Guest Editors' Introduction: Policy Assumptions and Lived Realities of Mixed-Income Housing on Both Sides of the Atlantic

James C. Fraser
Vanderbilt University

Deirdre Oakley
Georgia State University

Diane K. Levy
Urban Institute

Introduction

During the past several decades, a number of housing programs sought to create mixed-income housing and neighborhoods in the United States and Europe to negate the effects of concentrated poverty. In the United States, such initiatives have included the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Moving to Opportunity housing experiment, whereby low-income residents volunteered for relocation to low-poverty areas; the Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) Program for public housing transformation; and Choice Neighborhoods, a program broadly based on the HOPE VI model but expanded to revitalize entire neighborhoods (Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin, 2012).

In Europe, such initiatives fall under the rubric of neighborhood restructuring or urban renewal. These efforts often include mixed-housing strategies and have been implemented in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Finland, and Sweden. European strategies focus more on mixing homeowners with *social renters*—the equivalent of public housing renters in the United States—with the similar assumption that a more diverse socioeconomic mix of residents will remove the negative neighborhood effects of poverty. By far the largest European mixed-housing initiative is the Right to Buy (RTB) scheme in the United Kingdom. Since the 1970s, more than 2.7 million socially rented houses have been sold with large discounts, mainly to existing tenants and other more affluent households (see Reinout Kleinhans and Maarten van Ham's article in this symposium).

This *Cityscape* symposium showcases a series of refereed articles in which authors critically examine mixed-income housing initiatives in the United States, the United Kingdom, and, to a lesser extent, the Netherlands through both empirical and theoretical lenses, paying particular attention to whether benefits outweigh limitations in terms of resident, neighborhood, and sustainability outcomes. The overall goal of the symposium is to provide a nuanced critique of mixed-income housing by situating these initiatives within the broader context of affordable housing and diverse, healthy communities. In addition, the symposium addresses the question of whose responsibility it is to house the poor and which strategies are most effective.

The genesis of this symposium was the 41st annual conference, in 2011, of the Urban Affairs Association. During a session, "The Future in and of HOPE VI Developments," many of the authors in this issue, including Diane K. Levy, James C. Fraser, Robert J. Chaskin, Mark L. Joseph, and JoDee Keller, presented articles. During that same conference, Edward Goetz moderated a session entitled "Public Housing Transformation and the Right to the City" and also presented his own work on poverty deconcentration and HOPE VI. During the 42nd annual conference of the Urban Affairs Association, many of the participants and presenters continued a broader discussion of the ways in which mixed-income housing was affecting low-income and public housing residents. In a session moderated by James C. Fraser, "The Onset and Aftermath of HOPE VI," Deirdre Oakley, Katherine Hankins, Rachel Garshick Kleit, and Edward G. Goetz presented additional work on HOPE VI and resident experiences. These two conferences solidified our intention to produce a set of articles that would broaden our understanding of mixed-income housing as a policy and in implementation.

Mixed-Income Housing

Mixed-income housing and neighborhood development efforts go beyond the transformation of public housing. Their history extends back to Ebenezer Howard's "garden city" movement at the turn of the 20th century. Emerging out of the ideology that social mix—having a variety of income levels live in the same area—was necessary for moral order, mixed-income towns were planned to integrate the lower and middle socioeconomic classes with the wealthy, yet building types that housed different income groups were distinct and sited in separate areas of these developments in many cases (Rose et al., 2013). Likewise, people with utopian visions for better cities (for example, Patrick Geddes and Lewis Mumford) and people involved in efforts to improve the cities we already had (for example, Jane Addams and Jane Jacobs) had long touted the benefits of social mix for strengthening democracy and promoting empathy on the part of wealthier classes. An alternative ideology, similar to the emergence of company towns during the 19th century, suggested that deconcentrating the working class would minimize labor organizing and class conflict. As capitalists were made painfully aware by the Pullman strike of 1894, these social-harmonizing experiments did not produce the desired results (Crawford, 1995). The hopes for mixed-income communities, by and large, were not realized as the 20th century saw segregation by race and class increase over time. Urban demographers have vividly illustrated the emergence of hypersegregated poverty, a topic about which Douglass Massey and Nancy Denton (1993) wrote.

Partially in response to these conditions that scholars (for example, Massey and Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1987) wrote about, mixing strategies reemerged in the early 1990s. Policymakers,

government officials, and even private-sector developers have supported mixed-income housing, yet for different reasons. The ideology behind this resurgence of mixed-income housing has largely centered on the notion of healthy cities and poverty reduction. In the case of public housing and low-income neighborhoods, the general belief has been that concentrated poverty produces additional negative outcomes for the poor (Wilson, 1987). This theoretical scaffolding has supported the razing of many public housing developments and the relocation of residents, some of whom move to neighborhoods with less poverty, others of whom move to areas with similar rates of poverty, and a relative few who make temporary moves before returning to HOPE VI developments, living alongside market-rate households (Abravanel, Levy, and McFarland, 2011a; Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin, 2012; Popkin et al., 2000).

Mixed-income policies, however, have gone well beyond public housing redevelopment. City officials, seeking ways to revitalize low-income, inner-city neighborhoods have turned toward an ever-increasing set of organizations and their consultants espousing the virtues of mixed-income housing to legitimate public-private ventures that oftentimes seek to gentrify neighborhoods (Dutton, 2007; Fraser et al., 2003; Lees, 2008; Rose et al., 2013; Skirtz, 2012). Although this outcome may be the case in some mixed-income housing initiatives, it would be premature and suspect to write off mixed-income housing as simply a way to displace lower income people from neighborhoods cities want to redevelop.

Mixed-income policies and programs have become dominant urban planning strategies even as hypotheses about what mixed-income housing can achieve continue to change and questions remain about the model's purpose and actual effect. Core questions debated since the reemergence of the mixed-income model in the 1990s have evolved and broadened as empirical studies have shed light on the models in practice. Early on, questions tended to focus on the effect on lower income residents of living in mixed-income housing developments or neighborhoods. These questions were based on assumptions that the effect was unidirectional and likely beneficial. Hypotheses pointed to the expected positive effect on poorer residents' access to employment, improved quality of life, and overall self-sufficiency.

Although the hypothesized benefits of such mixed-income initiatives to improve employment access, quality of life, and self-sufficiency on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean have included the assumed socioeconomic advantages of poverty alleviation, the reduction of racial and income-based segregation (particularly in the United States), and the benefits of homeownership, the realities of living in these reconfigured spaces do not necessarily map well onto the original goals associated with them. This outcome has led some scholars to suggest that such mixing strategies boil down to state-implemented strategies to prepare neighborhoods for capital investment through the regulation, marginalization, and displacement of the poor. Such suggestions raise more fundamental questions about when and how society and its government leaders need to house the least advantaged (Levy, 2006).

Before describing the organization and content of this symposium, we believe it is instructive to provide a brief history of public and social housing in the United States and the United Kingdom, primarily because these histories reveal tension between the interests of capital investment and the provision of public goods (in this case, affordable housing for the poor). On both sides of the Atlantic, such tensions eventually led to mixing and redevelopment strategies.

Public Housing and Mixed-Income Redevelopment in the United States

Although governments have used a variety of mechanisms to house various low-income populations, (project-based) public housing has become iconic of these efforts. A concerted American housing movement, led by figures such as Catherine Bauer, Edith Elmer Wood, and Mary Simkhovitch, emerged during the turn of the 20th century. The movement achieved many victories, including the Wagner-Steagall Act of 1937,[1] which established the United States Housing Authority (Birch, 1978). The construction of public housing did not match the pace of slum removal, however, and many families in need could not gain admittance into the relatively few units of housing produced. From 1950 through 1970, in most cases, these developments were sited in low-income minority neighborhoods, and "White flight" to the suburbs accelerated (Freeman, 2004; Goering, Kamely, and Richardson, 1997).

During this period, Catherine Bauer wrote about "the dreary deadlock of public housing" lamenting that "[e]ven among public housing's most tireless defenders, many would welcome a fresh start if they did not fear that in the process any program at all might get lost" (Bauer, 1957: 140). Her sentiment was a foreshadowing of the continued concentration of the abject poor in public housing developments, some of which were becoming run down and isolated because of insufficient budgets. Although arguments could be made that income mixing existed in public housing until the 1960s (Hartman, 1975), a provision in the Brooke Amendments of the early 1970s established that public housing needs to be provided first and foremost to the poorest populations, thus creating financial constraints on housing authorities and ushering in an era in which public housing and its inhabitants became demonized (Goetz, in press). The development of mixed-income housing, particularly through HOPE VI, has been viewed by many policymakers as a considerable improvement from the public housing replaced, even if it caused displacement of public housing residents (FitzPatrick, 2000; Goetz, in press; Schwartz and Tajbakhsh, 1997).

Looking back on the early days of public housing, from the 1930s through the 1950s, provides notable parallels to current HOPE VI projects, whereby people with a mix of incomes reside together in a development. Although mixed-income housing was not a central component of public housing at its inception, a range of incomes did coexist. Low- and middle-income groups were both served, albeit they have generally been lumped into the "submerged middle class" label to distinguish them from those who were in abject poverty (Friedman, 1966; Schill, 1993). Likewise, the tenant screening process was aimed at distinguishing the "deserving" from the "undeserving" poor (Vale, 2000). Although language other than "deserving" and "undeserving" is currently in vogue, HOPE VI tenant screening relies on some of the same criteria for admittance, including employment, criminal record, and, informally, a desire to use public housing as a stepping stone into private-sector housing (Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin, 2012). Further, HOPE VI developments are expected to collect enough rents from moderate- and market-rate units to offset the costs of management and maintenance similar to the way that the initial public housing legislation required. Although some scholars described original public housing as being paternalistic (Argersinger, 2010; Mitchell, 1993), HOPE VI has been

---

[1] *The United States Housing Act of 1937*. Public Law 75-412.

characterized by its heightened surveillance of public housing tenants (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010; Fraser et al., in press). Researchers are only beginning to see the longer term effects of HOPE VI-style mixed-income housing; several articles in this symposium focus on the HOPE VI experience.

Social Housing and the Evolution of Mixing Policies in the United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, public housing is often referred to as *council housing*, or *social housing*. It formally began in 1919, but the U.K. Parliament granted local governments power to develop working-class housing in 1890 (Stone, 2003). The Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909 authorized local councils to assist copartnership societies (for example, cooperative societies, trade unions, and utility companies) in building working-class housing (Ravetz, 2001). Similarly, the Housing Acts of 1914 and 1915 provided state-sponsored housing for wartime government employees, setting a precedent on which council housing would follow (Ravetz, 2001). By World War I, 24,000 units of council housing had been built (Malpass and Murie, 1999). Much like U.S. policy in the 1930s, a coalition of reformers were openly concerned about the slum housing conditions that accompanied industrialization and urbanization of the United Kingdom.

During the interwar years, a severe shortage of housing existed in the United Kingdom. Although multiple rationales provided the conceptual framework for council housing, social unrest, strikes, and the return of military servicemen from the war prompted Prime Minister David Lloyd George to provide council housing for fear of revolt and a "Bolshevist rising" (Ravetz, 2001: 77). Between the wars, approximately 1,000,000 units of council housing were established, although rather than serving the working class in poverty—many of whom were returning soldiers—it housed a more affluent clientele, because rents were often more than in private-sector rentals (Forrest, Malpass, and Rowlands, 2010). In the post-1945 era, council housing increased, with 2.9 million units produced in two decades (Stone, 2003).

During the era of welfare capitalism (1945 to the 1970s), council housing provided high-quality homes for many well-off, working-class tenants who were oftentimes unionized and thus able to press their political and economic demands for shelter on the state.[2] In general, *welfare capitalism* refers to a state-sponsored safety net (welfare state) funded primarily through taxing private-market enterprises and private citizens' income (Esping-Andersen, 1990). During this era, the amount of council housing increased from 12 percent of the total housing stock in 1945 to 32 percent in 1979 (Esping-Andersen, 1990); however, in the 1980s, government disinvestment and related policies led to "residualization" of council housing.

Thus, despite periods and policies that bore some similarities, the two countries had quite different social-housing environments at the beginning of the 1980s. Both countries, however, were entering periods with somewhat similar political regimes, regimes with similar attitudes toward social housing but with rather different strategies given their different housing contexts (Stone, 2003).

---

[2] More impoverished populations relied on lower quality, privately rented housing (Malpass, 2010).

According to Malpass (2010), during the 1980s, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's housing policies underfunded council housing and began the privatization and effective residualizing of it and other welfare programs emerging out of the welfare capitalism era.[3]

Since the 1980s, much council housing has been razed or privatized. Between 1980 and 2006, the number of council-housing units dropped from 6.1 to 2.6 million (Mullins and Pawson, 2010). Although the structural role of state-sponsored housing has been a response to the inability or unwillingness of the private sector to provide high-quality, affordable housing to a mix of low- to middle-income populations, public policies have effectively created housing segregation. This segregation has been accompanied by "culture-of-poverty" discourse that further marginalizes those in poverty as being unwilling to take personal responsibility for their welfare.[4] Council housing has been characterized as a breeding place for antisocial behavior (Malpass, 2010). This characterization partially explains the negative public sentiment many have toward public and council housing, and disinvestment in these housing tenures has materially run down many housing estates and developments. Goetz (in press) has chronicled the "discourse of disaster" that has maligned public housing as being obsolete. In summary, the dismantling of this part of the welfare state has been ongoing since the 1970s, and housing has been a key domain in which we see this change.

In 2000, the backlog for repairs and improvements to council-housing stock was estimated at approximately £19 billion (approximately $28.5 billion U.S.), and the government set about to remedy this situation through a range of policy instruments that either privatized units or entire housing estates (or developments) (Stone, 2003). One primary policy has been Thatcher's 1980 RTB program, whereby sitting council-housing tenants were provided deep discounts of up to 70 percent to purchase their units. To date, nearly 3 million units of council housing have been sold off to former tenants, thus redistributing risk to the new owners (Blandy and Hunter, 2013). Likewise, local councils have transferred more than 50 percent of the social-housing stock to nonprofit housing associations. In addition to enacting these policies, local authorities have been able to sell off units and entire estates to private-sector developers. For example, Europe's largest landmarked council estate, Park Hill in Sheffield, was sold for £1(approximately $1.53 U.S.) to Urban Splash, a private development company that is renovating the estate as a mixed-income project (Heathcote, 2012). Clearly, the differing goal sets of local councils serving the public and the imperative of capital accumulation by the private sector have shaped projects like Park Hill. Finally, local councils have the authority to mortgage their council-housing estates to raise funds for maintenance and renovation. As of 2006, council housing that is owned and operated by the local authorities stands at about 10 percent of the total housing stock in the United Kingdom (Ginsburg, 2004).

As is the case in the United States, the concept of mixed-income housing in the United Kingdom has a foundation in an earlier history. Social mix was a central component of Ebenezer Howard's garden cities in the 1890s (Rose et al., 2013). Among other aspects, Howard conceptualized the garden city as a remedy for social polarization that he saw in London. Social mix was a prominent

---

[3] This pattern was similar to U.S. public housing in that it was the working, *submerged* middle-class people who were afforded housing and abject poor people who were excluded from state-sponsored developments (Vale, 2000).

[4] For example, President Ronald Reagan infamously stated that many single mothers in public housing who received cash benefits were "welfare queens."

feature that he believed would build cooperation and community across income groups; yet, a 1905 census of the 1,400 residents of Howard's first garden city, Letchworth, found that the only people living there were "middle-class men and women of independent means (and their servants) and the skilled artisans who were building the new town" (Fishman, 2002: 73). Working-class families who labored in Letchworth did not earn enough income to afford to live there and found substandard housing outside of the city (Fishman, 2002). In the early garden cities and later in British New Towns and council-housing estates, social-mix discourse emphasized lofty ideals of a good society, but none achieved what each set out to create.

In the context of council housing, mixed-income policies, referred to as *social-mix* and *social-balance* policies, existed during the 1940s and 1950s but came under criticism and lost favor (Goodchild and Cole, 2001). These policies then reappeared during the late 1990s. Social mix in the United Kingdom is currently deployed in a variety of public policies aimed at neighborhood renewal and council-housing transformation (Levy et al., 2010; Sautkina, Bond, and Kears, 2012). The antecedents to, and the purported benefits of, social mix have been well documented, and it is not our intention to provide another rendition of the urban underclass or concentrated poverty theses. Likewise, the proffered benefits of social-mix policies for low-income populations have been conceptualized, and many studies are beginning to test how mixed-income housing operates (for reviews, see Abravanel, Levy, and McFarland, 2011a, 2011b; DeFilippis and Fraser, 2010; and Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber, 2007). In summary, proponents of social mix (broadly defined) hold onto the rationale that low-income people living in propinquity to those with greater privilege will benefit from social contact, but evidence to support this perspective remains illusive. This reality is basically the same situation concerning mixed-income housing redevelopment outcomes happening in the United States.

Symposium Organization and Content

The symposium in this issue of *Cityscape* is organized in four topical sections: (1) the expectations and achievements of mixing policies; (2) the realities of implementation; (3) an examination of moving to and living in subsidized private-market rental housing; and (4) a synthesizing examination of these policies based on the articles and suggestions for future initiatives. For the initial three sections, a series of commentaries from housing policy experts follows the articles.

In the first section, Diane K. Levy, Zach McDade, and Kassie Bertumen set the stage for the subsequent articles by reviewing the varying ways in which mixed-income living has been defined, evidence of benefits to adults and children, and the viability of mixed-income housing over time. They conclude with a discussion of research findings on which consensus and divergences exist, and identify gaps in what we know about the effect of mixed-income developments and income-diverse neighborhoods on disadvantaged households.

Next, JoDee Keller, Janice Laakso, Christine Stevens, and Cathy Tashiro provide a case study of a Pacific Northwest HOPE VI site, exploring the issue of whether multiethnic communities are sustainable through HOPE VI redevelopment. Before redevelopment, the site was a multiethnic community with a strong sense of engagement and cohesion. Findings reveal that, after redevelopment,

returning residents experienced a diminished sense of community and results are mixed regarding reemergence of community. The authors argue that identifying and meeting needs of diverse populations is important to sustainability of HOPE VI sites, particularly with the country's increasing diversity. The authors discuss the challenges in building and maintaining community, with recommendations for meeting needs of ethnically diverse residents.

In the final article in this section, Ade Kearns, Martin McKee, Elena Sautkina, George Weeks, and Lyndal Bond present data from interviews with key mixed-housing actors in the United Kingdom—including planners, architects, housing managers, regeneration practitioners, and teachers at local schools—concerning perceived successes and ongoing challenges, particularly regarding sustainability. The authors contend that orthodoxy of mixing policies leads to a form of "tenure blindness." More specifically, they argue that orthodoxy in policy assumptions and practice results in an unwillingness or inability among the key actors to recognize that taking a mixing approach may not be sufficient for the creation of sustainable communities. James DeFilippis and Hilary Silver provide commentaries on the three articles.

The second section begins with an article by James C. Fraser, Robert J. Chaskin, and Joshua Theodore Bazuin, exploring the idea of mixed-income housing actually becoming home for low-income residents. As they state, research has demonstrated little interaction and community building between low-income households and the more affluent ones within HOPE VI redevelopments. They raise questions about whether such lack of interaction discounts the underlying assumption of mixing policies. The authors conclude by examining the possibilities for creating truly inclusive mixed-income developments that not only serve the housing needs of diverse income groups but also inspire residents to stay and build community.

In the next article, Reinout Kleinhans and Maarten van Ham examine the United Kingdom's Right to Buy initiative, which is, by far, the largest income-mixing operation in Europe. RTB enables social-housing tenants and other more affluent households to purchase this housing at large discounts. Although the program was not originally intended to be a mixing policy, the selling and reselling of social housing has, in many cases, created income mixing. The authors discuss the outcomes of RTB regarding neighborhood effects and household benefits. Katherine Hankins and Derek Hyra provide commentaries on the two articles in this section.

In the third section, authors turn their attention to the issues of mobility and relocation through subsidized private-market rental housing. Victoria Basolo uses a unique dataset comprising primary survey data and secondary data from multiple sources to examine the range of outcomes for Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) subsidy households under the administration of two public housing authorities in California. In particular, the author examines whether moving with a voucher subsidy results in changes in employment, neighborhood income mix, and school quality. As with previous studies, findings are mixed and the author discusses the implications.

In the second article, Kimberly Skobba and Edward G. Goetz examine the long-term housing experiences of both subsidized and unsubsidized low-income households in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota. Without housing assistance, participants moved through a wide variety of housing accommodations, often making strategic moves to avoid homelessness or to escape untenable housing and neighborhood conditions. Such strategies almost never resulted in upward mobility,

however. Housing assistance, particularly HCVP vouchers, enabled participants to remain in the private rental market and to avoid lower hierarchy living arrangements. Having a voucher also meant increased residential stability.

Using survey data from a study of 300 former public housing residents in Atlanta, the third and final article of this section, by Deirdre Oakley, Erin Ruel, and Lesley Reid, examines the issue of relocation satisfaction. The situation in Atlanta presents an interesting case because, as of 2010, the city had eliminated all its traditional project-based public housing. Unlike the city's previous HOPE VI efforts, this final round of demolitions was done under Section 18 of the amended 1937 Housing Act, requiring no immediate plans for redevelopment. Therefore, the only option given to residents was to relocate with a voucher subsidy to private-market rental housing. Findings indicate that level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction largely hinged on the tenants' age and previous tenure in public housing. Amy T. Khare, Rachel Garshick Kleit, and Sudhir Venkatesh provide responses to the articles in this section.

In the final section, Mark L. Joseph provides a transatlantic, synthesizing discussion of mixing policies within the broader context of affordable housing and diverse, healthy communities. In doing so, Joseph comes back to the overarching societal question of which institutions should be responsible for delivery of a needed public good like affordable housing: Is the private sector really suited for this responsibility, given the overall objective of return on capital investment? Are mixing strategies sustainable over time? Joseph also addresses important questions about the range of benefits and deficiencies emerging from mixing strategies. Beyond the question of who benefits from mixed-income developments are questions of how different stakeholders—developers, city agencies, financiers, and residents across income groups—benefit.

Concluding Thoughts From the Editors

The symposium in this issue of *Cityscape*, broad as it is, is not comprehensive. Although the articles address the theoretical, policy, and practice questions, other important issues remain. As the body of work on HOPE VI and similar mixing initiatives has grown in the United States and Europe—in particular the United Kingdom and the Netherlands—questions have shifted to focus more broadly on reciprocal effects, with the recognition that influence can run in more than one direction. More specifically, in addition to examining whether and how lower income residents have been affected by higher income neighbors, researchers are devoting growing attention to ways in which lower income neighbors might influence those residents who were better off economically. Hand in hand with such a question is another: Do residents interact across economic lines and, if they do, are the interactions positive or negative? Questions related to mechanisms of influence and change have begun to shift from those related to person-to-person effects to ways in which some residents might have positive influence on the surrounding environment: Do higher income residents' (assumed) expectations and demands on property management and city services bring benefits to all residents?

Alternatively, note that social mix in the United Kingdom and mixed-income housing in the United States are explicitly sociospatial strategies that seek to attract capital investment to places that oftentimes have been associated with gentrification (Bridge, Butler, and Lees, 2012; Lees, 2008).

Beyond examining physical displacement, a growing body of research has examined the social relations among multiple tenure and income groups (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010; Cole and Goodchild, 2001; Duke, 2009; Fraser et al., in press; Kipfer, 2009; Kleit, 2011). Sometimes, social mix is a problem for low-income households. Cheshire (2012: 24), addressing social mix, stated that, "while poor neighborhoods may not be 'attractive,' they are cheap; they have attributes such as access to cheap takeouts and neighbours with similar problems and needs who may have relevant and useful contacts." Galés (2012: 27) added that "most urban scholars are familiar with the idea that when very different social or ethnic groups live in the same building or the same neighborhood, this rarely leads to social mixing but rather to strategies of avoidance and distinction." Although these perspectives represent a lack of confidence that social mixing can have positive effects, other treatments in the United Kingdom suggest that neighborhoods marked by social mixing may enjoy a political economy-of-place benefit; that is, cities with a significant middle-income population are more likely to provide needed services and economic development that enhance neighborhood life.

More recent questions have also focused in greater detail on the supports that might be necessary to create conditions in which (positive) influence among neighbors might occur. As research started to show less interaction across lines of economic difference and tenure than had been assumed, attention turned to the structures that might be necessary to encourage interactions. Interest has grown about the effects of resident-based organizational and governance structures and informal opportunities for socializing. How to develop community intentionally remains an open question. Additional questions of considerable importance include the following. How do mixed-income developments fare over time in terms of the resident base? Are structures well maintained physically and financially over time?

Acknowledgments

Guest Editors

James C. Fraser is an associate professor in the Department of Human and Organizational Development at Vanderbilt University.

Deirdre Oakley is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgia State University.

Diane K. Levy is a senior research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute.

References

Abravanel, Mark D., Diane L. Levy, and Mark McFarland. 2011a. "The Uncharted, Uncertain Future of HOPE VI Redevelopments: Part I," *Real Estate Review* 40 (3): 17–39.

———. 2011b. "The Uncharted, Uncertain Future of HOPE VI Redevelopments: Part II," *Real Estate Review* 40 (4): 25–40.

Argersinger, Jo Ann. 2010. "Contested Visions of American Democracy: Citizenship, Public Housing, and the International Arena," *Journal of Urban History* 36 (6): 792–813.

Bauer, Catherine. 1957. "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing," *Architectural Forum* (May): 140–142, 219, 221.

Birch, Eugenie. 1978. "Woman-Made America: The Case of Early Public Housing Policy," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44 (2): 130–144.

Blandy, Sarah, and Caroline Hunter. 2013. "The Right to Buy: Examination of an Exercise in Allocating, Shifting and Re-Branding Risks," *Critical Social Policy* 33 (1): 17–36.

Bridge, Gary, Tim Butler, and Loretta Lees. 2012. *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth*. Bristol, United Kingdom: The Policy Press.

Chaskin, Robert, and Mark Joseph. 2010. "Building 'Community' in Mixed-Income Developments: Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences," *Urban Affairs Review* 45 (3): 299–335.

Cheshire, Paul. 2012. "Why Do Birds of a Feather Flock Together? Social Mix and Social Welfare: A Quantitative Appraisal." In *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth*, edited by Gary Bridge, Tim Butler, and Loretta Lees. Bristol, United Kingdom: The Policy Press: 17–24.

Cole, Ian, and Barry Goodchild. 2001. "Social Mix and the 'Balanced Community' in British Housing Policy—A Tale of Two Epochs," *GeoJournal* 51: 351–360.

Crawford, Margaret. 1995. *Building the Workingman's Paradise: The Design of American Company Towns*. London, United Kingdom: Verso Books.

DeFilippis, James, and James Fraser. 2010. "Why Do We Want Mixed-Income Housing and Neighborhoods?" In *Critical Urban Studies: New Directions*, edited by Jonathan S. Davies and David L. Imbroscio. Albany, NY: SUNY Press: 135–147.

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

Dutton, Thomas. 2007. "Colony Over-the-Rhine," *The Black Scholar* 37 (3): 14–27.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fishman, Robert. 2002. *Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

FitzPatrick, Michael S. 2000. "Disaster in Every Generation: An Analysis of HOPE VI: HUD's Newest Big Budget Development Plan," *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 7 (2): 421.

Forrest, Robert, Peter Malpass, and Rob Rowlands. 2010. "A Privileged State? Council Housing As a Social Escalator." In *Housing, Markets and Policy*, edited by Peter Malpass and Rob Rowlands. London, United Kingdom: Routledge: 37–58.

Fraser, James, Ashley Burns, Joshua Bazuin, and Deirdre Oakley. In press. "HOPE VI, Colonization, and the Production of Difference," *Urban Affairs Review*. DOI: 10.117/1078087412465582.

Fraser, James, John Lepofsky, Edward Kick, and Patrick Williams. 2003. "The Construction of the Local and the Limits of Contemporary Community-Building in the United States," *Urban Affairs Review* 38: 417–445.

Fraser, James, Deirdre Oakley, and Joshua Bazuin. 2012. "Public Ownership and Private Profit in Housing," *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 5 (3): 397–412.

Freeman, Lance. 2004. *Siting Affordable Housing: Location and Neighborhood Trends of Low Income Housing Tax Credit Developments in the 1990s*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.

Friedman, Lawrence M. 1966. "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," *California Law Review* 54 (2): 642.

Gales, Patrick. 2012. "Social Mix and Urban Policy." In *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth?* edited by Gary Bridge, Tim Butler, and Loretta Lees. Bristol, United Kingdom: The Policy Press: 25–34.

Ginsburg, Norman. 2005. "The Privatization of Council Housing," *Critical Social Policy* 25 (1): 115–135.

Goering, John, Ali Kamely, and Todd Richardson. 1997. "Recent Research on Racial Segregation and Poverty Concentration in Public Housing in the United States," *Urban Affairs Review* 32 (5): 723–745.

Goetz, Edward G. In press. "The Audacity of HOPE VI: Discourse and the Dismantling of Public Housing," *Cities*. DOI: 10.1016.2012.07.008.

Goodchild, Barry, and Ian Cole. 2001. "Social Balance and Mixed Neighborhoods in Britain Since 1979: A Review of Discourse and Practice in Social Housing," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19: 103–121.

Hartman, Chester. 1975. *Housing and Social Policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Heathcote, Ethan. 2012. "Park Hill: Urban Optimism Then and Now," *Modernism* (Summer): 30–36.

Joseph, Mark L., Robert J. Chaskin, and Henry S. Webber. 2007. "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development," *Urban Affairs Review* 42 (3): 369–409.

Kipfer, Stefan, and Jason Petrunia. 2009. "'Recolonization' and Public Housing: A Toronto Case Study," *Studies in Political Economy* 83: 111–139.

Kleit, Rachel Garshick, and Nicole Bohme Carnegie. 2011. "Integrated or Isolated? The Impact of Public Housing Redevelopment on Social Network Homophily," *Social Networks* 33 (2): 152–165.

Lees, Loretta. 2008. "Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance?" *Urban Studies* 45 (12): 2449–2470.

Levy, Diane K. 2006. "Re-Envisioning Public Housing: HOPE VI and the U.S. Federal Government's Role in Public Housing Provision." In *Homing Devices: The Poor As Targets of Public Housing Policy and Practice*, edited by Marilyn Thomas-Houston and Mark Schuller. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books: 21–37.

Levy, Diane K., Harris Beider, Susan Popkin, and David Price, with Aurelie Broeckerhoff. 2010. *Atlantic Exchange: Case Studies of Housing and Community Development in the United States and the United Kingdom*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Malpass, Peter. 2010. "The Rise (and Rise?) of Housing Associations." In *Housing, Markets and Policy*, edited by Peter Malpass and Rob Rowlands. London, United Kingdom: Routledge: 101–121.

Malpass, Peter, and Allan Murie. 1999. *Housing Policy and Practice*. London, United Kingdom: Macmillan.

Massey, Douglas, and Nancy Denton. 1993. *The Continuing Case of Segregation: American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of an Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mitchell, Don. 1993. "Public Housing in Single-Industry Towns: Changing Landscapes of Paternalism." In *Place/Culture/Representation*, edited by James Duncan and David Ley. London, United Kingdom: Routledge: 110–127

Mullins, David, and Hal Pawson. 2010. "The Evolution of Stock Transfer: Privatisation or Towards Renationalisation?" In *Housing, Markets and Policy*, edited by Peter Malpass and Rob Rowlands. London, United Kingdom: Routledge: 76–100.

Popkin, Susan J., Larry F. Buron, Diane K. Levy, and Mary K. Cunningham. 2000. "The Gautreaux Legacy: What Might Mixed-Income and Dispersal Strategies Mean for the Poorest Public Housing Tenants?" *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (4): 911–942.

Ravetz, A. 2001. *Council Housing and Culture*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Rose, Damaris, Annick Germain, Marie-Helene Bacque, Gary Bridge, Yankel Fijalkow, and Tom Slater. 2013. "'Social Mix' and Neighbourhood Revitalization in a Transatlantic Perspective: Comparing Local Policy Discourse and Expectations in Paris (France), Bristol (UK) and Montreal (Canada)," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (2): 430–450.

Sautkina, Elena, Lyndal Bond, and Ade Kearns. 2012. "Mixed Evidence on Mixed Tenure Effects: Findings From a Systematic Review of UK Studies, 1995–2009," *Housing Studies* 27 (6): 748–782.

Schill, Michael H. 1993. "Distressed Public Housing: Where Do We Go From Here?" *The University of Chicago Law Review* 60: 497–554.

Schwartz, Alex, and Kian Tajbakhsh. 1997. "Mixed-Income Housing: Unanswered Questions," *Cityscape* 3 (2): 71–92.

Skirtz, Alice. 2012. *Econocide: Elimination of the Urban Poor*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Stone, Michael. 2003. *Social Housing in the UK and US: Evolution, Issues and Prospects*. London, United Kingdom: Goldsmiths College, Centre for Urban Community Research.

Vale, Lawrence. 2000. *From the Puritans to the Projects: Public Housing and Public Neighbors*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.