesion in mixed neighbourhoods. Wittebrood and Van Dijk (2007) compared the assessment of place attachment in 24 restructured neighbourhoods in the Netherlands with 24 comparable neighbourhoods in which restructuring (mixed tenures) had not (yet) taken place. Place attachment turned out to have evolved more positively in the other neighbourhoods than in the restructuring neighbourhoods. Van Bergeijk et al. (2008) asked over a thousand respondents in six urban restructuring areas whether they had witnessed an improvement or decline of social cohesion in the neighbourhood since the differentiation of the housing stock had taken place. Only in one neighbourhood did people speak in a positive sense of an evolving social cohesion. In four neighbourhoods, those who saw improvement were significantly outnumbered by people who thought that the social cohesion had declined. This finding is in line with other evaluations of social mixing policies. Mixing is reported to have either no effect (Bond et al., 2011), or a negative effect (Kleinians, 2004), on social cohesion. Van Kempen and Bolt (2009) go further in their study, reporting also that this lack of social cohesion has a negative effect on the individual’s quality of life and on communal living. The lack of cohesion leads to a lack of attention for the living environment and fellow district residents, to a lack of social control, and to a lack of mutual trust. We’ll examine outcomes on individual health in next chapter (5).

If we take into account the development of social networks (bridging and bonding), as one of the measures of social cohesion, Pinkster and Volker’s (2009) findings can be of some interest. Analysing socio-economic prestige in residents’ networks show that disadvantaged residents in low-income neighbourhoods are slightly worse off in terms of network diversity than disadvantaged residents in mixed neighbourhoods, while they do not differ in terms of social support. Thus, residents in the low-income neighbourhood are socially isolated in terms of access to prestige, but not in terms of actual support. Although neighbourhood context plays only a moderate role in influencing socio-economic prestige compared to individual characteristics, such as level of education and ethnicity, it is nevertheless interesting from an international perspective that such mild forms of social isolation occur even in relatively fragmented and heterogeneous low-income neighbourhoods.
Evidence on housing policies: is mix achievable and how?

Previous urban renewal programmes already raised this question, leading to the departure of the most precarious people from city-centre areas. More generally, the improvement of housing conditions since the 1950s – partly thanks to urban renewal – has resulted in a paradoxical effect (Gilbert, 2010): the disappearance of a huge number of low-cost housing units in the private sector (Arbonville, 2000). Contemporary urban renewal reinforces this trend; however, this time it is low-cost social housing that is weakened. The replacement of social accommodation with new types of tenure (private renting and home ownership) leads to an increase in housing costs. This increase also concerns social housing, with new (albeit smaller) accommodation commanding higher rents and older properties facing a rise in costs related to their refurbishment. In view of these elements, this policy is likely to result in the displacement of precarious households to areas outside the renewed neighbourhoods.

Blanc (2010), trying to make a balance of social mix policies in France, highlights that creating new estates involving a mix of social and private housing is extremely difficult to implement, when private sector is involved. Most applicants in the private sector, in fact, object to the presence of social housing in their neighbourhood (Barthel and Dèbre, 2010). New social housing estates are smaller and better, but not for the very poor. Most social landlords intend to reduce their social sector to attract middle-class tenants. The paradoxical result of the French social mix police by implementation is then to reject the very poor into stigmatised housing estates (Lelévrier, 2010), which become true multi-ethnic ghettos in which class borders are more resistant than ethnic borders.

[...] We also note that other work on the comparative social and economic characteristics of different tenure types (for example, Smith and Mallinson, 1997; Burrows, 2003), suggests that owner-occupiers are not always or necessarily more advantaged than renters in social housing. Thus, there is no reason to assume that the owners will necessarily be ‘better off’ than the social renters.

4.8 Results of the narrative review: key findings

Does housing mix lead to social mix?

In general, little research has been done on the effects of housing mix, especially in European countries, but the existing evidence suggests that even if a mix in housing types and tenure does lead to greater spatial integration, it does not necessarily improve social integration between citizens of different age, class and ethnic group (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009). Other researchers do agree that this thesis is far from being proven (Briggs, 1998; Bramley and Karley, 2007; Graham et al., 2009).

Musterd and Andersson, in their study dated 2005 and based on quantitative data, found out that the association between housing mix and social mix is not very strong. Therefore the first assumption of this review - that there is a strong relation between housing mix and social mix - cannot be supported: in fact, most of the homogeneous neighbourhoods in terms of housing structure are not known as the most segregated areas.

Hence creating mixed neighbourhoods might not be the “Holy Grail” in preventing the negative effects of spatial community fragmentation. The consequences of forcing socio-economic and ethnic groups to mix in neighbourhoods, against mechanisms of residents’ preferences, could even create community tension and destabilise communities and neighbourhoods (van Ham and Manley, 2009).

According to Kearns and Mason (2007), ‘mixed communities’ as a guiding principle for regeneration and urban policy is too crude a mantra: which neighbourhood processes operate in what circumstances or how the positive gains to some people and communities are weighed against the dis-benefits that mixed communities may bring to others are not based upon knowledge.
Where and when does it work?

Gilbert (2010) gives an interesting input about which kind of policy could be more effective, drawing on Les Minguettes case study in France, where two areas where renewed with different approaches. In the most recently renewed area (hard renewal), the urban tools (mixed tenures, disciplinary apparatuses, amenities designed to attract outsiders, etc.) were deployed, whereas in the other area, renewed a few years earlier (soft renewal), certain features had been associated with new buildings designed for local residents. As well as local shops and services, it also opened a ‘neighbourhood centre’, where social workers promoted the development of local life and support, through activities for children and adults alike, and encourage local adults to take an active role. The ethnographic observations have shown that these new institutions, through their support of local social life, seem to have enhanced neighbourhood ties and made it possible for local residents to access elevated or central positions on the local scene – their notability compensating their exclusion from or disadvantaged position within the employment system. On the contrary, in the hard renewed area, central amenities (music school, training centres, etc.) have tended to attract outsiders and exclude the majority of local residents. In short, urban renewal (in its dominating hard version) does not offer any support to this lower-class-specific resource and tends instead to weaken it.

Another condition under which social mix might work is when diversity is achieved at a very low scale. The idea is that social interaction in the neighbourhood takes place mainly between people who live very close to each other, which is essential for local relations, since different groups share services and everyday life and familiarise themselves with ‘others’ through on-going everyday interactions (Koutrolikou, 2012).

At the contrary, when building blocks within a mixed neighbourhood remain homogeneous, it is not to be expected that many interactions between different groups will occur.

The importance of scale and its relationship to public space has been somewhat clarified by Kleinmans (2004, 378) as follows: ‘...the importance of building block and street level suggests that cross-tenure social interaction is subject to distance decay (cf. Atkinson and Kintrea, 1998; Page and Boughton, 1997). As proximity between tenures increases, so does the occurrence of social networks among residents of different tenures’. When viewed from this perspective, it is reasonable to suggest that while social mixing does not necessarily result in the formation of strong relationships between different groups, interaction is more likely to occur between groups when different tenures are placed in close proximity to each other (Lawton, 2013).

Such observations should be taken into account for future policies.

An insight on social spaces

Uitermark (2003) has conducted research on mixing at the building and block level, highlighting some interesting features on communal spaces. While a central element of social-mix theory is the common interaction within social space, the respondents have highlighted how the integration of different groups in close proximity itself brings a set of new difficulties related to social order and management (Tiesdell, 2004). In this same study, a number of respondents have ended up showing the desire for separation of communal social space within socially-mixed apartment blocks.

Therefore, it can be argued that social interaction will take place at a scale above that of the internal spaces of the staircases or corridors. Predominantly, the perspective amongst the respondents has been that social mixing would be most ideal at the level of the street or open public space.

Here, it is contended that while the micro-politics of enclosed spaces has resulted in the separation of social groups, the promotion of more openly accessible public spaces could be utilized as a mean of enhancing more informal interaction between different groups. Furthermore, there is an expectation that if
focused on the street, the form that interaction will take will become less fraught and conflictual, thus promoting greater ease of management and a more ‘liveable’ area (Uitermark, 2003, 2010).

The evidence reported by Roberts (2007) is partial, but it does demonstrate that where residents are required to encounter each other in the public realm, literally by “bumping into each other”, then there is some evidence of social interaction and mutual recognition. This is not to say that different groups of residents become intimate or supportive, but that a spectrum of relationships is facilitated, that at its weakest level becomes manifest as a tolerance of difference and at its strongest, actual mixing.

Public spaces, from the more private or semi-private spaces, such as inner-courtyards, stairwells and lifts, to larger public spaces, such as public parks, streets and squares (Lawton, 2013), are still considered as the epitome of the ideal public sphere and thus as the ideal terrain for encounters, visibility and dialogue among people and groups. Koutrolikou (2012) notes that despite their undoubted significance, the belief in the capacity of public spaces to improve intergroup relations and facilitate lasting interactions might be exaggerated and seems to be influenced as much by the kinds of interactions and by the groups involved (Amin, 2002; Vertovec, 2007).

Nonetheless, Koutrolikou (2012) stresses the fact that space, as a resource and as a terrain, is crucial for groups and for intergroup relations: together with housing, public spaces hold a prominent role in the discussion about ethno-cultural relations, mostly embodying the perception that they can facilitate relations.

Using local facilities and public spaces may indeed create the ‘public familiarity’ which results from running into the same people regularly and which helps people to feel ‘at home’ in their neighbourhood, even when not developing further social ties or even speaking to anyone. Such public familiarity may also provide the soil for growing local ties. It is logical that only residents who live in areas with racial, ethnic and class diversity have a statistical chance to accidentally get to know a neighbour who is not like themselves (Blokland and van Eijk, 2010).

Street markets also play an important role: often structured around food, local street markets represent a potential first step for overcoming stereotypes of otherness (i.e. smell, dirt, uncivilised), since the interactions that take place there, apart from the fleeting, can also be sustained or semi-sustained. Simultaneously, they offer employment opportunities through which traders develop more sustained relations with each other (and of course conflicts).

The street is therefore perceived as a ‘neutral container’ (Sennett, 1990) in which different groups will be able to negotiate desires for different uses. From a broader perspective, the desire for creating social-mix at a scale that promotes interaction only within the street or other public areas also leads to the possibility that different groups will be able to ignore each other’s existence, thus questioning the degree to which social interaction will take place within socially-mixed neighbourhoods (Tiesdell, 2004; Joseph et al., 2007; Smets and den Uyl, 2008).

5. HEALTH IMPACT: DATA EXTRACTION, ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

5.1 TARGET POPULATION

Setting: all studies included focused on neighbourhood level

Countries: all studies included examine situation in EU15 towns
Age: all studies explore the situation of adults with slight differences in minimum and maximum age. No studies were found about youth or teen-agers, probably due to a lack of focus (setting – e.g. school – or age in keywords)

Sex: no studies focused on one gender. Only Poortinga (2007) represents a sub analysis of the main one present in Poortinga (2008), concerning the effect on women.

Subgroup: even if some studies dealt with the ethnicity as a confounder or a mediator of the effect, no one excludes any ethnic group from the sample.

5.2 STUDY CHARACTERISTICS

Few articles have been found about the direct link social mix → health or health behaviour. Two are the social constructs investigated: social mix according to housing tenure (two UK study) and according to ethnic group (one systematic review including mainly US studies and only five UK studies).

Graham et al. (2009) tried to deal with the direct connection between social housing tenure mixing and health; they adopted the Census and administrative health data in two periods of analysis.

Lawder (2013) has the most complete source of data, having linked records from two cross sectional surveys, census data and administrative health data. This is the only study collecting data for both perceived and registered health.

The systematic review of Bècares (2012) couldn’t pool any results because of the heterogeneity of study designs and methods.

This scarcity of papers exploring the direct link pushed us into doing a deeper analysis of architectural, sociological and medical literature, investigating the influence that policies have on social networks.

The main part of research in this topic adopt cross sectional survey for both the psychosocial risk factor and the health outcome or the behavioural risk factor (14 studies), one study only has a cohort design. Some experience of mix methods are noteworthy (three studies), utilizing administrative data and questionnaires on the same geographical area.

Annex 3 shows the characteristics of the studies included.

5.3 CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Riva et al. in 2007 published a scoping review aimed at evaluating the status quo of research into small area effects on health. After appraising for the quality of study design and analysis of studies developed between 1998 and 2006, the authors gave a full picture of the methodological gap suffered by this area of research:

1. lack of conceptualization in logical causal framework,
2. units of analysis and measure of exposure without clear conceptual and operative definitions,
3. lack of consistency in controlling for individual variables and in defining as confounders, mediators or moderators,
4. different model of analysis with suboptimal use of multilevel modelling techniques,
5. lack of longitudinal studies.

This situation in Europe must be confirmed. The majority of studies selected rely on cross sectional survey, few of them compare different areas and the units of analysis seem to be often data driven.
Therefore, the quality of the studies in not high even when considering the difficulties of research in such a complex reality as urban neighbourhoods are, not randomizable interventions and often impossible comparison due to local peculiarity.

The two studies considering comprehensively the link between social mix → health, apply both mixed qualitative-quantitative methods of research with a huge effort of record linkage and new dataset construction.

Among the fifteen studies included for the link social cohesion → health, only one is a cohort study based on a longitudinal study database (Chaix, 2008), the other are all based on cross sectional survey, often the national one (six studies). According to the study design, the level of evidence is IV – V. According to CASP tool for qualitative research studies have an average value of 8/10: model of analysis are quite advanced and the strong weakness according with this criterion of evaluation is about ethical aspects (probably because the research team often deals with data collected by external institutions).

One study made a comparison among one US city and a European one (Drukker et al., 2005), no one compare different European cities; few adopt a comparison among different areas in the same cities (e.g resilient vs non resilient area).

The tools to measure both, the determinant or risk factor “social cohesion” and the outcome perceived or self-rated health, are seldom similar among surveys: concerning the risk factor, three study over 16 (different groups of researchers) adopt the same questionnaire; other two do the same with another tool but they belong to the same group of research.

The outcome “perceived health” misses comparability too, due to the fact that some of the studies measure it with SF36 questions but other don’t.

To conclude, the evidence available about the nexus social cohesion → health is weak in internal validity, due to study design generally not considering comparison in time (time series or longitudinal approach) and space (geographical comparison among neighbourhood, cities or countries). The external validity is undermined by the natural differences among different countries and cities but also by a difficult comparison among findings due to different measures adopted.

5.4 Key findings

Social mix → health

Three papers only have been found: one review and two primary studies. All refer to UK situation.

Graham et al. (2009) examined the effect of mixing housing tenure on mortality and limiting long-term illness, controlling for individual and housing characteristics, but nor beneficial neither negative effects in areas with the best social mix are evident. This is probably due to the macro level data they use to investigate the reality and not necessarily because of an absence of effect; the health outcome chosen were quite “hard” and influenced by a huge number of factors not recorded in Census data.

The study of Lawder (2013) adds to Administrative health data and Census a strong qualitative component, given by the Scottish Health Survey (two waves). The housing ownership is again the main independent variable. Results are interesting, in synthesis showing beneficial effects on health and health behaviour of a rate of owners equal or superior to social renters. The lack of variables describing social and built environment aspects can undermine the applicability of these results to our research question, since it focuses on the effect of housing tenure, more than on social mix.

The systematic review (Bécares, 2012) was mainly centred on US Black and Hispanic residents. Its main focus was the effect of ethnic density on health, but the five studies from Europe included report a null
association between ethnic density and health; the authors refer these results to inadequate adjustment for area deprivation and limited statistical power across ethnic density measures and study samples.

**Social cohesion→ health**

The strict selection criteria have determined a big exclusion rate in the articles reviewed for this link. The main objective for this was to increase the generalizability of results to EU context and look for similar objects of analysis, to increase the consistency of results.

Fifteen studies analysing the nexus between social cohesion and health have been selected.

They all ascertain the situation in the northern part of Europe, while the continental, Southern and Eastern countries are not represented. United Kingdom is well represented with eight studies (Araya 2006; Feldman 2004; Fone 2007; Kirkbride 2007; Mitchell 2009; Poortinga 2007, 2008, 2012 ), five studies have been found about the Netherlands (Cramm 2012; Dukker and van Os, 2003; Dukker et al., 2005; Kuipers 2012, 2013) and two in Sweden (Chaix 2008; Linden Bostrom 2010). No studies have been found about continental Europe and from Southern for this link.

All studies included adulthood and the elders (with different lower and upper limits of age), one only the nexus in younger people, 11-12 years old (Dukker et al., 2005) without statistically significant results.

Six studies limit the area of investigation at urban setting (Cramm, 2012; Dukker and van Os, 2003, 2005; Feldman, 2009; Kirkbride, 2007; Linden Bostrom, 2010), while the others included rural and suburban areas.

According to the search criteria all studies investigate the effect of social cohesion on health, some of them reported also other components of social capital (not reported here) in a not uniform way.

The most common outcome is perceived health and perceived mental health.

Two studies report data in acute myocardial infarction (AMI) mortality and all causes mortality base respectively on one longitudinal study (Chaix, 2008) and on administrative data (Mitchell, 2009). Another one report information about one behavioural risk factor as outcome (alcohol abuse) (Kuipers, 2013). Kirkbride et al. (2007) applied a diagnostic tool to investigate the link between psychosocial factors and schizophrenia.

Generally speaking the results are consistent and confirm previous non-European studies about the causal effect of social cohesion (in- group relationships) on perceived health and perceived mental health. More hard data (mortality) seem to have the same direction. The effect of context always remain after controlling for compositional individual measure (including deprivation and somewhere employment).

Psychiatric diseases (schizophrenia) don’t show a so clear correlation (non-linear association in one study only – Kirkbride, 2007).

The effects on women tend to be stronger than for men, who suffer the job environment more than the neighbourhood (Poortinga, 2007).

With Mitchell (2009), we can say that a cohesive community is often the explanation for a resilient health, that’s to say a better health than expected according to all other socioeconomic characteristics.

More details about results and studies’ characteristics are showed in Annex 3.
6. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

6.1 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Social justice

Housing mix policies are seen as the obvious solution not to overcome structural inequalities, but to engage in spatial re-ordering: to ‘break up’, ‘dissolve’, ‘de-concentrate’ poverty, to engineer beneficial social networks, restore functioning housing markets, and set free the market processes that will deliver greater neighbourhood resources and better individual outcomes (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008; Lees et al., 2012; Rose, 2013). Mixing for regeneration originates in a neoliberal analysis of the problems of low-income neighbourhoods, in which structural problems are individualised and spatialised, and disadvantaged neighbourhoods, particularly those with major social housing tenure, are discursively repositioned as irredeemably problematic. Drawing heavily on US policy and discourse, it relies on market solutions, in the context of new modes of urban governance that reposition neighbourhoods in relation to the broader interests of the competitive city. Its finance and delivery mechanisms shift power relations, with increased influence for the private sector: whatever local attempts are made to engage communities in the regeneration process, the reality is that neighbourhood transformation through private sector investment depends on private sector willingness to invest. This inevitably puts public and third sectors in less powerful positions to protect community interests, such as the levels of affordable housing that can be provided (Anastacio et al., 2000). Socially mixed urban communities created by the in-movement of middle-class people into poor, marginal areas of the inner city are being promoted under the rubric of urban renaissance, as the desegregating answer to isolation along class, income, ethnic and tenurial fault lines: but it has been demonstrated that this process results in an increased segregation and polarisation, thus not being a solution to the problem as advocated by policy makers.

Social mix policies rely on a common set of beliefs about the benefits of mixed communities, with little evidence to support them, and a growing evidence base that contradicts the precepts embedded in social mix policies that should make policy-makers sit up and take note.

Social mix policies are cosmetic policies rather than the ones prepared to deal with the whole host of complex social, economic and cultural reasons as to why there are concentrations of poor, economically inactive people in our central cities.

The new urbanist approach of intermixing a variety of building types and levels of affordability is not the panacea that some of its supporters assume. If, however, it becomes the template for infill development (rather than the formula to justify the destruction of public housing) it can provide a physical framework for a city that offers a higher quality of life to residents and visitors. Developing an appropriate physical setting for a heterogeneous urbanity, however, can go only so far in the generation of a just city.

Most crucial is a political consciousness that supports progressive moves at national and local levels towards respectfulness to others and greater equality (Fainstein, 2005).

How can we frame a socially inclusive urban renaissance? We can learn some things from the work on the just and the ideal city, work that seems to have been forgotten along the way. Iris Marion Young’s (1990) defence of the politics of difference is important in the face of the above critiques of social mix policies. Young accepts the domination of specific neighbourhoods by single groups, as long as the boundaries between these neighbourhoods remain blurred (fuzzy borders or fuzzy boundaries). In her ideal of city life, there is group differentiation and the interfusion of these groups occurs through social space

Lees (2008) suggests that if people prefer to live with people like themselves we should not be forcing them to mix, because ultimately this will fail; rather, we should be keeping the possibility for mixing open
to them. This means a refocus on urban design, disallowing fortress-style architecture and gated communities and rethinking the architecture of insecurity and fear.

**Integration as ‘sustained’ interaction**

Social mixing policies rely strongly on the influence of contact and the interaction of intergroup relations, but they tend to focus on a fleeting interaction approach, with questionable outcomes. Often though, the incorporation of contact hypothesis and the associated social psychology in urban policies and discourses ignores certain aspects, such as the importance of the socio-political context and the significance of cooperation as a sphere of transition between the private and the public and as terrain for facilitating relations (Koutrolikou 2012). There is a difference between ‘fleeting’ interactions (promoted by most policy recommendations) and ‘sustained’ interactions which involve continuous experience of others (Vertovec, 2007). Thus, contact can take place in varied ways and interaction or ‘rubbing along’ does not necessarily lead to relations and to overcoming stereotypes, resolving tensions.

In both the US and Europe, considerable attention has been given to local social networks as means to integrate people in the urban society (Musterd, 2002). The literature that does exist highlights a number of factors that are of direct importance for the broader enquiry of social-mix policies. This includes the relationship between the scale at which mixing takes place - whether it is at the level of the neighbourhood, of the street or of the urban block - and the role that ‘urban practitioners’ - those involved in design and architectural practices - play in influencing such factors (Jupp, 1999; Roberts, 2007). It also includes the role of market-forces in the implementation of social-mix policies, and the extent to which market-housing is prioritized in the planning and design of socially-mixed neighbourhoods (Tiedsell, 2004). When brought together, such factors have a direct impact upon the form that social interaction takes within socially-mixed neighbourhoods.

**Negative aspects**

Social mix may facilitate sustained interactions, but at the same time it may increase intergroup competition for resources (which can be the case in deprived neighbourhoods) or create even more homogeneous micro enclaves (through gentrification) (Koutrolikou, 2012).

Extreme caution should be given when implementing a social mix policy: in addition to the fact that the benefits are not proven, according to our findings housing policies could also reduce social cohesion among residents with bad impacts on health, deriving also from an increased phenomenon of displacement. The evidence outlined earlier suggests that over the longer term poor people suffer more from the loss of benefits of living in a poor neighbourhood, than they gain from living in a more affluent one.

Uitermark et al. (2007) are clear that an influx of middle-class residents into a disadvantaged neighbourhood does not increase social cohesion, rather the contacts between low-income and higher-income households tend to be superficial at best and downright hostile at worst (Lees, 2008).

However, evidence shows that not doing anything worsens the situation of highly segregated communities.

**Social cohesion and health impacts**

In the light of this knowledge, it could be said that a conflict emerges from two groups of sociological theories and empirical evidence: if social mix succeeds in improving social networks within a neighbourhood, that’s to say bridging social capital or out-groups relationships, we will observe a reduction in social conflicts but also a decrease in protective effects of in-group relationships (bonding social capital) for weak subgroups.
Even if the EU research about effects of psychosocial factors in small areas is still poorer than in other contexts and methodologically improvable, we can say that housing policies aimed at increasing the social mix can improve the so-called bridging social capital of residents, improving the social wellbeing of neighbourhoods, reducing social conflicts and violence; but it can undermine the social cohesion, or bonding social capital or in-group relationships and this could damage mainly the weakest social subgroups. Social cohesion has clearly a positive effect on health, mainly perceived and mental health but also cardiovascular health.

**Not only housing policy**

These considerations lead Cheshire (2008) to suggest that efforts to improve social equity would be more effective if directed towards people themselves rather than moving people around to mix neighbourhoods.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that the main arena for integration is employment and not housing (Andersson, 1999; Ostendorf et al., 2001). Some policy makers consider the labour market (and not the housing sector) to be the main integration arena for immigrants (Andersson, 1999). Employment is thought to create both social capital and a more favourable economic position for immigrants. Level of education is also a key issue, and thus extra attention to education will help in reducing gaps (Musterd and Andersson, 2005; Ostendorf et al., 2001).

### 6.2 Knowledge gaps and suggestions for further research

On the basis of the knowledge included in this review, gaps in literature and needs for future research have been identified: European research seems to lack a health evaluation impact approach and a focus on the implementation of social mix policy.

The ambiguity and uncertainty associated with determining the impact of social mix can, in part, be attributed to the lack of comparability between studies which have mostly been small-area, one-off snapshots providing only a rudimentary basis for comparative evaluation. Furthermore, few studies have examined inputs. That is, they have paid little or no attention to how issues such as the level of mixing (the relative proportions of owner-occupiers and social renters) or the geographical scale of investigation (building, block, neighbourhood) or the size of the community, might impact on outcomes. Evidence from such studies therefore provides little ground for generalisation or for an overall evaluation of the accomplishments of the policy (Graham et al., 2009). Exceptions to these small-area studies are provided by the work by Musterd (2002) in the Netherlands, and by Musterd and Andersson (2006) in Sweden.

A clear problem for those policy-makers who have consistently asked for more socially diverse communities as the basis for sustainability and social equity is that this position has relied on an intuitive rather than explicit evidence-base (Atkinson, 2005). In Europe there is a big gap between the political debates and actions regarding these issues and empirical research (Musterd and Andersson, 2005).

For what concerns evidence about the **neighbourhood effect**, until now, only few large-scale European studies have been carried out to test the basic hypotheses with some rigor. These studies were based on longitudinal data sets in which the construction of small neighbourhoods that vary according to the percentage of “poor” people was possible (Andersson, 2001; Ostendorf et al., 2001, 2003). These studies were based on several millions of individual cases available in Sweden and the Netherlands. They found small but significant neighbourhood effects. Apart from these, there are other interesting longitudinal studies that have been carried out but that were based on smaller samples. Even though these studies struggle with their smaller number of cases, their findings do not seem to fundamentally differ from results from the larger-scale studies (e.g., Farwick, 2002; Buck, 2001; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001).
Therefore, additional research that focuses on the implementation process could contribute to the growing research on social mix policy (Holmqvist and Bergsten, 2009).

We couldn’t find any articles exploring directly the effect of housing policies on health throughout the social relationships of the neighbourhood, or, at least, on social cohesion. Restricting the focus on EU countries reduced markedly the number of studies available but it highlights the very recent interest of few European researchers; the case of Drukker et al. (2005), aimed at comparing Chicago with Maastricht, shows how the well-known differences (in social, environmental, historical aspect and in data collection) among US and EU could make the application of plentiful US research to our context wrong.

Furthermore, the use of large datasets to examine these issues is less common in Europe, although growing in the Netherlands and Scandinavia, and to a lesser extent in the UK. Much of the European evidence to date has come from small case-study research or multi-site studies of mixed-tenure estates, both regenerated social housing estates and private housing developments containing low-income housing (Kearns and Mason, 2007)

However, not only policy tends to forget the multi-dimensional and multi-level character of social problems, but it is also based on housing mix assumptions that have been tested insufficiently, certainly in Europe (cf. Musterd and Ostendorf, 1998; Ostendorf et al., 2001).

We can’t say anything about the effect of social cohesion in different age, because no studies stratifies the analysis for age of respondents: in adulthood this psychosocial factor seems to have a protective effect even in deprivation and in segregated context. We couldn’t ascertain the effect on youth: social cohesion protect health or reinforce social norms and behaviour (even when this is a health damaging one)?

Some suggestions can be formulate to European researchers:

- The role of European Longitudinal Studies should be reinforced and data collected applied also to the “neighbourhood – health” area of research
- EU Research Authorities should stress the adoption of common tools in surveys or ad hoc studies, at least in part of them

On this topic, research should pay more attention to the different needs of youth and elders in terms of social relationships (out-group versus in-group), considering from the first point of view the importance of social norms in teen agers in-groups and from the second one the importance of emotional and practical support needed from neighbours in elderly.

As many authors highlighted (Blanc, 2010; Andersson et al., 2007) clarifying what mix matters is seen as an important task for social science research. There is a need for definition, comparison and evaluation of policy results in this field (Galster, 2007).

## 6.3 Policy recommendations

On the basis of the knowledge included in the review, policy suggestions (recommendations) have been identified by a group of expert (urban planners, epidemiologist, public health consultant and policy makers) by means of a focus group among review’s reviewers.

Some suggestions can be formulated to European local policy makers.

### When should action be taken?

Government (housing) policy has only a limited influence on the amount of intermingling between different groups and on how intermingling proceeds (e.g., through assimilation or mutual learning). This should encourage humility among politicians in their ambitions to change reality (Veldboer et al., 2002).
When should politicians start to think about action? We believe that involuntary concentrations emanating from poverty and lack of choice should be regarded as a serious problem, whereas voluntary concentration of groups of citizens should not necessarily be problematized. ‘Neighbourhoods with-identity’ should only be regarded as a problem when they are based on the negative avoidance of others, on discrimination.

Furthermore, policy should stress the increase of opportunities in the housing market for the socially and economically underprivileged. This could be achieved either through:

- carefully planned forms of diversification, aimed at satisfying the needs of residents and not pushing aside lower-income groups
- or through other methods like maintaining high levels of rental subsidies and providing specific information to impoverished people looking for housing.

But it seems most important to stress broad measures that restrain socioeconomic inequality. A general level of welfare strongly increases the equality of opportunities in the housing market. Whether people will subsequently live together on the basis of ethnic, religious, national, or other affinities (such as life style, sexual preference, or age) is a free choice that should be respected.

**Housing policies**

Generally speaking, in order to achieve some result, a long term vision should be adopted, able to consider and comprehend social dynamics (mobility, gentrification, etc.) which are taking place, also at embryonic stage.

From the evidence collected, it is clear that some (minimal) beneficial effects show up only in neighbourhoods where mixing is between a close range of income/tenure differences, that’s to say where disadvantaged groups are not too far from less disadvantaged. Policy makers therefore shouldn’t aim at mixing between low-income groups and high-income, because it has been proved that this doesn’t lead to any beneficial effect, especially for the former group.

Dol and Kleinhans (2012) bring the attention of policy makers on the fact that when there is a tight balance between the target group and the social housing stock, further restructuring can lead to shortages of affordable dwellings and (even) longer waiting lists for social housing.

The only way to maintain sufficient supply of social housing would be to introduce a strictly enforced ‘mirrored construction’ for every demolished social rental unit. The tight balance will also intensify the calls for efficient distribution of the social housing stock. This might involve political pressure to set lower income levels for the primary target group and/or attempts to encourage tenants with ‘too high an income’ to move out of the social rented sector. Furthermore, relocated households should be offered another comparable social rental dwelling: this is both sensible and gains support for restructuring operations. This means that these households also exert some pressure on the diminishing social rental stock.

When the City Council adopts a housing policy with a probable effect on increased social mix, special attention must be paid to support mainly women and elders in maintaining psychosocial wellbeing and to create new relationships among different social groups.

**Suggested measures to integrate with housing policies**

Recommendations focus on developing cross-cultural dialogue and communication, promoting shared activities and events for groups that could be helpful in bringing people together (such as festivals, school twinnings and community events), promoting conflict resolution initiatives and moving from single to multigroup funding (Koutrollikou, 2012). Community development initiatives have included projects which: build local identity and channel energies positively (e.g. public art, sports and leisure programmes);
improve residents’ quality of life and remove barriers to employment and educational achievement (e.g. health programmes); create places for community life (e.g. community centres); help meet the educational, social and recreational needs of young people (e.g. community radio station) (Evans and Derek, 2000). Event-based interaction might work well for familiarising with others and for opening up possible opportunities, even if it should be kept in mind that its temporary character is not sufficient for building relations or resolving existing tensions.

Parks and public spaces could be contact points: therefore, urban design is seen to play a significant role in the development of socially-mixed neighbourhoods. Thus, it is theorized that mixed-income developments, if appropriately designed in ways that promote the spatial integration of residents at different income levels and provide appropriate common space that allow for informal interaction, may shape relationships among individual residents (Lawton, 2013).

By the way, any long-term solution to poverty involves education and employment that reaches all youth and their families. Plans by city officials to demolish existing schools and build new ones, relying on the idea that new buildings will attract a middle - and upper - income families, should be developed including consultation and engagement with teachers who have committed their lives to the shoring up of low-income youth and their families (Gordon, 2008).
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**ANNEX 1 - Search strategies**

Hereafter details of the full searches for each database illustrating the search terms used, the total number of results and the number of documents included in the review.

### First research question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Number of papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ProQuest</strong> (Social Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, Avery Index, ERIC, IBSS International Bibliography of the Social Science)</td>
<td>ti(housing OR &quot;social mix*&quot; OR segregation OR neighbo*) AND (ab(mix* AND housing) OR (mix* AND neighbo*) OR (mix* AND urban)) AND ab(interven* OR poli* OR project* OR program* OR strateg*)</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBSCO</strong> (Urban Studies Abstracts, Art Source, Art Full Text)</td>
<td>ti(housing OR &quot;social mix*&quot; OR segregation OR neighbo*) AND (ab(mix* AND housing) OR (mix* AND neighbo*) OR (mix* AND urban)) AND ab(interven* OR poli* OR project* OR program* OR strateg*)</td>
<td>245 (160, 57, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA/BALC</td>
<td>‘social mix*’ AND ‘housing’ in ALL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second research question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Number of papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embase</td>
<td>('social cohesion' OR 'segregation' OR 'social mix') AND ('health'/exp/mj OR 'health inequalities') AND ([article]/lim OR [article in press]/lim OR [review]/lim OR [short survey]/lim) AND [humans]/lim [title OR abstract]</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDLINE</td>
<td>('social cohesion' OR segregation OR 'social mix') AND ('health' OR 'health inequalities') AND ([article]/lim OR [article in press]/lim OR [review]/lim OR [short survey]/lim) AND [humans]/lim [title OR abstract]</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINAHL</td>
<td>'social cohesion' OR 'segregation' OR 'social mix' AND 'health inequalities' [title OR abstract]</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EconLit</td>
<td>‘health’ AND ('social cohesion' OR ‘segregation’ OR 'social mix') [tw]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2 - NEBP classification of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence level for randomizable interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Appraisal of evidence strength levels for randomizable studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence level for non-randomizable interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Proposal of appraisal of evidence strength levels for non-randomizable studies
Annex 3 - Data extraction for Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>article</th>
<th>setting</th>
<th>time period</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>study design</th>
<th>sample size</th>
<th>level of evidence</th>
<th>CASP</th>
<th>construct investigated</th>
<th>tool for construct</th>
<th>outcome</th>
<th>tool for outcome</th>
<th>findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vayer P 2006</td>
<td>Bristol of Health</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18-75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>increased health</td>
<td>OR=1.42</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Don 1998</td>
<td>Scarpa Region</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>cohort</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Scarsa (WHO)</td>
<td>Well mortality</td>
<td>Longitudinal Multiaxial Analysis in Scarsa (WHO)</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion and indicators of mental health (OR=1.43; IC 95% 1.04-1.96). Neighborhood safety into the model. The same happens when introducing in the model different (i.e. different model) socioeconomic characteristics, population density, immigration density, residential stability and distance to the hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Schraup IM 2013</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18-70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health examination of Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vicker M 2003</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vicker M 2005</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vicker M 2006</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vicker M 2007</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vicker M 2008</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vicker M 2009</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vicker M 2010</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vicker M 2011</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vicker M 2012</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vicker M 2013</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vicker M 2014</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vicker M 2015</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion</td>
<td>Health Survey in Rotterdam</td>
<td>Well being</td>
<td>WHOQOL</td>
<td>Social cohesion module of perceived health (OR=0.74; IC 95% 0.57-0.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Social cohesion:** Often reported.
- The increased proportion of the results among US studies compared to (UK studies) is probably due to small samples.
- **Social cohesion:** Sometimes reported.
- **Social cohesion:** Often reported. The increased proportion of the results among US studies compared to (UK studies) is probably due to small samples.
- **Social cohesion:** Often reported. The increased proportion of the results among US studies compared to (UK studies) is probably due to small samples.
**The Institute’s profile**

SiTI – Istituto Superiore sui Sistemi Territoriali per l’Innovazione (Higher Institute on Territorial Systems for Innovation) is a non-profit association set up in 2002 between the Politecnico di Torino and the Compagnia di San Paolo, to carry out research and training oriented towards innovation and socio-economic growth. Its activities are concentrated in the following sectors: Logistics and transport, Environmental heritage and urban redevelopment, Environmental protection, engaging the help of numerous researchers who complete the various specialist skills available within the Politecnico di Torino, the Universities and other research centres.

The Institute develops its researches mainly through participation in European bids for tender and the funding of projects by internationally acknowledged Entities and subjects. SiTI carries out useful monitoring and evaluation activity in various sectors in which the Compagnia di San Paolo is involved, with particular commitment to the “Social Housing Programme”.

**Environmental Heritage and Urban Redevelopment**

The research activities regard conservation, defence of the natural and cultural components of the environmental systems and urban redevelopment.

The study activities carried out for the proposals of candidacy of UNESCO sites, the preparation of management plans and the collaboration with the Ministry of cultural heritage and activities for monitoring all the Italian UNESCO sites have assigned to SiTI an important role in this field. At international level, the Institute cooperates in the organisation of the Master World Heritage at Work, for the higher training of UNESCO site managers. SiTI identifies new territorial development scenarios, through feasibility studies and the integration of specialised skills; it develops methodologies and innovative solutions for managing tourist flows.