



UCD GEARY INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY
DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

Tenure Mixing to Combat Public Housing Stigmatization: external benefits, internal challenges and contextual influences in three Dublin neighbourhoods

Anna Carnegie,
Department of Social Policy and Social Work
University of York.

Michelle Norris
School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice
University College Dublin, Ireland

Michael Byrne
School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice
University College Dublin, Ireland

Geary WP2018/01
January 4, 2018

UCD Geary Institute Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of UCD Geary Institute. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

Anna Carnegie,
Department of Social Policy and Social Work
University of York,
Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK
E: acc547@york.ac.uk

Michelle Norris
School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice
Hanna Sheehy Skeffington Building
University College Dublin, Ireland
E: michelle.norris@ucd.ie

Michael Byrne
School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice
Hanna Sheehy Skeffington Building
University College Dublin, Ireland
E: Michael.byrne@ucd.ie

Tenure Mixing to Combat Public Housing Stigmatization: external benefits, internal challenges and contextual influences in three Dublin neighbourhoods.

Combatting stigma in public housing is a key concern among policy makers in the Republic of Ireland and internationally and this paper critically assesses the mechanism most commonly employed to achieve this – ‘income mixing’ or ‘poverty deconcentration’ of public rented neighbourhoods by encouraging households with a wider mix of incomes to live there. This is most commonly achieved by ‘tenure mixing’ - providing private housing alongside public housing on the grounds that occupants of the former tenure tend to have higher incomes than occupants of the latter. To do this the paper draws together empirical research on three public housing neighbourhoods in Dublin - Ireland’s capital and largest city - and insights from the critical geography and urban studies literature, to critically examine the effectiveness of tenure mixing as a public housing destigmatizing tool. The analysis presented here demonstrates that tenure mixing often produces contradictory results – in terms of reduced external stigma but heightened internal or within neighbourhood stigmatization. It links these outcomes to the policy and socio-economic contextual factors which we argue which play a central but underappreciated role in shaping the implementation of tenure mixing and its impact on public housing stigmatization.

Introduction

Stigmatization of public housing neighbourhoods is not a widespread problem in Western Europe but there is evidence that it is a growing problem for both individual public housing neighbourhoods and, in some countries, for the tenure as a whole (Scanlon, Whitehead and Arrigoitia, 2014). Furthermore, where it does occur, stigma has very negative implications for public housing residents’ quality of life and life chances (Warr, 2006). Consequently, this is an increasing concern for governments and policy on the provision of new public housing and regeneration of existing public housing neighbourhoods often identify combating stigma as a key objective (Dean and Hastings, 2000).

Combatting stigma in public housing is a key concern among policy makers in the Republic of Ireland and this article critically assesses the mechanism most commonly

employed to achieve this – ‘income mixing’ or ‘poverty deconcentration’ of public rented neighbourhoods by encouraging households with a wider mix of incomes to live there. This is most commonly achieved by ‘tenure mixing’ - providing private housing alongside public housing on the grounds that occupants of the former tenure tend to have higher incomes than occupants of the latter. This policy has been commonplace in Western Europe, Australia and North America for several decades (see: Musterd and Andersson, 2005; Arthurson, 2008) but in the Irish context its use dates back to the late 1990s when the Dublin Docklands Development Agency, which was responsible for regenerating the former port area of this city, stipulated that all private housing developments in its operational area should include a minimum of 20% of public housing (Moore, 2008). This policy was subsequently extended nationwide by the 2000 Planning Act which enabled local government to take up to 20% of private developments for public housing for rent or for ‘affordable housing’ for sale at cost price to low income home buyers. Although neither policy was explicitly justified with reference to its potential for combatting stigma, Lawton's (2015) research with policy makers indicates that this concern was a key inspiration behind these reforms. Similarly, Roberts (2015: 64) reports that in the case of the DDDA the tenure mixing “idea was taken from experiences in the Netherlands and Belgium which shows that integration helps reduce the stigma of social housing”. Since the late 1990s almost every programme for the regeneration of unpopular public housing neighbourhoods in Irish cities has included tenure mixing interventions which are often justified as a destigmatizing measure (e.g. Ballymun Regeneration Ltd, 2007; Cork City Council, 2011; Whyte, 2005; Redmond and Russell, 2008).

This article draws together empirical research on three public housing neighbourhoods in Dublin - Ireland’s capital and largest city - and insights from the critical geography and urban studies literature, to critically examine the effectiveness of tenure mixing as a public housing destigmatizing tool. The three cases examined here are ideal for this purpose because they have been subject to almost all of the tenure mixing strategies employed in Ireland including: mixing as a condition of planning permission or as part of the regeneration of existing dwellings; tax incentives; public private partnerships and sale of affordable housing to low income home buyers. Furthermore, the Irish public housing sector has contracted radically in recent decades (it housed 18.4% of

households in 1961 but just 9.7% in 2016) and is now strongly residual zed (i.e. dominated by low-income and otherwise marginalized households) therefore it is a prime candidate for stigmatization (Central Statistics Office, various years; Redmond and Norris, 2014). The critical geography and urban studies literature highlights the ambivalent and contradictory role of state responses to public housing stigmatization, which can reinforce rather than resolve this problem or generate other negative consequences. It also links these responses to flawed analyses of the causes of stigmatization which fail to take full account of the political and socio-economic structures that produce socio-spatial inequality. The empirical research on the use of tenure mixing as a public housing destigmatization measure which is reported here echoes these analysis by demonstrating that intervention also produces contradictory results – in terms of reduced external stigma but heightened internal stigmatization – and linking these outcomes to the policy and socio-economic contextual factors which we argue which play a central but underappreciated role in shaping the implementation of tenure mixing and its impact public housing stigmatization.

The discussion of these issues presented here is organized into four further sections. The next section critically reviews the existing literature on stigma and public housing and on the use of tenure mixing to destigmatize these neighbourhoods. This is followed by an outline of the characteristics of the case-study neighbourhoods and of how the research was conducted. The main body of the article then examines the implementation of tenure mixing in the case study neighbourhoods and its impact on their external and internal stigmatization. The article concludes by highlighting the key findings and learning for housing policy and practice which arises from this analysis.

Stigmatization of Public Housing and Tenure Mixing Responses: a critical review

Erving Goffman's (1963) work, which examines how 'spoiled identities' can become attached to individuals and groups, was one of the first attempts to think systematically about the stigmatization. Subsequent research has expanded his framework to demonstrate that *place* is also a distinct domain of stigmatization and to conceptualize its operation (Warr, 2006). For instance, Wacquant (2007) employs Goffman's (1963) theory to conceptualize how structural, institutional and cultural mechanisms operate

to construct particular geographical communities as tainted 'sites of deprivation' and how place often interacts with other dimensions of stigma such as socio-economic status and ethnicity.

Research has revealed that public housing is an increasing site of stigmatization due primarily to housing and urban development policy drivers. In particular, the residualisation of public housing in many western European countries in recent decades, often combined with the expansion of home ownership and the "normalization" of this tenure as the one in which most people should aspire to live, has helped to characterize public housing as a 'tenure of last resort' (Jacobs and Flanagan, 2013).

Hastings (2004) notes that discussions of the causes of public housing stigmatization among policy makers and in the media often focus, at times unintentionally, on pathological explanations which portray tenants as a "moral underclass" and thereby problematize the tenure (Westergaard, 1992). The pervasiveness of this discourse is demonstrated by Cole and Smith's (1996) analysis of a public housing neighbourhood in Northern England where local people identified a high proportion of lone parent residents as the root of its stigmatization, despite the lack of evidence of any association between lone parenthood and anti-social behavior. This is an example of how stigmatization often involves the amplification of cultural differences and operates through an array of factors such as local history, media influences and entrenched myths and stereotypes (Cole and Smith, 1996; Wassenberg, 2004).

Jacobs and Flanagan (2013) draw attention to the way in which poverty and public housing are also often conflated in these pathological discourses because all public housing residents are perceived to be members of a low-income socio-economic group, for example, unemployed people and *vice versa*. Such generalizations can contribute to complacency about stigma and a perception that the situation of public housing residents results from poor life choices rather than the impact of socio-economic inequality which impedes exit from poverty (Arthurson, 2004).

In a similar vein, the critical geography literature draws attention to the ways in which discourses about 'problem places' risk producing and reproducing stigma by implying that these neighbourhoods are populated by 'problem people' (Gray and Mooney,

2011). Confusion between correlation and causation in explanations of neighbourhoods is one mechanism through which this occurs. Discourses which emphasize the association between stigmatized social housing neighbourhoods and anti-social behavior or addiction, for example, can imply that addiction or anti-social behavior cause stigma. Slater's (2013) critique of the enormous body of research on 'neighbourhood effects' – which suggests that additional social problems are generated by spatial concentrations of low income households - is also instructive here because stigma is one of the neighbourhood effects most commonly identified in this literature. He argues that this literature focuses on how where people live affects their life chances, but fails to address *why people live where they do*. Thus, by eschewing the structural political and especially economic dynamics that produce socio-spatial inequality, this research risks implying that poor neighbourhoods precipitate their own decline and thereby reinforce their stigmatization (Slater, 2013).

The insights generated from these critiques of discourse on public housing stigmatization are also relevant to tenure mixing which is one of the most commonly used destigmatization measures. For instance Crump (2002) points that in common with much of the discourse on neighbourhood effects, tenure mixing policy is underpinned by the assumption that spatial concentrations of low-income households exacerbate problems of poverty and stigma. Therefore, like the neighbourhood effects discourse, tenure mixing policy can be criticized for implying that stigmatized neighbourhoods have contributed to their own stigmatization. Second, the idea that low-income individuals or neighbourhoods will benefit from contact with higher-income populations is often cited as a rationale for tenure mixing. In its most simplistic iterations, the transmission of middle class behavioral norms (e.g. two parent families and commitment to education or employment) or 'home ownership cultures' is therefore presented as a solution to stigma (Crump, 2002). Third, the critical geography and urban studies literature reveals that tenure mixing of existing public housing communities often involves their partial or total destruction by demolishing and rebuilding the dwellings and/or by replacing public housing with home owner housing. Crump (2002: 592) also notes that demolition 'erases from the landscape the highly stigmatized structures of public housing, aiding in the reimagining of the city as a safe zone of commerce, entertainment and culture'. In this sense, tenure mixing can in some

instances form part of neoliberal urban governance strategies (Gray and Mooney, 2011).

In addition to critiques of tenure mixing as a solution to stigmatization of public housing there is also significant empirical research evidence on its effectiveness. Most of this focusses on the tenure mixing of existing public housing estates as part of regeneration schemes. These studies indicate that, when applied in this context, tenure mixing has had some success in reducing the external public image of target neighbourhoods but these achievements are limited because, once established, stigmatized public images can be extremely difficult to shift (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; Arthurson, 2013; Cole and Smith, 1996; Hastings and Dean, 2003). Even where radical changes are made to a neighbourhood's built environment and tenure mix, the general public may continue to associate it with crime, drug use etc. and this is also true of media professionals and of other influential actors such as estate agents who, it would be expected to have greater awareness of the changing socio-economic profile of a particular neighbourhood (Gourlay, 2007).

Tenure mixing seems to be much more effective in combating external stigmatization of public housing when applied to new developments. Public housing residents of neighbourhoods which were mixed tenure from the outset experience far less place-based stigma than that associated with traditional mono-tenure public housing developments. This appears to be because these neighbourhoods are not ever regarded as public rented and are thus affected to a lesser degree by the external stigmatization of this tenure (Allen *et al.*, 2005; Arthurson, 2013). It can be argued, however, that such interventions do not tackle the stigmatization of public housing *per se*, but instead deal with stigma by reducing the amount of public housing (Ruming, Mee and McGuirk, 2004).

A significant body of research has also found that public housing tenants in mixed tenure developments can experience intensified forms of internal stigma, particularly from non-public renting neighbors (Ruming, Mee and McGuirk, 2004). Public housing tenants are often identified by privately housed neighbors the cause of any problems which arise regardless of evidence and can be excluded from decision-making processes in the community (Chaskin and Joseph, 2013). As a result, public housing residents can

feel more stigmatized *within* their mixed neighbourhood but concurrently enjoy a less stigmatized *external* reputation. There is no conclusive evidence as to why these patterns develop, but it is reasonable to assume that owner occupiers resident in mixed tenure developments simply “import” prevailing stigmatized attitudes to public renters. Once established, internal stigmatization is maintained by low levels of interaction between home owners and public renters (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000). The use of different designs, façades and entrances for public and private housing in mixed tenure neighbourhoods amplifies divisions between tenure groups (McCormick, Joseph and Chaskin, 2012).

Context, Cases and Methods

In terms of the prevalence of the aforementioned factors which influence the public reputation of a housing tenure, the Irish public housing sector is a prime candidate for stigmatization. As mentioned above this sector has contracted by half since the 1960s and has concurrently residualized because declining availability of dwellings combined with the needs-based system for allocating new tenancies has resulted in low-income (primarily welfare dependent) and otherwise marginalized households receiving most new tenancies recent years (Fahey, 1999; Norris, 2014). Unusually in the Western European context, due to the strongly mono-ethnic nature of the Irish population, residualisation was not associated with the domination of public housing by ethnic minority households, although this is likely to change in coming years the Irish population-at-large has diversified (Scanlon, Whitehead and Arrigoitia, 2014). Exit patterns have also reinforced residualisation because Ireland’s long tradition of selling public housing to tenants (introduced in the 1930s) has facilitated the outward migration of higher-income tenants into home ownership (Norris, 2016).

These residualisation drivers have operated in a spatially uneven fashion, particularly in urban areas, with the result that some public housing neighbourhoods are much more stigmatized than others. For instance, because tenants tend to buy homes in high-demand neighbourhoods, stigmatized neighbourhoods are more likely remain public rented (Fahey, 1999; Norris, 2014). Economic restructuring and rising unemployment

in the 1970s affected some urban neighbourhoods more than others, as did the severe heroin epidemic which emerged in Dublin in the 1980s (Punch, 2005). Traditional models of public housing delivery which until the 1980s was done almost entirely by local government (since the non-profit housing associations have played an increasing role) reinforced these patterns. Traditionally public housing was provided in mono-tenure developments, with distinctive design and nomenclature and was therefore identifiable as spatially and culturally distinctive from private housing (Ravetz, 2001).

Two of the three neighbourhoods examined in this research – Ballymun and Fatima Mansions – are testament to this uneven residualisation. Both are local government ‘flats’ (apartment) complexes, with typical, distinctive ‘public housing designs’ and were ineligible for purchase by tenants (until recently, only houses were eligible for tenant purchase). Joblessness, hard drug addiction and dealing from the early 1980s precipitated high rates of tenancy turnover and vacant dwellings and consequently severe stigmatization (Power, 1997; Corcoran, 1998). In contrast the third case-study neighbourhood (Clarion Quay) is not externally stigmatized and includes housing association rather than local authority provided public housing as well as private housing. It was built in 2002 as a mixed-tenure, mixed-use neighbourhood which includes public and private housing and commercial space. Ballymun and Fatima Mansions have been extensively regenerated in recent years as part of which attempts have been made to introduce private housing to address stigma among other concerns (Whyte, 2005; Ballymun Regeneration Ltd, 2007). Although Clarion Quay hasn’t been regenerated, its initial construction as a mixed-tenure development was inspired by a concern to avoid ghettoization of public housing in the Dublin Docklands Development Authority regeneration area where it is located (Norris, 2006; Moore, 2008) (see Table 1).

As is the norm in case-study research a mix of research methods were employed to operationalize this study (Yin, 2003). A review of the literature on the case study neighbourhoods was conducted which included: research on these districts, regeneration plans and project evaluations and information on social and community services and groups operating in the area. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were also conducted with residents (of both public and private housing) community activists and social service providers between April and September 2016 (see Table 1).

Table 1 Characteristics of Case Study Neighbourhoods and Interviewees from these Neighbourhoods

	Ballymun	Clarion Quay	Fatima Mansions
Characteristics of Neighbourhoods			
Year built	1966-1969	2002	1949
Location	Northern periphery of Dublin.	Regenerated docklands area in Dublin's inner city.	Mixed-income district in Dublin's south inner-suburbs.
Original Design	15, 8 and 4-storey apartment blocks and standard houses.	10 blocks of 4 storey apartments.	4 storey apartment blocks.
Current Design	A mix of 2, 3 and 4-storey houses and apartments, leisure facilities, retail outlets and an arts and community centre.	Same as the original design.	Mix of 4 storey apartments, terraced houses and maisonettes, retail, offices and a sports and community centre.
Number and tenure of dwellings originally provided	3,237 dwellings all public rented (from local government)	185 dwellings of which 37 are of public rented (from a housing association). The rest were sold at market price and 50% of these are privately rented	394 dwellings all public rented (from local government)
Number and tenure of dwellings currently provided	Rebuilt from 1998-2014 currently 62% public rented, 26% owner occupied and 12% private rented	Same as original.	Rebuilt in 2007 to include 180 public housing units, 70 'affordable' dwellings (sold sub-market value) and 396 private dwellings (sold at market price).
Characteristics of Interviewees			
Community development workers (paid)	4	N/a	1
Community group activists (volunteers)	1	N/a	0
Private renting tenants	0	4	1
Public housing managers	1	0*	2
Local authority provided public housing tenants	8	N/a	1
Housing association provided public housing tenants	2	4	1

Note: N/A means not applicable and refers to the fact that some categories of interviewees did not live or work in some of the case-study neighbourhood. *: a public housing manager involved in the Clarion Quay estate was interviewed by telephone.

Using Tenure Mix to Destigmatize the Case Study Public Housing Neighbourhoods

Operationalizing Tenure Mixing

Although tenure mixing was attempted in all three case-study neighbourhoods, it was not successfully operationalized in all cases and, in terms of its primary objective of deconcentrating poverty, this measure also achieved uneven outcomes.

Tenure mixing was most successful as an income mixing strategy in Clarion Quay. Following its construction in 2002 two apartment blocks there were purchased by a housing association for letting as public housing and the remaining eight blocks were sold on the market, for top-end prices (Norris, 2006). Half of these are owner occupied, the remainder are private rented and interviewees reported these are occupied by high-income households.

Some tenure mixing was also achieved in Fatima Mansions following its demolition and reconstruction (via a Public Private Partnership) but not at the levels originally envisaged because the housing market suffered a severe crash when these dwellings were due to be sold in 2007 (Whyte, 2005). Some of the private dwellings which proved unsaleable at this time they were bought by a housing association for letting as public housing instead. However, the consensus among interviewees was that Fatima Mansions' regeneration has had some success in facilitating income mixing because the private dwellings are mainly occupied by households in employment – an outcome which was facilitated by the strong private rented market in this conveniently located and rapidly gentrifying part of Dublin.

As part of Ballymun's regeneration land designated for private residential development had tax incentives attached to encourage the purchase of dwellings for home ownership and private renting (Norris and Gkartzios, 2011). However, the private housing in Ballymun was overwhelmingly purchased by private landlords and then let to benefit dependent households in receipt of government housing allowances who are probably the only households seeking private rented accommodation in the depressed rental market in this peripheral part of Dublin. To qualify for housing allowance these households would have had incomes low enough to public housing therefore although

the proportion of public housing in Ballymun has declined by half in recent years, has not effected income mixing (Kintrea and Muir (2009) reach the same conclusion). This was confirmed by a local community worker we interviewed claimed: “I personally don’t see that diversity. Even in the voices I hear here – they’re Ballymun voices”.

In all three case-study neighbourhoods the public housing was clustered together in separate apartment blocks rather than dispersed among the private dwellings. This was done primarily to increase the ease and reduce the costs of managing the public housing because it enables public landlords to fit out their dwellings to their own specifications and to cut costs by not availing of some of the services provided by the private management agency which was appointed by the apartment owners to manage the communal areas of the neighbourhood (e.g. elevator, roof and grounds maintenance). This approach is the norm in mixed tenure developments in Ireland due primarily to the limited funding for housing management available to public housing landlords (Norris, 2006). Although central government funds the purchase or construction of public housing, housing management costs are funded entirely by rents which are linked to tenants’ incomes and therefore are very low (€244 per month in 2014 which is around a third of average private sector rents) (Central Statistics Office, various years). In Dublin City (where all three case-study neighbourhoods are located) public housing rental income amounted just 116% of spending on the management and maintenance of individual dwellings in 2014 which leaves very little revenue to spend on paying private management agencies (National Oversight and Audit Commission, 2017).

Impact on External Stigmatization

The mixed achievements in implementing tenure mixing/ social mixing in the case study estates had significant implications for the impact of this measure on stigma. Interviewees from Clarion Quay and Fatima Mansions where tenure/ income mixing had been achieved, albeit with varying levels of success, were more positive about its contribution to destigmatization than residents of Ballymun where it was not operationalized successfully.

Public housing residents of Clarion Quay thought that their prestigious address, in the heart of Dublin’s business district, did confer social status. One claimed, with a laugh,

that “people think I’m loaded”. As predicted by Goffman (1963), some residents used their address to conceal the “spoiled” aspects of their identity. One interviewee admitted that it enables her to hide her status as a public renter from work colleagues. However, despite these advantages, the public renters in Clarion Quay did not cite the absence of address-based stigma as a tangible benefit when asked directly by the interviewers.

Conversely, public renters in Fatima Mansions have experienced longstanding, external stigmatization which this research indicates reduced following its regeneration and residents were very positive about this development. Interviewees agreed that tenure mixing contributed to this outcome, but felt that the neighbourhood’s redesign and the image change strategy implemented as part of the regeneration had made greater contributions in this regard.

Primarily due to its failure to facilitate income mixing, the social housing residents and housing managers interviewed for the Ballymun case study almost unanimously agreed that in this case tenure mixing had limited impact on external stigmatisation. Although she acknowledged that other estate regeneration interventions did help reduce stigma, a Ballymun based community worker we interviewed felt that more tenure mixing was needed to properly resolve stigma:

It needs private housing, it needs income – income-supported housing as opposed to social welfare-supported housing. Otherwise... you’re only increasing the amount of people with no jobs, you’re only increasing the amount of people requiring social services, you’re only increasing the amount of people who may not... know how to look after their children or their young people as well as they might. So that – like as well as providing for the economic development of the place, you also need people to go and buy houses who have a vested interest in where they live.

However, other interviewees from Ballymun disagreed. They complained that the rationale for tenure mixing implies that public housing residents lack neighbourhood pride and ambition and they disputed this implication. One resident also challenged

view that more private housing is required attract businesses to Ballymun, asserting that after housing costs his spending power was the same as a homeowner who was meeting mortgage payments.

Impact on Internal Stigmatization

While helping to reduce external stigmatization of Clarion Quay and to a lesser extent Fatima Mansions, tenure mixing created internal challenges particularly in the former neighbourhood. As predicted by Atkinson and Kintrea (2000) these challenges are manifested in limited interaction between private and public residents which raises questions about the cohesion of these communities. None of the private residents of Clarion Quay who were interviewed for this study reported ever visiting the home of, or knowing the names of, any public renting neighbors. The former did not think this unusual but public housing tenants found this situation odd and unsatisfactory. A similar pattern was observed in Fatima Mansions, with one public housing tenant complaining that the redeveloped neighbourhood is:

... so quiet and you don't see anybody, whereas in the [pre regeneration] flats... no matter what time of the day or night you stood out on your balcony, there was always someone to talk to... in the [post regeneration] houses they lost that a little bit...You miss it.

Several interviewees linked the lack of interaction to the more transient lifestyles of private renting tenants and their higher employment rates which reduced the time spent in the neighbourhood. However, most interviewees suggested that interaction between public and private residents has increased over time (Davison *et al* (2013) profer the same conclusions).

More worryingly, there was significant conflict between private and public housing residents in Clarion Quay to an extent which indicates that tenure mixing had precipitated full-blown internal stigmatization within this neighbourhood. Some residents interviewed suggested that "there's a divide"; "we are segregated" and "it's an internal ghetto" (between public and private residents). These sentiments were expressed by both private and public housing residents but the latter interpreted this issue more negatively. Conflict centered almost entirely on the use of the grassed

courtyard in the center of the complex - the only communal area shared by all residents. There were marked differences in how the public and private housing residents perceived this space. Private residents viewed the courtyard as a 'visual amenity' (they used this term in interviews) rather than as a space to use for activities. They also considered unsupervised play in the courtyard (almost entirely by public housing residents' children) as *de facto* problematic and raised questions about noise levels, children's safety and the ultimately quality of parenting. Public housing residents had a contrasting interpretation - they viewed the courtyard as a space which could and should be used and believed it was not only normal but inevitable that children would play there. So they couldn't understand objections to their children's play and interpreted these as a form of stigmatization.

These internal divisions partially reflected lifestyle differences particularly almost complete absence of children in privately housed families but building design played an important role in this regard. In both Fatima Mansions and Clarion Quay public housing tenants argued that the clustering of public housing together was a form of 'segregation' and highlighted three particularly negative effects:

- public and private dwellings could be easily distinguished.
- It impeded interaction between residents of different tenures and,
- physical segregation has a powerful symbolic effect in terms of dividing the two cohorts of residents.

Public housing managers reported that other mixed tenure neighbourhoods where private and public housing residents were more interspersed experienced less internal-stigma. However, they acknowledged that in Fatima Mansions the lack of obvious boundaries between different tenure types (e.g. gates) and the availability of communal play facilities which were used by all households also helped integrate the different tenures.

Neighbourhood management issues and particularly the role of the private management agency appointed by the apartment owners to manage the communal areas also amplified internal stigmatization in Clarion Quay. Private residents, in conjunction with the management agency, have sometimes sought to adopt a security-

led approach to estate management by using CCTV cameras and management agency staff to monitor (public housing tenants') children's use of the common areas. The staff of the public housing landlord in Clarion Quay have did help mitigate this conflict however by acting as advocates for the public housing tenants; ensuring that complaints were not framed in stigmatizing terms and also were addressed quickly to ensure they did not fester.

Conclusions

This article has drawn together empirical research on three public housing neighbourhoods in Dublin and insights from the critical geography and urban studies literature, to critically examine the effectiveness of tenure mixing as a public housing destigmatizing tool. Echoing the themes from these critical literatures, the analysis offered here has demonstrated that the use of tenure mixing to destigmatize public housing can produce contradictory results in practice and have linked these outcomes to the policy and socio-economic context which play an important and but often underappreciated role in shaping the implementation of tenure mixing and its impact public housing stigmatization.

The evidence from the case-study neighbourhoods examined here reveals that tenure mixing is difficult to operationalize in practice particularly in existing, highly stigmatized public housing neighbourhoods where dwellings are difficult to sell or at least difficult to sell to occupants with higher incomes than existing residents. This is a key shortcoming in this intervention since its central objective of facilitating income mixing is hardest to achieve in the neighbourhoods which need it most. Tenure mixing implementation strategies are also strongly influenced by arrangements for funding public housing in Ireland because inadequate housing management revenue makes it difficult to intersperse public and private dwellings in mixed tenure apartment complexes and encourages landlords to cluster the public housing together in single blocks instead (although dispersing public housing in low density estates of traditional houses is likely to be easier) (Norris, 2006).

Where tenure mixing is successfully implemented in a way which enables income mixing that it can help to ameliorate 'external stigmatization' of public housing

neighbourhoods, but this benefit was not always highly valued by the public renting residents of the three neighbourhoods examined here. Furthermore successful implementation of tenure mixing created significant community cohesion challenges in two of these case-study neighbourhoods which at best was manifested in lack of interaction between residents of public and private housing and at worst in full-blown 'internal' (i.e. within neighbourhood) stigmatization. This outcome was also shaped by wider structural factors because macro level socio-economic inequalities and stigmatizing attitudes towards public renters were reflected in micro-level divisions at neighbourhood level and the difficulty in properly mixing public and private dwellings created by public housing policy also reduced opportunities for interaction between neighbors which might have facilitated better neighbourhood level integration.

Thus this article highlights the importance of taking account of socio-economic, housing market and socio-economic context when designing programmes to employ tenure mixing to combat stigmatization of public housing. The research reported here also suggests that in the Irish context where cities which are small and only minimally socio-spatially segregated by the standards of the UK, USA and France and public housing funding arrangements don't facilitate the fine grained mixing of public and private dwellings in high density housing, building small public housing developments in mixed income urban districts may be a more effective strategy to combat stigmatization of this tenure than tenure mixing individual developments.

Funding sources:

The research on which this article is based was supported by the Adrian Norridge Housing Research Bursary, established in honor of the founder of Clúid Housing.

References

- Allen, C. *et al.* (2005) *Mixed Tenure, Twenty Years On: Nothing out of the Ordinary*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Arthurson, K. (2004) 'From stigma to demolition: Australian debates about housing and social exclusion', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19(3), pp. 255–270.
- Arthurson, K. (2008) 'Australian Public Housing and the Diverse Histories of Social Mix', *Journal of Urban History*, 34(3), pp. 484–501.
- Arthurson, K. (2013) 'Mixed tenure communities and the effects on neighbourhood reputation and stigma: Residents' experiences from within', *Cities*, 35, pp. 432–438.
- Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2000) 'Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts', *Policy and Politics*, 28(1), pp. 93–108.
- August, M. (2008) 'Social mix and Canadian public housing redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto', *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), pp. 82–100.
- Ballymun Regeneration Ltd (2007) *Tenure Diversity, In the Ballymun Regeneration Catchment Area*. Dublin: Ballmun Regeneration Ltd.
- Central Statistics Office (various years) *Census of Population of Ireland*. Dublin.
- Chaskin, R. and Joseph, M. (2013) "'Positive" Gentrification, Social Control and the "Right to the City" in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), pp. 480–502.
- Cole, I. and Smith, Y. (1996) *From estate action to estate agreement: regeneration and change on the bell farm estate*. Bristol: The policy Press.
- Corcoran, M. (1998) *Making Fatima a Better Place to Live*. Dublin: Fatima Groups United.
- Cork City Council (2011) *Cork City Northwest Regeneration Masterplan & Implementation Report*. Cork: Cork City Council.
- Crump, J. (2002) 'Deconcentration by demolition: Public housing, poverty, and urban policy', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20(5), pp. 581–596.
- Davison, G. *et al.* (2013) *Understanding and Addressing Community Opposition to Affordable Housing Development*. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Fahey, T. (ed.) (1999) *Social Housing in Ireland: a study of success, failure and lessons learned*. Dublin: Oak Tree Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gourlay, G. (2007) *It's got a bad name and it sticks... Approaching stigma as a distinct focus of neighbourhood regeneration initiatives*, paper presented at EURA Conference, 'the vital city', 12-14 September. Glasgow.

- Gray, N. and Mooney, G. (2011) 'Glasgow's new urban frontier "Civilising" the population of "Glasgow East"', *City*, 15(1), pp. 4–24.
- Hastings, A. (2004) 'Stigma and social housing estates: Beyond pathological explanations', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, pp. 233–254.
- Hastings, A. and Dean, J. (2003) 'Challenging images: Tackling stigma through estate regeneration', *Policy and Politics*, 31(2), pp. 171–184.
- Jacobs, K. and Flanagan, K. (2013) 'Public housing and the politics of stigma', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, pp. 319–337.
- Kintrea, K. and Muir, J. (2009) 'Integrating Ballymun? Flawed progress in Ireland's Largest Estate Regeneration Scheme', *Town Planning Review*, 80(1), pp. 83–108.
- Lawton, P. (2015) *Socially Integrated Housing and Sustainable Urban Communities: Case Studies from Dublin*. Dublin: National Economic and Social Council.
- McCormick, N., Joseph, M. and Chaskin, R. (2012) 'The New Stigma of Relocated Public Housing Residents: Challenges to Social Identity in Mixed-Income Developments', *City and Community*, 11(3), pp. 285–308.
- Moore, N. (2008) *Dublin Docklands Reinvented: post-industrial regeneration of a European City Quarter*. Dublin: Four courts press.
- Musterd, S. and Andersson, R. (2005) 'Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities', *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(6), pp. 761–790.
- National Oversight and Audit Commission (2017) *A Review of the Management and Maintenance of Local Authority Housing*. Dublin: NOAC.
- Norris, M. (2006) 'Developing, designing and managing mixed tenure estates: Implementing planning gain legislation in the Republic of Ireland', *European Planning Studies*, 14(2), pp. 199–218.
- Norris, M. (ed) (2014) *Social Housing, Disadvantage and Neighbourhood liveability*. London: Routledge.
- Norris, M. (2016) *Property, Family and the Irish Welfare State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norris, M. and Gkartzios, M. (2011) 'Twenty years of property-led urban regeneration in Ireland: Outputs, impacts, implications', *Public Money and Management*, 31(4), pp. 257–264.
- Norris, M. and O'Connell, C. (2010) 'Social housing management, governance and delivery in Ireland: Ten years of reform on seven estates', *Housing Studies*, 25(3), pp. 317–334.
- Power, A. (1997) *Estates on the Edge: The Social Consequences of Mass Housing in Northern Europe*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Punch, M. (2005) 'Problem drug use and the political economy of urban restructuring: Heroin, class and governance in Dublin', *Antipode*, pp. 754–774.

Ravetz, A. (2001) *Council Housing and Culture: the history of a social experiment*. London: Routledge.

Redmond, D. and Norris, M. (2014) 'Social Housing in the Republic of Ireland', in Scanlon, K., Whitehead, C., and Arrigoitia, M. F. (eds) *Social Housing in Europe*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 143–162.

Redmond, D. and Russell, P. (2008) 'Social housing regeneration and the creation of sustainable communities in Dublin', *Local Economy*, 23(3), pp. 168–179.

Ruming, K., Mee, K. and McGuirk, P. (2004) 'Questioning the Rhetoric of Social Mix: Courteous Community or Hidden Hostility?', *Australian Geographical Studies*, 42(June), pp. 234–248.

Scanlon, K., Whitehead, C. and Arrigoitia, M. (Eds) (2014) *Social Housing in Europe*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Slater, T. (2013) 'Your Life Chances Affect Where You Live: A Critique of the "Cottage Industry" of Neighbourhood Effects Research', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), pp. 367–387.

Wacquant, L. (2007) 'Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality', *Thesis Eleven*, 91(1), pp. 66–77.

Warr, D. (2006) 'There goes the neighbourhood: The malign effects of stigma', *Social City*, 19(1), pp. 1–11.

Wassenberg, F. (2004) 'Large social housing estates: From stigma to demolition?', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19(3), pp. 223–232.

Westergaard, J. (1992) 'About and Beyond the Underclass: Some Notes on Influences of Social Climate on British Sociology Today, 1992', *Sociology*, 26(4), pp. 575–587.

Whyte, J. (2005) *Eight Great Expectations: a landmark and unique social regeneration plan for Fatima Mansions*, Dublin: Fatima Regeneration Board.

Yin, R. (2003) *Case Study Research design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.