ACE 17

Electronic offprint

Separata electrónica

RACE, SPACE AND PLACE: LESSONS FROM SHEFFIELD

JUDITH ALLEN, TERI OKORO and ORNA ROSENFELD

ACE: Architecture, City and Environment = Arquitectura, Ciudad y Entorno [en línea]. 2011, Año 6, núm. 17 Octubre. P. 245-292

ISSN: [1886-4805](https://doi.org/10.18866/1886-4805)

Website access: http://www-cpsv.upc.es/ace/Articles_n17/articles_pdf/ACE_17_SE_25.pdf

UPCommons Access: <http://hdl.handle.net/2099/11089>

ACE

Architecture, City, and Environment
Arquitectura, Ciudad y Entorno

C

RACE, SPACE AND PLACE: LESSONS FROM SHEFFIELD

ALLEN, Judith¹
OKORO, Teri
ROSENFELD, Orna

Initial submission: 18-3-2011

Final submission: 21-9-2011

Key words: Housing, Pakistanis, immigrants, Sheffield, multi-ethnic, multicultural.

Abstract

How has housing played a role in incorporating immigrants into English society? Inspired by a small demonstration project in Sheffield, *Twice the Terrace*, which aimed to convert two small bye-law houses into a single larger house appropriate for a large and traditional Pakistani family, the paper traces the history of this house type using the concept of living-in-space to explore not only the social practices of families living inside them, but also the way they affect relationships outside the property itself. Using Keith's concept of racialization as being equally about how specific ethnic groups re-invent themselves over time and how urban space provides a stage on which the performance of re-invention simultaneously alters the urban object itself, the paper traces the history of the demonstration project as it emerged from a localised struggle to prevent the demolition of the area within which it was located (Keith, 2005). The paper concludes that while houses play important roles in incorporating immigrants into English society, it is not the same role everywhere at all times. Both localisation and temporisation are important processes in grasping the wider role of racialization in urban change.

1. Introduction: *Twice the Terrace*

In 2009, the City of Sheffield sponsored a design competition to convert two small bye-law houses into a single home. A young Asian architect won the competition with a house adapted for a traditional large family of Pakistani origin. The City Council, which owned the houses, subsequently altered the design and converted them. The Council's design provided more usable floor space, but did not meet all the culturally specific requirements of the winning scheme. The entire scheme was called *Twice the Terrace*.

This simple housing design project sparked off this paper. We originally found it while looking at housing design innovations to support *the integration of immigrants* (Allen and Rosenfeld,

¹ **Judith Allen:** School of Architecture and the Built Environment, University of Westminster, 35 Marylebone Road, London NW1 5LS, England. Contact email: allen4049@gmail.com.

2011). *Twice the Terrace* resonated with earlier research by Okoro, who explored culturally specific housing needs among overcrowded Bangladeshi families in London (Okoro, 1995). The paper uses this small project as a peg on which to hang a wider discussion of how a group of immigrants from Pakistan have come to be living in the oldest and worst housing in a formerly industrial city in the north of England. Our interest arises from seeing all housing forms as *culturally specific*, both in terms of how the configuration of space-within-the-house is linked to

assumptions about specific socio-cultural relationships and in terms of how specific housing forms are set within wider urban socio-spatial processes, the space-outside-the-house. How does living-in-the-space of a specific housing form relate to living-in-the-(changing)-space of the city? This is one focus of the paper. It intersects the second focus: What happens when a specific housing form, designed for one cultural group, comes to be inhabited by another cultural group? We explore this as a historical process in order to identify how physical characteristics of housing carry wider social meanings and how the concept of cultural specificity emerges within racialised discourses, rhetoric and struggles.

The overall question is: What role do these small bye-law houses play in the incorporation of migrant families into a (changing) English society? We use the word *incorporation* to evoke the way bodies relate to space. The challenge is to draw out the elusive and multifarious connections between house form and social process. The first section of the paper introduces *Twice the Terrace*. The next section discusses the notion of racialization, which informs our investigation. Following this, we show how bye-law housing came to carry specific social meanings in England. Since our specific interest is in families of Pakistani origin, we then explain the socio-economic position of Pakistanis in England and how this shapes their access to housing. The next section discusses how families have adapted to the physical characteristics of their housing. The final section returns to *Twice the Terrace*, setting it within its localised urban housing policy context. We conclude by returning to our original question and suggest three possible answers.

1.1 *Twice the Terrace*

71 and 73 Robey Street were two bye-law terraced houses in a part of Sheffield which is popularly known as Burngreave. Robey Street is part of a cluster of streets which were built between 1890 and 1910. These streets are now known locally as Page Hall. These houses were built, first to house the families of workers in an adjacent colliery, and then in Sheffield's rapidly developing steel industry. When they were built, each of the houses had two rooms downstairs and two rooms upstairs. A tunnel ran through the centre of every four houses to allow access to collect night soil from the privies in the backyards of the houses.

Figure 1. 71 and 73 Robey Street, after conversion

Source: Left: Burngreave Messenger. Right: Authors' own.

By the beginning of the twenty first century, the houses were in very poor physical condition and Page Hall was home to an ethnically mixed community. It is an area of *ethnic concentration* within Sheffield, and the majority ethnic group is Pakistani. Burngreave, the electoral ward within which Page Hall sits, contains sixteen percent of Sheffield's Pakistani population, and approximately three percent of Sheffield's total population. Fifty eight percent of the population within Burngreave is white, nineteen percent is Pakistani, another four percent is from elsewhere in the Asian subcontinent, and twelve percent are Black (evenly divided between Caribbean and African). The white population cannot be assumed to be entirely English, and seven percent are from other places, mainly Yemenis, Somalis and Kurds, Czechs and Slovaks, more recently.

Sheffield City Council was committed to improving the area using funding from the national Housing Market Renewal Programme, which was supposed to run from 2002 to 2018. The initial proposal in 2005 was to demolish all the housing in the area, but lively community resistance meant that it has been preserved. It was at this point that it acquired the name *Page Hall*. In 2009, the City Council announced a design competition to improve five of the houses in Robey Street, which it purchased at £1 each from a local housing association. 71 and 73 Robey Street were to be laterally converted, or *knocked through* to demonstrate the potential to create larger and culturally sensitive houses for severely overcrowded Pakistani families in the area. Three other houses were renovated to demonstrate the potential for ecological retrofitting. Figure 1 shows 71/73 Robey Street after conversion.

The *Twice the Terrace* competition was won by a young Asian architect. The winning design is shown in Figure 2a. The configuration of spaces shows all the main elements which would adapt the houses to the way of living which is desired by larger, more conservative Pakistani families: separate living room spaces for men and women, a separate large kitchen, a bathroom downstairs to serve male guests. Detailed specifications would have picked up other requirements: provision of showers, orientation of toilets, large cookers, more storage space and better ventilation in the kitchen.

The City Council adapted the plans before commissioning the building works. Its adaptations are shown in Figure 2b alongside the winning design. It is clear that the final design of the

ground floor does not meet the spatial configuration requirements of Pakistani families although the conversion still presents a much larger house. The City Council argues that these adaptations were required to meet *regulations*, but this is a complicated argument to disentangle. Apparently, the most important regulation was for a dustbin store to be incorporated within the curtilage of the building, which is a local regulation, not a national requirement. At the same time, the plan does not meet the national lifetime homes standard, which is a requirement if the original intention of funding through the Housing Market Renewal policy initiative were to be used.

In terms of costs, the City Council has been evasive. It states that the materials costs for the conversion were £65.000, and acquisition costs were nominal, at £1 each for the two houses. However, the median asking price for a two bedroom house in the area is currently close to £47.000. The average price of a three bedroom house in Page Hall, one in which the attic has been converted into a third sleeping room, is £70.000. A crude estimate of labour costs for the conversion would be £120.000 (including 20% value added tax for renovated housing). This gives a conservative estimate of the full economic cost for the project between £279.000 and £300.000².

A rough estimate of average Pakistani household income in Sheffield is around £18.000 per annum³. In practical terms, assuming a prudent price to income lending ratio of 2,5 this means that the maximum mortgage available would be £45.000. At the same price to income ratio, a family seeking a mortgage to buy the *Twice the Terrace* house would require an income of between £116.000 and £120.000. While these estimates are crude, the scale of the differences is substantial enough to allow two conclusions to be drawn from them. Firstly, places like Page Hall serve an important niche in the market, providing housing for all those on low incomes, not just Pakistani families. Secondly, *Twice the Terrace* is clearly beyond the financial reach of Pakistanis living in Page Hall.

Thus, *Twice the Terrace* raises more questions than it answers. At the centre of this paper is the attempt to adapt two old and small English terraced houses to suit the familial practices of Pakistani families in living in Page Hall. The questions are: What are the houses like? What role have they played in the English social structure and how has this role changed over time? How have Pakistani families come to live in them? To what extent do these houses suit the lives of the families living in them? What role have these houses played in the incorporation of migrant families into English society?

² Based on asking prices for houses in the area advertised on the internet, June 2011 <http://www.findaproproperty.com> [accessed 20 June 2011] Labour cost: Personal communication from Yvonne Simpson, RICS. One of the two houses in *Twice the Terrace* had two bedrooms and the other had three bedrooms.

³ In 2007, the regional economic development agency estimated that average household income in Sheffield was 80 percent of the national average. The DWP estimates, nationally, that Pakistani household income is 87 percent of the national average. More detailed data is not available and the sources used for this estimate are not fully compatible.

1.2 The general question

All immigrants must adapt to new and (sometimes) unfathomably strange built environments. All physical environments are adapted by their users. This interplay between immigration and physical environment is well captured in Shaun Tan's pictorial novel, *The Arrival*, and in Friedmann's thought experiment which imagines Bourdieu's Kabyle villagers as they confront living in flats in Frankfurt (Tan, 2007; Friedmann, 2005). Similarly, Szilard presents an enjoyable introduction to the puzzles of interpreting other cultures, as a group of aliens from outer space attempt to decipher the social role of pay toilets in Grand Central Station (Szilard, 1967).

These processes of mutual adaptation are rarely studied for they require seeing both how the spaces within and around buildings shape and support the private social relationships and how private and social relations are linked, and how, in turn, how social relationships can configure space. Buildings have a stubborn temporality, persisting over long periods of time, while social relationships exhibit a temporal fluidity, changing more rapidly than buildings. Within the shaped social spaces provided by buildings and their insertion into the urban fabric, some interactions are facilitated while others are hindered. Over a longer period, spaces may be reshaped or their uses and users organised in a different way to reflect desired or new forms of social interaction. These interactions are deeply embedded in social infrastructures and endow buildings with socially symbolic meaning. They are never completely predictable, nor are they always regularised. The same buildings can both unite and differentiate social groupings.

There are a handful of historical studies which examine these processes in terms of nineteenth century rural to urban migration in England (Burnett, 1986; Daunton, 1983; Chapman, 1955; Gauldie, 1974). When it comes to international migration, there is widespread agreement that locality matters. The experience of different (racial) minority groups varies from place to place (Reeve and Robinson, 2007; Swanton, 2010; Saggar and Geddes, 2000; Gill, 2010; Garner and Bhattacharyya, 2011). This consensus is more of an injunction *not* to assume that wider structural and institutional processes play themselves out in the same way in every locality. Thus, it is important to examine how different ethnic groups construct their relationships in each locality. The problem with this approach is that it ignores time. It yields studies which reflect a single point in time, and urban cartographies yield a road map which is out of date. Less attention has been given to the temporalities which shape the meanings of places and social, political and economic relationships within them. Once time is taken into account, Keith (2005) argues, the map keeps changing, and what is needed is a compass. His compass has two dimensions. One looks to the normative bases of arguments (left and right versions of liberalism and communitarianism). The second dimension distinguishes between naturalised descriptive analyses of urban order and critical responses to their reification, to show how they inscribe relations of power. However, Keith's main concerns are around issues of voice and representation. He deploys the concept of racialisation to talk about the mutability of the racial subject, as it changes over time, and the simultaneous mutability of the urban object, which is manufactured through multicultural interaction. While the city provides the stage on which interaction - and politics - takes place, the performance itself changes both racial groups and the city. Nevertheless, Keith insists on the importance of the political and governmental institutions which frame these performances. If racialisation is a process, it is a process which is performed in specific places and over time. The urban map needs continuous redrawing, to determine the direction of change.

Figure 2: *Twice the Terrace* plans, 71/73 Robey Street, Sheffield
2a. Winning entry for *Twice the Terrace* project 2b. Sheffield Council adjustments for delivery

Source: a) Courtesy of Sheffield City Council. b) Shillam + Smith Architecture and Urbanism.

Keith sets out a general analytical approach for using the notion of racialisation in looking at specific places:

“The increasingly diverse nature of contemporary cities has to be understood as taking place through this process of staging and place-making of the neighbourhoods of the city. The city is constituted both as a cartography of sites through which communities identify themselves in the migrant metropolis and as spaces that are appropriated in the performance of community-making. Both these forms of spatialization literally *take place* within specific regimes of national, transnational, and local governance and power that mark their constitution” (Keith, 2005: 263).

These ideas provide heuristic guidelines for tracing the role that the houses in Page Hall have played in incorporating migrant families into English society. *Twice the Terrace* sits like a cork on the surface of a number of longer historical and wider political cross-currents. The next section of the paper looks at how the houses in Page Hall came to occupy a particular social position within Sheffield.

2. Bye-law housing: the social evolution of a house type

2.1 Rural to urban migration in the nineteenth century

In 1801, only a third of the population of England and Wales lived in urban areas. By 1851, more than half the population lived in towns and cities. But this was only the start of a massive rural to urban migration. By 1911, 80 percent of the population lived in urban areas. Thus, between 1801 and 1911, the total population of England and Wales increased fourfold, the urban population increased nearly tenfold (946 percent), and the rural population increased by only 20 percent (Law, 1967).

Although the housing stock also grew in the nineteenth century, it lagged well behind the growth in the urban population, who found places to live in larger houses subdivided into single rooms housing an entire family or in new housing rapidly thrown up in courtyards and narrow streets in the existing cities. Figure 3 shows one of the courtyards which housed rural migrants. Cherry Tree Yard had only one small tunnel entrance, and families lived in one or two rooms, one above the other.

Figure 3. **Cherry Tree Yard in Leeds and its only entrance**

Source: By kind permission of Leeds Library and Information Services, www.leodis.net.

Courtyards and narrow streets created a warren as the spaces behind larger houses fronting on the main streets were enclosed. Figure 4 shows a number of courtyard layouts from Liverpool.

Figure 4. **Liverpool street layouts, nineteenth century**

Source: Daunton, 1983, follows p. 88

Figure 5. Narrow Marsh Courtyard, Nottingham

Source: cited in Dauntton, 1983, follows p 88

Narrow Marsh Courtyard, shown in Figure 5, gained notoriety when it was included in the Parliamentary Commissioners Report into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts in 1894. It was a totally enclosed courtyard, with only two tunnel entrances, one of which is less than a metre wide. The houses in it were back-to-back, having ventilation only via windows in the front walls. The houses on the right hand side of the drawing had one room on each of four stories, to allow more light for the lace-makers who worked on the top floor, while those on the left side had three rooms arranged on top of each other. The midden or privies were located at each end of the yard, and those at the far end were in a narrow passage which ran beneath the two end houses. Residents from the houses fronting on the street, thus, had a long journey through the courtyard. In Nottingham, pail privies were used, which frequently overflowed and had to be set out in the streets for emptying (in other places, waste was caught in underground receptacles which often seeped into the ground beneath the houses). There is no obvious source of water in this diagram, so it is unknown whether there was a standpipe in the yard or nearby street or whether residents bought their water from itinerant water sellers.

Such a courtyard formed an ambiguous space which could not be observed from the street. Its use was restricted to the residents who lived in it, making it not fully public. But neither was its use restricted to a single household. Rather it was a communal form of private space. Dauntton (1983) labels these spaces as cellular since their more or less self-contained nature set them apart from the rest of the town. He also labels them as promiscuous because what later came to be considered as private household activities were carried out in a public setting: socialising, child care, washing clothes and persons, storage of coal and ashes, sometimes cooking, raising chickens, and work activities such as rag picking. The cholera epidemics in the nineteenth century provided the public political platform for changing the form of working class housing. Reformers emphasised health, sanitation, comfort and, especially, the privacy of the home.

2.2 Through housing and bye-law housing

The Public Health Act of 1875 required all local authorities to regulate new house building by adopting local bye-laws based on centrally determined minimum standards. These regulations effectively meant that all new housing would be through houses, with front and back rooms. In addition, the bye-laws determined the overall urban form: streets over 30 metres long should be at least 11 metres wide; each house was to have an open space at the rear for its sole use of at least 14 square metres; and windows should have an area of at least one-tenth of the floor space. These regulations remained in force until 1918 (Burnett, 1986).

The morphology of the terraced house evolved from the simple two-up two-down form shown in figure 6. Initially it was a simple design, with perhaps some very cramped sleeping space beneath the attic. The front door opened directly onto the street and there was a small yard behind the house. Laundry, some food preparation and other wet activities occurred either in the yard or in the downstairs back room. The privy was located at the back of the yard to facilitate night soil collection, usually along an alleyway running behind two rows of terraces. In difficult terrains which did not permit alleys, a tunnel would run between pairs of houses.

Figure 6: Two-up two-down through house

Source: Burnett, 1986, p. 160.

This simple house form encapsulated family life, removing it from semi-public courtyard spaces, establishing a front door which marked a strong division between private and public, and making the street into a “wasteland” within which no social activities take place (Dauntton 1983: 34). The *Twice the Terrace* houses could have been built from this plan. The only differences are that the *Twice the Terrace* houses have a frontage of 4,5 m., compared with the 3 m. shown

in Figure 6, both houses had divided the first floor backroom into a smaller bedroom and a bathroom, and the stairs ran between the rooms.

Figure 7 shows how the gridiron urban form evolved as a consequence of the bye-laws. The diagram is a nineteenth century proposed layout for Gateshead. The top picture is in South Yorkshire and the bottom picture is in Nottingham. Both pictures show pre-1918 terraced housing as it is 2011.

Figure 7. Urban street layouts associated with bye-law housing

Source: For the diagram: Dauntton, 1983, follows p. 89.

While the gridiron street layout has persisted, the morphology of the terraced house evolved over time. Shared standpipes were gradually replaced by running water within the house, initially in the scullery, which was distinct from the main back room. Water borne sanitation allowed water closets to be located adjacent to the house and, later, within it.

Larger houses had internal arrangements which allowed the regulation of family life (see Figure 8). These included a passageway leading from the front door, which allowed the household to use the front room as a parlour, for formally entertaining more distant friends and preventing them from reaching the heart of family life in the rear room. Within the family itself, the parlour was often used only on weekends⁴. More familiar friends used the back door, entering from the alleyway between terraces. Partitioning rooms to create distinct staircases and hallways provided privacy for members of the family within. Such privacy was especially important if the family was taking in lodgers to help with its expenses. The hallways allowed independent direct access to all the bedrooms on the top storey, so that adults and children could be separated, the latter by gender. Through these changes, children acquired their own rooms within the house.

⁴ When minimum standards were set for social housing at the end of the First World War, the Ministry of Housing argued that working class families did not need parlors since they rarely used these rooms. The Ministry of Reconstruction argued that parlors were essential to designate the higher social status of those for whom the houses were intended.

A final set of changes took place in the mid-twentieth century, when gas appliances allowed cooking to be shifted from a coal-fired range in the back living room into the former scullery, which was now regarded as a proper, although very small, kitchen. Bathrooms were added later, either in the ground floor extension or by dividing the first floor back bedroom or in a first floor addition to the back extension. In many houses, the loft space was converted into an additional bedroom.

In the early 1950s, Chapman surveyed 75 small bye-law houses (two rooms on each floor, sometimes with a small scullery or kitchen in the yard) and 50 large bye-law houses (with larger rooms, three bedrooms and, in some cases, a small kitchen or scullery). In the larger dwellings, he was surprised to find that, "Some of these houses have a bathroom" (Chapman, 1955: 32). In the smaller houses, the two downstairs rooms were used either as a kitchen and living room (33 percent of families), or as a kitchen/living room and parlour (23 percent). The remaining 44 percent had a very small kitchen in the extension, and the two downstairs rooms were used as a living room and a parlour. Eighty four percent of families living in the three room houses followed the pattern of parlour, living room and kitchen. Thus, by 1950, the parlour was firmly established among English families as a sophisticated social buffer between the public space of the street and the private family space.

In the small bye-law houses, all visiting between families in the neighbourhood was informal and restricted to women and children. In the larger houses, the pattern of informal neighbouring was preserved, but there was also more formal visiting in which the parlour was used. Interestingly, there was no informal neighbouring in the detached houses in Chapman's survey and very little among semi-detached houses. Thus, informal and impromptu social visiting came to be seen as an activity confined the working classes. Emerging lower middle class families *kept themselves to themselves*⁵ (Grossmith, 1945).

Figure 8. Evolution of the bye-law house

Source: Burnett, 1986, pp: 163 and 165.

⁵ For a humorous account of lower middle class life in a larger terraced house in the late nineteenth century.

Chapman's study was primarily concerned with establishing a scale of social status. This scale was closely correlated with house type: small bye-law housing represented the lowest status groups on his scale. Living in such housing was widely understood as a sign of low status among the English families. Small bye-law houses built before 1918 contained the lowest social groups, whereas when they were built, they were destined for the highest status groups in the working classes.

As Wohl remarks, a problem with writing the history of nineteenth century housing is that the poor were mute (1977). Largely illiterate, they left no documentary evidence of how they felt about their housing. Reconstructions are largely critical responses to policy debates among the comfortable classes. Daunton (1983) argues that the latent purpose of bye-law housing was to contain family life within well-defined nuclear units which rested on a strong division between private life, what happened within the family house, and public life, outside the *home*. Gaudie focuses on the dynamic realignment of class relations. "Middle class Victorian society constantly rejoiced in its prosperity, its freedom, its well-protected safety, and yet as constantly feared the threat which lay not entirely dormant in the slum areas of the cities" (Gaudie, 1974: 266)⁶. While the house itself regulated family life, the urban form which the bye-laws generated, with its straight streets and alleys, ensured that the poor could be kept under surveillance. Gatherings of the poor could be restricted to public places which were more easily observed and controlled: churches, trade union premises, workingmen's educational institutions, etc. At the same time, creating better housing available only to an artisan elite began a process of social control within the popular classes by creating divisions between respectability and disreputableness. The respectable poor were enlisted in the process of controlling the behaviour of the more disreputable by presenting the possibility of a better life which could be aspired to through habits of regular work, sobriety, thrift, self-discipline and cleanliness.

To conclude, by 1950 housing which had been the best available a century earlier was now considered to be the worst available in the urban stock and living in small bye-law housing was a sign of the lowest social status in most cities in England. These buildings, therefore, could only be regarded as something to be moved away from. Not only did the terraced houses contain the families who lived in them, but the terraces become the urban containers of the lower social classes in England. Most importantly, bye-law housing had established a strong social demarcation between *private* (within the house) and *public* (outside the house). This assumption has informed English housing provision ever since.

By 2001, some areas of small bye-law housing, especially in the northern industrial cities, had become enclaves for immigrant families of Pakistani origin. This raises the next question: what social processes brought these families to live in housing which was already considered to be an indicator of low status?

⁶ This view has never been absent in English perspectives on slum areas in cities. Kramer and Young (1978) show how it shaped strategic planning for housing in London between 1965 and 1975, and it resurfaces whenever urban riots recur as in the early 1980s, 2000s and this year.

3. Family housing strategies: Pakistanis and terraced housing today

Before discussing how family housing strategies were constrained, it is useful to present a summary of the position today, looking first at the remaining nineteenth century terraced housing and at the position of Pakistani families searching for housing in northern industrial cities. What this shows is that Robey Street and Page Hall are not unique, but fit into a wider pattern in the north of England.

3.1 Nineteenth century terraced housing

Today, terraced housing constitutes 28 percent of the English housing stock, and slightly over a third of all houses. Its regional distribution is skewed towards London, where it makes up 58 percent of all houses, and towards cities in those regions which hosted heavy industrialisation in the nineteenth century: the North East and the North West, 38 percent of all houses, and Yorkshire and Humberside, 34 percent of all houses (English Housing Survey, 2011: Table 117).

Precise numbers are not available to estimate the number of nineteenth century terraced houses still remaining. However, it is possible to give some idea of the magnitude of this figure. Eighteen percent of the total English stock was built before 1918 (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011a: Live Table 195). Eighty-three percent of the existing pre-1918 stock is houses, rather than flats. Thus, approximately 15% of the current stock consists of pre-1918 houses, and it is reasonable to assume that almost all of these are bye-law housing (Survey of English Housing, Table S195).

Table 1. Tenure by age of stock, England, 2007/08, percentage of households

Tenure	Pre-1918 houses	Total housing stock in 2007
Owner occupied	81	69
Social rented	4	19
Private rented	15	12

Note: Columns do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government (2011a) Live Table 195, adapted by authors.

However, the tenure pattern across the housing stock shows interesting variations. Table 1 show that the rate of owner occupation in pre-1918 houses, at 81 percent, is much higher than in the total housing stock, at 69 percent.

Not surprisingly, terraced housing is the cheapest form of housing in England as table 2 below shows.

Thus, two bedroom terraced houses in Page Hall, with an average price of £47.000, are among the cheapest available in Sheffield. The situation in Page Hall is replicated across the northern cities in England and affects all those on low incomes, not just Pakistani families. It cannot be assumed that low housing prices in such areas indicate *weak market demand*. An equally valid interpretation is *high demand from low income households*, reflecting how the housing market is partitioned by house type, social class and ethnicity. In this way, socio-spatial segregation is fundamental to the operation of the whole of the housing market.

Table 2. **Average prices by property type, Sheffield versus England and Wales, April 2011**

House type	Sheffield		England and Wales		Sheffield as % of E and W
	Price (£)	As % of all prices	Price (£)	As % of all prices	
Detached	235.181	203,3	256.923	157,4	91,5
Semi-detached	120.494	104,3	153.670	94,2	78,4
Terraced	89.732	77,6	124.601	76,4	72,0
Flat/maisonette	104.501	90,3	152.530	93,5	68,5
All	115.703	100,0	163.083	100,0	70,9

Source: Land Registry, House Price Index, 31 May 2011.

Available in: <http://www1.landregistry.gov.uk/upload/documents/HPI_Report_Apr_11_ta6ld4.pdf>
<<http://www1.landregistry.gov.uk/house-prices/house-price-index-custom-reports>>

3.2 *Pakistanis and owner-occupation*

This interpretation of the pattern of house prices is supported by data which shows the high level of owner-occupation among Pakistani households. Table 3 presents tenure data by ethnicity over the last 30 years. In 1981, rates of owner-occupation by Pakistani, Indian and East African households were significantly higher than that for the white majority, which was 57 percent.

**Table 3: Tenure by ethnic group. England, 1981 to 2007/08,
percentage of households within each group**

	Owner occupation		Rented from local authority		Privately rented	
	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991
Pakistani	82	76	11	10	9	9
Bangladeshi	49	44	31	37	19	9
Indian	77	81	12	7	10	6
Caribbean	43	48	44	35	12	6
East African	69	54	14	13	16	24
Far eastern	51	62	13	13	35	17
New Commonwealth and Pakistan	60	59	24	36	14	11
All	58	66	29	na	13	7

	Owner occupation		Rented from social landlord		Privately rented	
	2001	2007	2001	2007	2001	2007
Pakistani	66	68	16	16	15	16
Bangladeshi	37	38	48	47	12	15
Indian	76	74	10	7	13	20
Other Asian	61	na	16	na	19	na
Mixed	46	39	32	33	19	28
Black Caribbean	48	49	43	41	8	11
Black African	26	28	51	44	20	28
Black other	35	na	51	na	11	na
Chinese or other	51	52	18	13	27	35
White	70	70	19	17	10	13
All	69	68	19	18	10	14

Note: Rows do not sum to 100 for all groups and all years due to rounding and the exclusion of some minor forms of tenure. Data for earlier Census years is too sketchy to be used.

Source: For 1981 and 1991: (Luthra, 1997: 313, based on the Census) adapted by authors. For 2001, data taken directly from the Census at www.nomisweb.co.uk [accessed 27 june 2011]. For 2007/08: (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2009: 33) adapted by authors.

Three general observations can be made about the patterns shown in Table 3⁷. Firstly, there has been a long run convergence in the tenure pattern between Pakistanis and the white English groups. This has been due to both a decrease in the rate of owner occupation by Pakistanis, possibly due to the demolition of bye-law housing, as well an increase among white English. Secondly, the private rented sector serves as reception housing for newly arriving groups. As early as 1965, Rex and Moore (1969) noted the significance of ethnic minority landlords in providing for newer immigrants and this partly accounts for some early owner-occupation where landlords lived in the property they let. Thirdly, those arriving after the collapse of social sector building in the mid-1980s have little option but to remain in the private rented sector or, if possible, access owner-occupation (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011b).

Table 3 also reflects how the English tenure system shaped family housing strategies for ethnic groups in different locations. The three earliest groups to arrive were Pakistanis, Indians and people from the Caribbean islands. Pakistani migration peaked in the 1950s and 1960s (Peach, 2005) and a large proportion were recruited to work in the textile mills in northern cities. Overt discrimination meant that they were barred from entering local authority rented housing and had little choice but to buy into terraced bye-law housing. Indians arriving at the same time faced many of the same constraints. This resulted in exceptionally high levels of owner-occupation by 1981, 82 percent for Pakistanis and 77 percent for Indians compared with only 57 percent for white English families. Consequently, mainly second and third generation families have been able to move into the social rented sector. These moves were supported by two factors. The first was strong enforcement of the Race Relations Act 1976 in social housing⁸. The second factor was the changing social status of local authority housing after the 1980s. In the final years of the long post-war economic boom, between 1960 and 1975, many white English skilled workers were able to buy semi-detached homes in the suburbs built from the 1930s onward. As skilled workers left the social rented sector, it became available to poorer white and other ethnic groups who had previously been trapped in very poor quality privately rented housing or in owner-occupied bye-law terraces (see Figure 9 for a graphic representation of these processes).

⁷ The data presented in Table 3 are not fully comparable and this is unavoidable (see Burton *et al*, 2010 and Finney and Simpson, 2009, chap 2 for a full explanation). The data for 1981 and 1991 are probably based on place of birth, not ethnicity, since the 1981 Census did not ask for ethnicity (Luthra, 1997, is not explicit). Data for 2001 and 2007/08 are based on self-chosen ethnic groups. The main choice is black/white, followed by a mixed set of categories based on country of household origin and/or global region. Data for 2007/08 are based on the Labour Force Survey, whereas data for the other years is based on the Census. For 2007/08, the sampling errors for Bangladeshi and Chinese groups are high, due to the small size of the groups and, for Bangladeshis, spatial clustering. Virtually all national data sources, except the Census, now combine Pakistani and Bangladeshi households for reasons of sample size. This statistical practice is based on a number of unspoken but obvious assumptions: 1) The two groups are more similar to each other than to other ethnic groups, 2) they are from "the same part of the world" and/or from "the same former colony, India", and 3) they share a common religion. The first assumption could not be less true for tenure. The second assumption forgets the murderous history of Partition in 1947, civil war in 1972, and continuing conflict in Kashmir. The third assumption is true (see Appendix B), but neglects the number of Muslims found among other ethnic groups as well as the immense variety of practices and beliefs among Muslims.

⁸ The investigation of racial discrimination in the London Borough of Hackney was extremely effective throughout the social housing sector because it brought the threat of the central government taking over the administration of the local authority's housing stock (Commission for Racial Equality, 1984). Unfortunately, the Commission for Racial Equality's enforcement powers did not extend to the private sector although it published a number of studies documenting discrimination in that sector.

Black Caribbeans arrived in England at much the same time as Pakistanis. They were largely recruited directly from the islands to work for London Transport and the newly formed National Health Service. They began to access social rented housing through slum clearance programmes which demolished large areas of very poor quality privately rented housing up until the mid-1970s, although there was considerable discrimination against rehousing them. They benefitted more directly from the development of renovation programmes by newly set up housing associations. Those in more highly skilled jobs also had access to owner-occupation during the post-war boom years (see Figure 9).

Figure 9. Family housing strategies

Source: Authors' own analysis.

Migration from Bangladesh started later, in the 1970s, and peaked in the 1980s⁹. Bangladeshis arrived much more quickly than other groups since the immigration legislation set a time limit on family reunification in the UK. They clustered strongly in inner London, but gained access to the social rented sector more quickly than other groups for several reasons. Most importantly, one of the biggest clusters was in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Here, 90 percent of the housing was owned by either the Borough or the metropolitan Greater London Council. The latter addressed discrimination in housing allocation much earlier than many other local authorities¹⁰. Beyond this, and in common with all minority groups at the time, Bangladeshis benefitted from the declining status of local authority owned housing and from the implementation of the Race Relations Act in 1976.

A comparison of Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups indicates how important both temporal and localised factors are in understanding family housing strategies. Figure 10 shows the income distribution of different ethnic groups in Britain for 2002/2005. While all minority groups are poorer than the white British population, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are the poorest and have the most restricted range of incomes.

⁹ Bangladesh became a nation-state in 1971. Earlier data on ethnicity is a bit fuzzy since the Census only recorded place of birth before 1991. The extent to which "Pakistani" immigrants were from the area that now constitutes Bangladesh prior to 1971 is unclear. There is a similar problem with early data about "Indians" since approximately a third of the "immigrants" from India were ethnic English returning after Indian achieved independence in 1947.

¹⁰ People from the Caribbean also benefitted from GLC allocation policies. Pakistanis did not benefit, because most of them were living outside London.

Figure 10. Median equivalised weekly income average and distribution by ethnic group

Source: Markkanen *et al.*, 2008: 16.

Poverty brings its own constraints on family housing strategies. The measure of poverty used in Figure 10 is explicitly designed *not* to take account of housing costs and is also standardised for household size and composition. In addition, the usual English assumption that owner-occupation denotes higher social status does not hold. Figure 11 shows income levels by tenure for the main ethnic groups in Britain. For Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, in contrast to all other ethnic groups, there is almost no difference in the income levels in any of the tenures. What this means is that the overall tenure pattern shown in Table 4 above is a consequence of restricted choice¹¹. Discrimination in social rented housing meant that Pakistanis were restricted to buying low-status housing. Discrimination combined with low incomes meant that they bought the cheapest housing available, small bye-law housing. The later arrival of Bangladeshis meant that they had access to housing rented from local authorities, mainly the oldest and worst local authority stock (Commission for Racial Equality, 1984). Those Bangladeshis who have bought in London were also restricted to bye-law housing.

As a consequence, family housing strategies focus on managing family in the space of the house rather than managing housing properties to suit changing family configurations¹².

¹¹ Kenway and Palmer (2007) repeat a common assertion that Indian and Pakistani families migrating in the 1950s brought a strong commitment to owner-occupation with them. The problem with this argument is that it is probably true of most migrants who intend to settle in England, so that it underestimates the discrimination which made poor quality owner-occupation the *only* possibility.

¹² This contrasts with family housing strategies in southern Europe which manage family across a number of patrimonial properties (Allen *et al.*, 2004).

Figure 11. **Median equivalised weekly income before housing costs by tenure type, 2005**

Source: Markkanen, 2008: 17.

4. Managing family

Pakistanis in the north of England have almost no choice about living in small bye-law housing. Thus, the question becomes one of how to adapt to living in housing that is often small and overcrowded? What are the characteristics of the family itself? And what shapes how they use the space available to them?

4.1 Household size and composition

The first part of this paper argued that the development of nineteenth century bye-law housing was designed to create, contain and regulate nuclear families among the English working class. The long term success of this societal strategy means that the terms family and household are virtually synonymous in English usage and they both generally connote nuclear families and the stages in its life cycle. Where the two terms are distinguished, *household* is the larger unit which may consist of more than one *family*¹³.

However, the notion of family that Bangladeshi and Pakistani migrants brought to England was very different. Family is more than the nuclear unit. It extends laterally and vertically to include siblings, cousins, grandparents and parents, children and grandchildren. Not only are these kin considered as immediate family and referred to as brother, sister, father, mother without

¹³ This use of the terminology in England is quite the opposite of southern European terminology, in which the family (*famiglia*) consists of several households.

differentiation, but also these kin, considered as family members, often live under the same roof. After marriage, for instance, the son's new wife moves into her husband's family home.

Estimates of the number of complex households are difficult to arrive at using British census data. However, Modood *et al* fitted their sample information into the census categories to show that 49 percent of Bangladeshi and Pakistani households lived in households with three or more adults, with or without children (1997). The comparison with white English households is striking: only 17 percent live in complex households. Further analysis of the 2001 Census results found that 17 percent of Bangladeshi households contained at least two full nuclear families, each with dependent children (Office for National Statistics, 2005). Modood *et al.* (1997) also analysed the number of elderly people living with their children among Pakistani and Bangladeshi households. Table 4 summarises the results, which are surprising because migrant families tend to be young and few of their parents also migrate.

Table 4. **Percentage of individuals aged over 60 years with an adult child living in the same household, England and Wales, 1994**

Ethnic group	percentage
White English	13
Pakistani	61
Bengali	65

Source: Modood *et al.*, 1997: 45; adapted by authors.

Bengali and Pakistani families are large. Table 5 summarises changes in household size since 1982. There has been a steady long run decrease in household size among white English households since the 1960s. Migrating families, however, are generally very young and fertile. Thus, for both groups, household size initially increased after arrival as families were completed in England. Second and third generation families have been smaller, so that average household size for each of the migrant groups is reducing over time. Thus, averages conceal the range of household sizes, which are set out in Table 6.

Table 5: **Average household size by ethnic group, England and Wales, 1982 and 1994**

	White	Pakistani	Bangladeshi
1982			
Number of adults	2.0	2.7	2.4
Number of children	0.5	2.5	2.6
Total number of persons	2.5	5.2	5.0
1994			
Number of adults	1.9	3.0	3.0
Number of children	0.5	2.1	2.7
Total number of persons	2.4	5.1	5.7
2001			
Total number of persons	2.3	4.1	4.5

Source: For 1982 and 1994 (Modood *et al.*, 1997: 47). For 2001 (Office for National Statistics, 2005: 5).

Table 6: **Number of children per family by percentage within ethnic group, England and Wales, 1994 and 2002/05**

	White		Pakistani		Bangladeshi	
	1994	2002/05	1994	2002/05	1994	2002/05
1	38	43	24	26	20	24
2	44	43	23	28	20	30
3	14	12	21	22	18	25
4 or more	4	2	33	24	42	20

NB: Families without children are not included in this table.

Source: For 1994 (Modood *et al.*, 1997: 41). For 2002/05 (Markkanen *et al.* 2008: 62). Adapted by authors.

Overcrowding is worse among ethnic groups who have larger family sizes (Table 7). The standard for overcrowding allows one bedroom for each couple or person over 21 in a household, plus bedrooms for children on the assumption that two of the same sex can share, as can two children of different sex aged under 10 (See Appendix A for the full formal definition). This definition has implications for multi-generational households: it assumes that single grandparents will share with grandchildren under 10 years old.

Table 7: **Overcrowding by bedroom standard, percentage within ethnic group, England, 2003/06**

	Below standard	Equal to standard	Above standard
White British	2	23	75
Pakistani	18	37	45
Bangladeshi	26	49	25

Source: Markkanen *et al.*, 2008: 63. Adapted by authors.

Household size and structure is only half the picture of overcrowding. The other half is the size and layout of available housing. Two storey bye-law housing, with a bedroom in the attic, has a maximum of three bedrooms. The bedroom standard would allow up to six people to live in this dwelling, assuming two of the children were girls and two were boys (or the children were either all boys or all girls). A different gender mix among children would mean that the dwelling was overcrowded. In short, large families in two storey terraced housing are always precariously balanced between having *enough* space (that is, not very much) and being overcrowded.

4.2 Culture, overcrowding and the use of space

Two key studies document the emergence of separate socio-cultural identities among Bangladeshis and Pakistanis, on the one hand, and east African and other Asians, on the other hand (Brown, 1984; Modood *et al.*, 1997). The key element in this identity is the significance of religion among Bangladeshis and Pakistanis. Approximately 92 percent of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are Muslim. The detailed data in Modood *et al.* shows strong links between religion, using mother tongue languages and wearing Asian clothes, with only more minor links with other cultural practices around marriage, visiting country of origin, and education. Nevertheless, a recent online forum in the professional magazine, *Inside Housing*, indicates that small groups from varied places of origin have different cultural practices, which they themselves identify as *religious*. These small, and sometimes isolated, groups tend to assume that their own practices are common among all their compatriots (*Inside Housing*, 2011). This gives a second dimension to the notion of localisation.

Other aspects of *living as a Pakistani or Bangladeshi Asian in Britain* are also important in understanding people's cultural expectations and desires about home in Britain. Most Bangladeshi migrants and many Pakistani migrants came from rural areas although this is rarely discussed in academic and grey literature¹⁴. This observation is important because *living* in Britain is very much contained *within* buildings and within nuclear family households. Rural life was primarily lived outdoors. Only sleeping spaces and a space for male socialising were contained within buildings. Thus, coming to Britain required the reorganisation of many aspects of domestic life and was particularly hard on women who lost many of their previous opportunities for socialising and social support.

There are almost no in-depth studies of how Asian families use domestic space within their homes, beyond what can be inferred from design guides (Housing Corporation and Chartered Institute of Housing, 2008; *Inside Housing*, 2011; Nashayman Housing Association, 2010; Housemark, 2008). These do not directly focus on social relationships in space. Okoro's study in 1995 is one of the few which provide direct insight into the use of space by large and/or extended Bangladeshi families. She explored the ways that social relationships within and outside the family influenced the use of space inside dwellings, by interviewing the leading woman in twenty Bangladeshi families in London. Overcrowding was the most significant issue affecting social relationships within the home and also had implications for social relations with guests. Overcrowding arose from the arrival of additional children, as well as existing households being joined by, for example, a new bride or other relatives. Some of the extended family relations observed in the study are illustrated in Figure 12.

¹⁴ For this, it is necessary to rely on the imaginative literature. For Britain, the best known resource is Ali ,2004.

Figure 12. Extended family relationships within households

Source: Okoro, 1995.

The families made decisions about the use of space which differed from the assumptions embedded in the original design of their housing. This was expected where overcrowding was a problem, but it also occurred when the houses were not overcrowded. Three main strategies were used to manage the family within the houses: reassignment of space, duplicating the functions of a space, and sharing.

Figure 13 shows an example of reassignment of space in a small bye-law house. In this case, living rooms were used as bedrooms. The front living room is used by the parents and the rear living room is used by the sons. The rear bedroom provides access to a kitchen in the basement, limiting the sons' privacy. The parents through their age and the daughters by virtue of their gender had a higher status in the allocation of space within the household. This was a privately rented house, and the landlord retained the front bedroom, the largest, for himself although he did not use it regularly.

The allocation of space within the homes on the basis of gender and age differentiation often led to unbalanced outcomes. In another instance, the eldest son had a room to himself while his two sisters and parents shared. His room was out of bounds to his sisters except when there were guests and his sisters could not do their homework as usual in the living room.

Figure 13. Mrs BC's house

Source: Okoro, 1995.

A second strategy to reconcile large family size and limited space in the home was to extend the boundary of the area designated for sleeping, that is, combining living and sleeping functions in the same space (see Figure 13). This strategy was also used in Mrs BC's home to prevent the parents sharing with children aged over ten years old. Also, in Mrs BC's home, the son's bedroom was sometimes used to receive guests.

Sharing sleeping rooms between adults and children was the third strategy for coping with overcrowding. In all instances, this occurred where children were aged ten years old or less. Parents shared with toddlers. Widows sometimes shared with children, especially where this allowed an eldest son to have his own room.

Where families could access adjoining terraced houses, they were able to convert their use to a single family dwelling, albeit with two front doors (see Figure 14). Decisions were made in allocating bedrooms on the basis of age, with couples and children sharing on the basis of nuclear units. Privacy in relation to outsiders was maintained by designating one of the living rooms solely for family use and the other for guests. Only one kitchen was used and the other was redundant. One of the front doors regulated the link between family and public space. The other front door was for family use only.

Figure 14. Use of adjacent terraced houses as one dwelling, designed use and actual use

Source: Okoro, 1991.

It is difficult to disentangle general adaptations to overcrowding from culturally specific practices. However, a survey by Shelter England identified the three most common adaptations in the use of space by overcrowded families (Wilson, 2010; Shelter, 2005):

- In 74 percent of overcrowded families, at least one child shares a bedroom with their parent(s)
- In 27 percent of overcrowded families, children sleep in rooms other than bedrooms
- Ten percent of overcrowded families paired teenagers of opposite sexes in the same bedroom

Personal accounts of how families adapted to overcrowding also emphasised the extent to which sleeping arrangements created tensions in interpersonal relationships among family members (Shelter, 2005). The main differences in Okoro's study from the Shelter study are, firstly, that Bangladeshi families would not allow teenagers of opposite sex to share a bedroom and, secondly, that the Bangladeshi families prioritised space for an eldest son. Finally, Shelter noted that ethnic minority families, in general, were six times more likely to be overcrowded than white English families¹⁵.

4.3 Spatial configuration within houses and changes in external social relationships

In households where the pressure of family size eliminated a dedicated living room (and in several other households where there was a living room), Okoro (1995) noted that men preferred to socialise outside of the home. The house was maintained as a private family realm. This differed from the social use of space in Bangladesh. One respondent observed that in rural areas, the home included a spare living room for a guest which was a male domain which females were not allowed to enter. Some men in Britain, by choice or by default, have relocated the male socialising space outside the home. When male guests do come to the house, women have to withdraw from the living area.

The Bangladeshi women in Okoro's study regretted the loss of communality which they had enjoyed prior to moving to Britain. In the villages they had left, interaction with other women occurred during journeys to the pond to wash clothes and to bathe. This loss of interaction was often contrasted with having a home with an internal water supply. Some women were able to extend the boundaries of their homes to interact with other women living close by, but, even so, home-making had become a more private and lonely activity.

The key argument in Okoro's work is the different, and always adapting, line between public and private within the home. In the short run, where the amount of space cannot be increased, then family activities and relationships must be adapted to *fit the space available*. Living in bye-law housing has had some of the same effects on Bangladeshi families as it had many earlier on English families: pressure to nuclearize the household, visiting activities within the home more curtailed, and greater use of public spaces for men's socialising. In the longer run, these patterns of space use may change as second and third generation households have smaller families and/or find larger housing.

¹⁵ The sample was too small to distinguish different ethnic minorities.

Creating new *ways of living* was supported by the tendency to micro-cluster in areas where earlier migrants, known from *home* had settled. This strategy was reinforced by racial discrimination, and confined Asians to areas of settlement which English people were deserting (Brown, 1984). In the north of England, this led to micro-clusters of people from specific villages, even within much larger areas of Asian settlement. Today, the balance of factors supporting clustering is different as younger families seek to move out of older enclaves but desire to remain relatively near to family and community.

For the Bangladeshis and Pakistanis who occupy rented or owner-occupied terraced houses, moving on may be an option, but moving up to a larger space is not usually part of the option. Those who voiced their aspirations in Okoro's study wished they could have more space to suit their large households, but they also wished to stay within the same community. For most of them, a more appropriate solution to the mismatch between house type and households who occupy them has to be generated by outside agencies. But, even where such agencies do exist, there is a strong element of ethnic self-help in their work.

5. Place matters

Not all localities encounter racial diversity at the same point in time. Not all minority groups entered England at the same point in time. Some groups are now well settled, with children and grandchildren born here. Other groups have come more recently, not always by choice. Over the last twenty years, the number of asylum seekers entering the UK has increased, and over the last ten years, flows from the European Union, especially the accession countries, have increased. The social relations and processes of settling into a new home vary among groups depending on the time, circumstances and place of their arrival. England's population, especially in its metropolitan areas, has become very diverse. There are signs of tension among and within minority ethnic groups (*white* as well as *black*) layered on to new and evolving forms of hybridity (Meridien pure, 31 July 2006; Keith, 2005; Hall, 1996; Harris and Young, 2010).

This section of the paper looks at local experiences in Sheffield. It sets out the temporality of immigration in Sheffield, and the way Page Hall was *produced* by the intersection of national, regional, local government and local initiatives.

5.1 Race and ethnicity in Sheffield

Race came late to Sheffield. Table 8 shows that in 1981 the best estimate is that at least 97 percent of Sheffield's population was white, and between 1,2 percent and 3 percent were non-white. By 2001, only 91,2 percent was white, which is very close to the national average. In 2005, Sheffield City Council estimated its black and white minority ethnic population as 13 percent (Sheffield City Council, 2007c).

Table 8. Ethnic composition of population, Sheffield, 1981-2001

1981 Place of birth	% of total	1991 Ethnicity	% of total	2001 Ethnicity	% of total
UK, Ireland, Old Commonwealth	97,0	White, including Irish	95,6	White, including Irish and other	91,2
Africa	0,2	Black African	0,2	Black African	0,6
Caribbean	0,6	Black Caribbean	1,0	Black Caribbean	1,0
		Black other	0,4	Black other	0,1
India	0,2	Indian	0,3	Indian	0,5
Bangladesh	0,1	Bangladeshi	0,2	Bangladeshi	0,3
Pakistan	0,7	Pakistani	1,8	Pakistani	3,1
Far east	0,2	Chinese	0,3	Chinese	0,4
Other New Commonwealth, European, Rest of World	1,2	Other: Asian and elsewhere	0,9	Other	0,4
Mixed	na		na	Mixed: All	1,6

Source: Population Census for 1981, 1991, 2001.

This is a rapid change in population composition. A significant part of it was induced migration. Between 1981 and 1991, Table 9 shows that Sheffield's population fell by over 29.000 people (an estimated 12.500 households). The reason for the fall in population was the complete collapse of Sheffield's basic industry, steel production, between 1981 and 1984, which led families to leave Sheffield in search of work.

Table 9. Total population, Sheffield, 1981-2010

Year	Total population	As % of 1981 population
1981	530,843	100.0
1991	501,202	94.4
2001	513,230	96.7
2010	555,500	104.6

Source: Population Census for 1981, 1991 and 2001. Registrar General's Mid-year population estimate for 2010 [available at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/Product.asp?vlnk=15106>].

Between 1991 and 2001, the population increased by 12.000 people (an estimated 5.200 households). By 2010, the Registrar General estimated Sheffield's population at 555.500, an increase of 41.000 people (approximately 17.700 households) since 2001. Over the entire period, from 1981 to 2010, there was a net increase of 20.000 people (or 8.600 households).

The overall pattern of population change created pressures on the housing stock. The initial exodus left many houses vacant in both the social rented and private sectors. In the social

rented sector, this meant loss of rental income. In the private sector, it is likely that many families were able to trade up, creating vacancies in the worst stock, small bye-law housing. The vacancies in the very low priced housing in Page Hall meant that there were cheap places for new migrants to Sheffield to live in. However, by 2001, increases in the population would have reversed these processes, and there is evidence to suggest that prices in terraced housing began to increase relative to other types of housing in Sheffield (Land Registry, 2011; LDA Design, 2005).

While some of the population increase after 1991 may be due to natural growth, most of it appears to have been a consequence of migration by three different groups. The first group has been Pakistani families, moving from other cities in the region into the low priced bye-law housing being deserted by white English workers. In 1981, Pakistanis were hidden away in an isolated enclave, in Darnall on the far eastern edge of the city. By 2011, they were living in Burngreave and the area north of it and in Sharrow south of the city centre. They now constitute 30 percent of Sheffield's minority ethnic population (Meridien pure, 2006).

The second group started to arrive in 2000, when the City Council joined with two local housing associations to sign an agreement with the Home Office to serve as a Gateway city for asylum seekers. The contracts with reception cities also included a range of support services to be offered to asylum seekers. They have a right to accommodation and limited cash support, mainly covering food expenses, while their application is being determined. If the Home Office decides they can stay in the UK as refugees, they lose their *right* to accommodation and support. However, they gain access to the rights available to all residents in the UK: to apply for social housing (competing with the local population), basic income support, and, if they are not working, rent subsidy. The majority of asylum seekers who gain refugee status stay in the area where they first find housing on arrival¹⁶. From Sheffield's point of view, the Home Office contract addressed the problem of vacant social housing and had financial advantages in minimising rent losses from vacant homes. From other points of view, there were problems of coordination and a lack of sufficient local knowledge about the experiences and cultural backgrounds of specific groups (Hynes and Thu, 2008; Darling et al, 2010). The initial contract involved Sheffield's housing department as well as two housing associations. In 2005, the Home Office revised the national scheme to separate the provision of permanent housing for refugees from accommodation and support services for asylum seekers. The main organisational change was from contracts with specific local authorities to contracts with regionally based specialist organisations through the Refugee Employment and Integration Scheme. This left a gap in localised support services for refugees, so the City Council created a specialist Refugee and Asylum Seekers Team within its own housing department. Aside from the changing national policy framework, the biggest problem in coordinating support lies in the super-diversity of asylum seekers and refugees. Although there are asylum seekers from 55 countries in Sheffield, 65 percent of them come from one of eight countries: Somalia, Angola, Congo, Iran, Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Albania (Meridien pure, 2006). This means there are very small groups from 47 other countries.

The third group of migrants to Sheffield have come from northern and eastern Europe. Many eastern Europeans migrants, in particular, have little experience of living with *black* people and

¹⁶ Not all asylum seekers take up their right to housing support. Many go to places where there are fellow countrymen (mostly London). Some who have been dispersed may also find their way to London after gaining refugee status.

have come from countries which were deliberately constructed as mono-ethnic after World War Two. They occupy a very awkward position in terms of English patterns of racial discrimination. On the one hand, they are *white*, but on the other hand, as migrants, they have a very low social status among white people. Sheffield estimates that 30 percent of its minority ethnic population is *white*, which includes some of the refugee population, European migrants and Irish (Meridien pure, 2006).

Thus, by 2010, Sheffield had absorbed three very different streams of minority ethnic population. One stream was Pakistanis, who are now the largest single minority ethnic group in Sheffield. The second stream, asylum seekers and refugees, comprises a large number of small ethnic groups, each requiring specific forms of welfare and social support. The third stream was independent migrants from eastern and northern Europe. Over a period of 30 years, Sheffield went from being a city which scarcely knew it had a minority ethnic population, to a city which has a proportion of ethnic minorities above the national average, is super-diverse, and in which 30percent of its minority ethnic population is *white*.

5.2 *The local political and institutional frame*

In 1981, local government in Sheffield was dominated by the local trade union branches operating through the Trades Council. As the steel industry collapsed, the close connection between the Labour Party and the unions was severed. A talented group of Labour politicians in the 1980s began to forge a local politics more rooted in civil society and supported a variety of local voluntary and community organisations. Voluntary Action Sheffield, an umbrella for all voluntary organisations, estimates that it now has 900 members, which is a large number for a city with Sheffield's population (Voluntary Action Sheffield, 2011).

The Race Relations Act 1976 required all local authorities to review their policies to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity, and good relations between persons of different racial groups. In line with this, the City Council funded the Sheffield and District Afro-Caribbean Community Association in 1986 and the Pakistan Muslim Centre in 1989. In 1991, the Black Community Forum was set up to provide an umbrella for non-white civil society organisations. It was disbanded in 2006, apparently because increasing diversity in Sheffield brought about new and complex relationships among the increasing number of non-white ethnic minority groups together with growing self-confidence among more long-settled groups (Modood, 1997; Modood et al, 1997; Luthra, 1997).

The City Council's work in housing is split between Sheffield Homes, a company set up in 2002 and wholly owned by the Council, which is responsible for managing the houses owned by the Council. Strategic housing functions were retained within the Council's own housing department. One of these functions is the Asylum Seekers and Refugees Team. In 2002, the housing department published its first Black and Ethnic Minority Housing Strategy, and in 2004 it formed a Black and Ethnic Minority Housing Strategy Monitoring Group, involving a variety of voluntary organisations, to advice on implementing the strategy. The BME Housing Strategy covers all tenures in Sheffield (Sheffield City Council, 2007c). There is also a BME Planning Group within Sheffield Homes, as a focus for tenant participation in the management of this part of the social rented sector.

Thus, the way local government is rooted in civil society has shifted in Sheffield from being based in labour organisations to being based in a wide range of community groups. The growth in the minority ethnic population and its diversity is reflected in this change. As the largest single minority ethnic group, Pakistanis are well represented on Sheffield City Council. In 1981, there were two Asian councillors. There are presently seven Asian elected councillors, five Labour and two Liberal Democrats, and one Labour Afro-Caribbean member¹⁷. Thus, taken as a whole, the minority ethnic population is proportionately represented on the City Council, but all eight councillors are drawn from long settled minority groups (Saggar and Geddes, 2000). Two of the three Burngreave councillors are Pakistani and they have a strong relationship with the Burngreave Community Action Forum, formed in 1997 as an umbrella group for both individuals and 32 affiliated organisations (see Appendix 7 for a list of its current affiliates). The growing strength and self-confidence of Pakistanis in local politics and in civil society organisations ensures their political visibility in Sheffield.

6. Cultural specificity in housing: Sheffield's experience

The notion of cultural specificity came into social housing discourses in the 1980s. The notion of cultural specificity covers three areas of work. The first relates to space/overcrowding and the layout of houses, and has been discussed for Pakistani and Bangladeshi families in the earlier section of this paper. The second area relates to day to day housing management in the social rented sector. Issues of language and inter-cultural empathy underlie a wide range of specific practices. The third area relates to location, both in allocating social sector tenants to houses and in choosing sites for new development in the social sector. The two most important locational factors are safety, not exposing families to racial harassment and violence, and accessibility to culturally relevant facilities: shops, meeting places, religious facilities, etc. (this effectively means that minority ethnic families generally prefer neighbourhoods which are already ethnically mixed; see Allen and Rosenfeld, 2011).

The main social sector strategy for developing culturally specific knowledge in housing was the creation of black and minority ethnic housing associations (Harrison, 1991). Tomlins explains that:

"Schemes designed by and for minority ethnic communities can meet cultural and social needs which would otherwise go unmet by mainstream provision. They highlight housing need amongst minority ethnic communities rather than hiding housing needs which are different from those traditionally found within the majority ethnic community" (Tomlins, 1999, no pagination).

In 1986 and 1995, the Housing Corporation implemented two five-year strategies to set up and support black and minority ethnic housing associations. By 1995, 59 BME housing associations were registered with the Corporation and eligible for capital subsidy to build new houses. Eighty percent of these associations were small, owning less than 250 homes. In 1995, their future was uncertain as they had insufficient asset bases and cash reserves to face cuts in the rate of subsidy (Royce *et al*, 1996; Tomlins, 1999). The specific source of financial vulnerability for those catering to Asian families is that the general subsidy structure has always been strongly

¹⁷ There are no Conservative councillors in Sheffield.

biased against the development of large houses with four bedrooms or more (only three percent of the social rented stock has four bedrooms or more; English Housing Survey, 2011: 21).

The Housing Corporation's strategy passed Sheffield by for two reasons. One was the relatively small ethnic minority population in Sheffield at the time. The other was that the City Council was deeply committed to municipal provision of social housing and not a fertile ground for housing associations. Table 10 shows the change in tenure in Sheffield between 1981 and 2001. Sheffield's political stance towards housing associations shifted as central government subsidy became restricted to housing associations only. In addition, Sheffield lost 37 percent of its own housing stock, largely through sales to existing tenants.

Table 10. Tenure in Sheffield 1981 and 2001 (households)

	1981		2001	
	Number	%	Number	%
Owner-occupied	90,353	44.4	130,907	60.3
Rented from local authority	91,478	45.1	57,432	26.4
Rented from housing association	3,341	1.6	8,278	3.8
Private renting	17,902	8.8	20,556	9.5
Total	203,074	100.0	217,177	100.0

Source: For 1981, Census table sas8113. For 2001, Census table S49.

In 2005, Sheffield's first BME housing association was registered with the Housing Corporation. The Arches Housing Association was set up in 1975, but remained small and outside the formal regulatory system. It was fundamentally restructured in 2004. Its Board is now 80 percent Asian. In 2005, 40 percent of its tenants were from minority ethnic groups although 70 percent of new lettings were to minority ethnic groups. It presently owns and/or manages 900 homes, about half of which have been acquired or developed since 2005, most of which are located in Sheffield.

The change in Sheffield has been dramatic. In 1981, it had a very small minority ethnic population which was scarcely acknowledged. By 2010, it had a dazzling array of minority ethnic groups and an extravert approach to their housing. While national discussion of cultural specificity in housing has been confined within the social sector (Housing Corporation and Chartered Institute of Housing, 2008), Sheffield City Council, in contrast, was implementing its third city-wide Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy, covering all tenure sectors and with a robust monitoring group. Moreover, most of the change in Sheffield has taken place within the last ten years. Sheffield's increased sensitivity to cultural specificity and its minority ethnic populations provides the working context for the *Twice the Terrace* project and for the social production of an area called Page Hall. The next section of this paper sets out how urban programmes have affected this area over the last ten years.

6.1 The spaces of intercultural relations: Locating Page Hall in its urban context

Page Hall currently sits within the electoral ward of Burngreave, one of a number on the eastern side of Sheffield which have strong concentrations of minority ethnic populations, as Figure 15 shows.

Figure 15. **Spatial distribution of ethnic minority population in Sheffield, 2007**

Source: Authors' own analysis.

Figure 16. **Page Hall in context: land uses and housing types**

Source: LDA Design, Master Plan for Burngreave and Fir Vale, 2005, pp. 8 and 23

The Pakistani population in the ward is concentrated in the area to the east of the Northern General Hospital (including Page Hall) and in an enclave in the centre of the ward. Figure 16 shows the general urban pattern of the area: a jumble of terraced houses, disused industrial

sites, green areas, a major hospital and several major roads cutting through the area. It also shows how the small terraced houses of Page Hall stand out within a pattern of larger nineteenth century villas, semi-detached and large terraced housing (shown in blue) and postwar council-owned blocks of flats (yellow and orange) in the area.

6.2 The spaces of intercultural relations: Urban policy after 1997

Burngreave had lost its general social status long before the the last Labour Government's urban policy initiatives. Technological changes in steel production after the Second World War required fewer, but more highly skilled, workers. These workers moved out of the terraces, leaving them to poorer English and, later Pakistani and other minority ethnic families. It also appears that the City Council's own housing allocation policy had concentrated minority ethnic groups in Burngreave, where it owned half the housing. In the 1990s, white English social attitudes to the area were shaped by a *fear of the other, the dark stranger*. It was best to *leave themselves to themselves*. The New Labour Government, elected in 1997, declared that combatting social exclusion was its main domestic policy priority. Almost immediately, this commitment led to a set of small area based initiatives from a variety of ministries. By 2000, Sheffield had eight area based initiatives running, but only two were exclusively focused on Burngreave: one was for families with children under 4, and the other was a police initiative aimed at young people and burglary reduction. The remaining six included Burngreave within a much wider catchment area. Because Burngreave contained the most deprived areas in Sheffield (and, in terms of income, nationally), it became a source of additional finance for the City Council as the New Labour Government repaid its political debts in the Labour heartlands of the north. In 1999, the Government introduced the the New Deal for Communities programme, which aimed to focus and, then, replace the variety of small area initiatives. The problem for Burngreave was that the Liberal Democrats had taken control of the City Council by this time (see Table 11). So, in 2000, the Burngreave Community Action Forum decided to *nudge* the City Council into applying for money from the New Deal for Communities. This required a complex political balancing act by the Forum to link a Labour national government and Liberal Democratic local authority. The outcome was that the Government gave Sheffield £55.2m to spend over a period of ten years in the Burngreave NDC area. This area included the multicultural residential area sandwiched between the industrial areas of the Lower Don Valley and the council-owned estates to the northwest of the ward.

Table 11. Political control of Sheffield City Council, 1973-2011

Political party in control	Years
Labour	1973-1999
Liberal Democrats	1999-2002
No overall control	2002-2003
Labour	2003-2007
No overall control	2007-2008
Liberal Democrats	2008-2010
No overall control	2010-2011
Labour	2011-present

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sheffield_local_elections.

More importantly, the Community Action Forum was to form the interim initial Board of the NDC. In anticipation, in 1999 the Forum had set up the Burngreave Community Action Trust, which it envisaged would be operationally responsible for distributing New Deal money. The City Council was the *responsible body*, that is, the organisation charged with oversight and auditing New Deal expenditure. The Community Action Forum's overall strategy was to fund as many community groups and projects as possible. It also planned to refurbish three buildings (known as legacy buildings) which could be let commercially at the end of the programme in order to generate income to continue funding community based projects. Following the funding of the New Deal, the Board was restructured to comprise seven community representatives and eight other members, two of whom were from the City Council, one appointed and one elected official.

In 2000, Page Hall together with its surrounding area (now called Fir Vale) was still within Firth Park Ward, so it was not included in the NDC area. By 2002, the Fir Vale Forum had been set up and was liaising with the Burngreave Community Action Forum. In 2004, the ward boundaries for Burngreave were altered in 2004 to include Page Hall, the Northern General Hospital, and the area to the west of the hospital. Thus, both Forums were invited to sit on the steering group for the Burngreave and Fir Vale Masterplan.

The Masterplan was part of the national Government's Housing Market Renewal programme, which was introduced in 2002. It aimed to use private sector housing investment as a way "to provide lasting solutions for communities blighted by derelict homes through investment and innovation" (Leather *et al.*, 2007: 4). This was a sub-regional programme which covered areas of poor housing within all four of the local authorities in South Yorkshire. Figure 17 shows the boundaries for the whole programme and the area within Sheffield which was included. The sub-regional agency was known as Transform South Yorkshire.

Each of the agencies was expected to find their own solutions to specific housing market weaknesses, defined as "high vacancy rates, high population turnover, low demand for social rented housing, low sales values, and in extreme cases, housing abandonment and failure of the market for owner-occupation" (Leather *et al.*, 2007: 4).

Transform South Yorkshire selected nine neighbourhoods and developed master plans for each of them. One of the continuing criticisms of Transform South Yorkshire was that it was unable to develop appropriate consultation techniques for minority ethnic groups (Audit Commission, 2010). For example, none of the initial consultation documents for the Burngreave and Fir Vale Masterplan were translated into *community languages*.

Figure 17. Boundaries of Transform South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Area

Source: Audit Commission, 2004: 59.

When the masterplan for what became known as Burngreave and Fir Vale was published for consultation in October 2004, it proposed demolishing all 542 houses in Page Hall and replacing them with 250 newly built houses (Burngreave Messenger, March 2005). Figure 18 shows the Burngreave and Fir Vale masterplan area and the final *concept plan* for it, published in May 2005. The plan covers all of the NDC area as well as significant parts of the rest of the area within the new Burngreave electoral ward.

Figure 18: Burngreave and Firvale Housing Market Renewal Area and Concept Plan

Source: LDA Design, Burngreave and Fir Vale Masterplan, 2005: 7 and 53).

However, community organisations do not recognise the same boundaries as central government funding programmes. The residents of Page Hall organised themselves into the Page Hall Community Association to oppose demolition. The Fir Vale Forum and Burngreave Community Action Forum joined together, and the New Deal funded organisations brought their resources to bear on the problem together with a number of other organisations in Fir Vale funded directly by Sheffield City Council. Virtually the whole of the Burngreave community, including its three Labour councillors, were mobilised to oppose the demolition proposals. Page

Hall Community Association organised a petition to the City Council to reverse the recommendation to demolish the area. In October 2004, the City Council asked the consultants, LDA Design, to rethink the form of intervention in Page Hall.

After three meetings between LDA Design and people from Page Hall, held at the Pakistani Advice Centre, the final version of the plan, published in May, notes that there is general support for *regeneration*, but a number of unresolved issues, “especially about the affordability of new housing to new residents and some outright opposition to the proposals for demolition and redevelopment” (LDA Design, 2005). The final plan proposed a community planning exercise, which could include a mixture of interventions: *2 into 1* conversions, energy efficiency improvements, selective demolition, creation of pedestrian areas, open space, parking areas and works to make streets safe for children to play in them, and refurbishment of existing homes. This was clearly a stand off solution - identifying an area for significant intervention and, then, proposing to do next to nothing - but Sheffield City Council was eager to approve the overall plan in order to access Housing Market Renewal funding for other projects within Burngreave (Sheffield City Council, 2004).

The eventual outcome was the Page Hall Urban Development Framework, which was adopted as a formal amendment to the Burngreave and Fir Vale Master Plan in 2007 (Sheffield City Council, 2007a). It proposed little more than improving two greenspaces and the road intersections in the area. By 2010, the City Council had designed and built *Twice the Terrace* and three eco-houses, and started work on one of the green spaces. It has also refurbished 28 other houses in its ownership and is selling them with restrictive covenants to keep the prices down. Page Hall Community Association continues to press the Council to improve day to day services in the area, including rubbish collection, street cleaning, policing and educational services. The entire Housing Market Renewal programme was wound up in 2010, following the change in national Government.

During the period when the community planning exercise was being carried out, the New Deal delivery programme was experiencing difficulty. Although the interim board for the New Deal was entirely community based, once it was funded the board was composed of seven community representatives and eight others, drawn from outside experts. Under a contract with the NDC board, Burngreave Community Action Trust disbursed and managed grants to community groups. It was also managing the conversion of the two buildings which would provide an income base for continuing the work of the New Deal, once central government funding ended in 2010. BCAT had also managed £800.000 of European Objective One money for Burngreave, which was targeted on the areas outside the NDC area including Fir Vale.

In 2006, Burngreave Community Action Trust went into receivership. It owed more in grants to community organisations than the income available to it from the New Deal project. It also became clear that the New Deal would have spent its entire funding, two years before its formal end of its funding in 2011. The proximate cause was that the New Deal organisation had completed its investment in the *legacy* buildings earlier than expected. At the same time, there were long standing issues about governance, personnel and financial management at both BCAT and the New Deal organisation, as well as audit competence at the City Council, and these were rooted in a deep mistrust between the New Deal organisation and the Council (Sheffield City Council, 2009). There were also problems about inconsistent advice and poor

monitoring by both the regional government office and the central government's Neighbourhood Renewal Unit. An agreed short term funding solution was found by selling Forum House, one of the *legacy* buildings, back to the City Council for slightly less than the price which Burngreave New Deal had paid for it. This allowed the New Deal to close down in an orderly fashion, giving the recipients of its grants sufficient notice to settle their affairs before losing their funding. The New Deal had provided £15,6 million directly for community groups, £11,3m for projects sponsored by the City Council, and spent £9m on acquiring and starting to refurbish three legacy buildings. In 2009, Burngreave Community Action Forum restructured itself, into a not-for-profit company, limited by guarantee. The original activists have left and its aims are more about monitoring and managing the City Council's activities than about *building a community*.

Underlying the organisational issues is a question about how to view the entire area. This was summed up in a letter to the Burngreave Messenger (March 2007), New Deal believes in communities (plural) and defined by ethnic and other dubious definitions, it divides us. Whereas BCAF/BCAT defines community (singular) as geographical and therefore totally inclusive and is unifying. In other words, there were clearly tensions between (at least part of) the New Deal board and its contractor, BCAT. Another letter in the Burngreave Messenger from one of the BCAF members of the New Deal Board expresses sadness that *the community* had lost control over the Board when it was restructured following funding of the New Deal. On the other hand, there are still others in Sheffield who think Burngreave got *too much* and their complaints can be found by searching on the Sheffield Forum (Sheffield Forum, 2011).

The last area initiative that Sheffield City Council applied for in Burngreave is known as the Mixed Communities Initiative. This central government programme is aimed at creating mixed income neighbourhoods. It does not bring money with it, but allows local authorities more flexibility in how they spend their budget. The baseline study for this initiative remarked wryly, *When you ask people in Burngreave about mixed communities, they assume you mean ethnically mixed.*

One of the losses brought about by the bankruptcy of BCAT and the subsequent organisational upheavals around the New Deal organisation was a more formal linkage between activists in Fir Vale and in the central portion of the ward. In 2006, a proposed merger between the Fir Vale and the Burngreave Community Action Forums was quietly set to one side. This left the Page Hall Community Association standing, more or less, on its own by the time the alterations to the Masterplan were agreed. What is important, however, is that the Community Association is ethnically mixed (Burngreave Messenger, March 2005).

Young white English couples have been moving in and slowly renovating their houses. These couples are unable to access more expensive owner-occupied properties, and with eighteen percent of the City's population on the waiting list for social housing, will never access the social rented sector. One feasible scenario for the future of Page Hall is a slow, relatively downmarket kind of gentrification, that is, a process through which Pakistani families currently living there can make a windfall profit on their present housing. Meanwhile, everyone currently living in Page Hall has a common interest in environmental improvements and better day to day urban services.

The last ten years in Sheffield have been turbulent. The city absorbed an increase of around 18.000 households. A portion of this increase will have found a place to live in previously vacant

properties, but others will be doubling up in existing properties since there has been little new housebuilding over this period. The ethnic population of Sheffield increased by 50 percent, and Pakistanis established themselves as the dominant group (although one large enough to contain internal divisions) alongside a spectacularly diverse set of other groups. The second generation of Pakistanis came to adulthood during a period of Islamophobia (Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia, 2004) and were more outspoken than their parents. The increasing black and minority ethnic population of Sheffield expanded into the eastern and southern parts of the City. The most impoverished neighbourhoods were found in Burngreave, which formed the focus for two national funding programmes, the New Deal for Communities and the Housing Market Renewal programme. Throughout the whole period, Sheffield City Council was politically unstable. As control changed from Labour to Liberal Democrats and back again, there were periods when neither party had overall control. This led to a failure in political leadership and vision. In addition, few elected councillors had the experience and ability to take on the managerialist role which the national Labour Government was creating for all local authority councillors.

The turbulence of these years created a window of time within which a group of committed community activists were able to bring significant resources to Burngreave. It was also a window of time within which the balance of forces could defeat the proposal to demolish the houses in Page Hall. The complexity and fluidity of inter and intra-ethnic relationships during this period was crucial as they allowed Page Hall residents to present themselves as both a *victimised* poverty stricken Pakistani community and as a coherent multi-ethnic neighbourhood. Leaving 542 houses standing in Page Hall was a small enough price to pay for the City Council to gain major benefits from two major national funding programmes. In a longer run, more down to earth perspective, the New Deal funding, in particular, created a web of networks across different (ethnic) groups and probably eased the transition from a mildly mixed area to one which is now richly mixed. If Sheffield came to race late, then it is lucky that race came during a period in which resources for community groups were abundant

What can be learned from looking at *Twice the Terrace* and Page Hall in their larger context is that place does matter, that local processes have their own dynamic, and that localised dynamic occurs within a specific temporal context. Another city would have a different story to tell.

7. Conclusions

Twice the Terrace was a conversion of two small bye-law terraced houses to create a single larger house which would be appropriate for a large and traditional Pakistani family. It is located in an area, Page Hall, which contains many overcrowded families, many of which, in turn, are Pakistani. The design competition for the project was won by a young Asian architect. The City Council which owned the houses, then, let the final design to another firm of architects who altered it in ways which do not fully reflect what is known about Asian families desired ways of living-in-space. The final design has five bedrooms, instead of the four in the competition entry, making it appropriate for an even larger and more complex household, but the arrangement of the ground floor spaces does not allow for the separation of spaces for women and men. Nor is there a separate kitchen and dining space.

This simple demonstration project raised more general questions. The next section of the paper traced the social history of the small bye-law house and the way this type of housing in Britain was used to contain and discipline the English working classes in the nineteenth century. It then showed how small bye-law houses became associated with the lowest classes by the middle of the twentieth century. Pakistanis who came to England after the Second World War were and are one of the poorest groups in the English population. They faced widespread racial discrimination in the social housing sector, leaving them with little choice but to buy these very small and socially undesirable houses. Large families or households meant that overcrowding was an unavoidable adjunct of finding someplace to live.

The situation has eased somewhat since the 1980s. Second and third generation Pakistani families are smaller. There are an increasing number of second and third generation people who are beginning to access more highly paid jobs. Anti-discrimination legislation and other initiatives have stopped the worst practices in the social housing sector. Localities with larger concentrations of minority ethnic populations, and with more diversity, have developed more sensitive practices. And Pakistanis themselves have become more actively involved in their localities in a variety of ways.

So, the overall question becomes: what role do these small bye-law houses play in the incorporation of migrant families into English society? The word incorporation is used here to evoke the way bodies relate to space: the spaces within houses, the socially constructed spaces surrounding the houses, and the political spaces which can reconfigure both physical and symbolic spaces. There are three possible lines to answering this question from the evidence in Sheffield. Firstly, the houses themselves shape family life-in-space. They assume a way of living-in-space which is English (and which the English working classes were taught in the nineteenth century). Children growing up in these houses become used to such ways of living-in-space. Although these children may go on to live in small bye-law houses themselves, their way-of-living-in-space has become more Anglicised. Secondly, Pakistanis in Sheffield have become incorporated into community groups, initially in groups composed of fellow countrymen/women and then in mixed-ethnicity groups. Thirdly, they have become incorporated into English politics. These last two changes have been especially important because they are no longer hidden away in ethnic enclaves, but acquire a visible public presence which generates changes in how the majority white ethnic group responds to problems placed on a public agenda.

An implicit line in the argument is a comparison between the experience of living in these houses in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century when they were first built and living in them today. There is an important gap in the evidence, although interpretive studies suggest the houses were used to create a controllable class system during the period of industrialisation. The experience in Sheffield suggests a role for these houses in creating a multi-ethnic system in a period of globalisation, understood in terms of linkages between English citizens and the countries from which their parents and grandparents migrated. The two periods are not the same, and the houses have deteriorated over the last 100 years. But there is insufficient evidence to do more than raise this question.

In tracing through the wider questions raised by *Twice the Terrace*, we have used Keith's work on racialisation in urban areas as a set of guidelines. Thus, we have tried to focus on the

mutability of both the *racial subject* (Pakistanis) and the *urban object* which is manufactured through multicultural interaction. He also points to the significance of the political institutions in framing multicultural performances and how these mark their enactment. Finally, and most importantly, we have looked at both localisation, by discussing spatially wider contexts, and temporalisation, by comparing the time when these houses were built and the last ten years. The most important thing is that Keith says, *go look at the situation, do not assume that you know what it is*.

Appendices

Appendix A

Definition of English bedroom standard: This definition is taken from the notes to the Survey of English Housing:

This indicator of occupation density was developed by the Government Social Survey in the 1960s. . . . *It incorporates assumptions about the sharing of bedrooms that would now be widely considered to be at a margin of acceptability.* [Italics inserted by authors.]

A standard number of bedrooms required is calculated for each household in accordance with its age/sex/marital status composition and the relationship of the members to one another. A separate bedroom is required for each married or cohabiting couple, for any other person aged 21 or over, for each pair of adolescents aged 10-20 of the same sex, and for each pair of children under 10. Any unpaired person aged 10-20 is paired, if possible with a child under 10 of the same sex, or, if that is not possible, he or she is counted as requiring a separate bedroom, as is any unpaired child under 10.

This standard is then compared with the actual number of bedrooms . . . available for the sole use of the household. Bedrooms converted to other uses are not counted as available unless they have been denoted as bedrooms by the residents, bedrooms not actually in use are counted unless uninhabitable. If a household has fewer bedrooms than implied by the standard then it is deemed to be overcrowded.

Note: This definition is the one used in all statistical sources. The full legal definition is based on floor space per person, and as the Survey authors imply, would be even less acceptable today.

Appendix B

Table 12. Ethnicity by religion, England and Wales, 2001

Ethnicity	Total people within the ethnic group	Number of people who are Muslims	Muslims as a percentage of total
White	47,520,866	179,773	0.4
Mixed	661,034	64,262	9.7
Indian	1,036,807	131,662	12.7
Pakistani	714,807	657,680	92.0
Bangladeshi	280,830	259,710	92.5
Other Asian	241,274	90,013	37.3
Black Caribbean	563,843	4,477	0.8
Black African	479,665	96,136	20.0
Other Black	96,069	5,732	6.0
Chinese or other	446,702	57,181	12.8
Total	52,041,916	1,546,626	3.0

Source: Census 2001.

References

ALI, M. *Brick Lane*. London, Black Swan, 2004. 496 p.

ALLEN, J. and ROSENFELD, O. Social housing policies and ethnic minorities in the UK: Developing an ethnically sensitive approach. In: PONZO, I. (Ed.) *Immigrant integration policies and housing policies: The hidden links* [online] [Accessed at: 08 oct 2011] Available in: <http://www.fieri.it/2010_rapporti_ricerca.php#immigrant_integration_policies_and_housing_policies_the_hidden_links>, 2010.

ALLEN, J. et al. *Housing and Welfare in Southern Europe*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 240 p.

AUDIT Commission. *Market Renewal: South Yorkshire Pathfinder*. London, Audit Commission, 2004. 63 p.

AUDIT Commission. *HMR Performance Review 2009*. London, Audit Commission, 2010. 25 p.

BROWN, C. *Black and white Britain: The third PSI survey*. Aldershot, Gower, 1984. 420 p.

BURNETT, J. *A Social History of Housing 1815-1985* (2nd ed.) London, Methuen, 1986. 360 p.

BURNGREAVE Community Action Forum [online] [Accessed at: 08 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.bcaf.burngreave.net>>, 2010.

BURNGREAVE Messenger. *Remaster the Plan*. [online] [Accessed at: 08 sep 2011] Available in: <http://www.burngreavemessenger.org.uk/49mar05/march05_s_bm.pdf>. 2005.

BURNGREAVE Messenger. United we should stand for divided we have fallen [online] [Accessed at: 08 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.burngreavemessenger.org/>> and <http://www.burngreavemessenger.org/archives/2006/june/dear-messenger/united-we-should-stand/>>, 2007.

BURTON, J. *et al. Measuring ethnicity: Challenges and opportunities for survey research*. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (8): 1332-1349, 2010.

CHAPMAN, D. *The Home and Social Status*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1955. 301pp

COMMISSION for Racial Equality. *Race and council housing in Hackney: Report of a formal investigation conducted by the Commission for Racial Equality into the allocation of housing in the London Borough of Hackney*. London, Commission for Racial Equality, 1984. 146 p.

COMMISSION on British Muslims and Islamophobia. *Islamophobia: Issues, challenges and Actions* [online] [Accessed at: 8 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.insted.co.uk/islam.html#islam>>, 2004.

DARLING, J. *et al. City of sanctuary -- a UK initiative for hospitality*. In: *Journal of Forced Migration* (34): 46-47, 2010.

DAUNTON, M. J. *House and Home in the Victorian City: Working-Class Housing 1850-1914*. London, Edward Arnold, 1983. 352 p.

DEPARTMENT for Communities and Local Government. *Housing in England 2007-08*. London, DCLG, 2009. 210 p.

DEPARTMENT for Communities and Local Government. *Index of Multiple Deprivation* [online] [Accessed at: 24 july 2011] Available in: <<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/corporate/statistics/indices2010>>, 2010.

DEPARTMENT for Communities and Local Government [online] [Accessed at: 30 july 2011] Available in: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/corporate/researchandstatistics/publicdatasources/housing/livetables/>. Live housing tables no 244 Historic Series Housebuilding in England. 2011.

ENGLISH Housing Survey. *English Housing Survey Household Report 2009/10*. London, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011. 94 p.

FINNEY, N. and Simpson, L. *'Sleepwalking to segregation?' Challenging myths about race and migration*. Bristol, The Policy Press, 2009. 224 p.

FRIEDMANN, J. *Place-making as project? Habitus and migration in transnational cities* (2nd ed.) In: HILLIER, J. and ROOKSBY, E. (eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place*. Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005, pp: 315-333.

GARNER, S. and Bhattacharyya, G. *Poverty, ethnicity and place*. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011. 29 p.

GAULDIE, E. *Cruel Habitations*. London, Allen and Unwin, 1974. 368 p.

GILL, N. *Pathologies of migrant place-making: the case of Polish migrants to the UK*. In: *Environment and Planning A*, (42): 1157-1173. 2010.

GROSSMITH, G. A. *The Diary of a Nobody*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1945. 176 p.

HALL, S. *New Ethnicities*. In: MORLEY, D. and CHEN, K. H. (eds.) *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London, Routledge, 1996, pp: 443-451.

HARRIS, M. and Young, P. *Building bridges: the third sector responding locally to diversity*. In: *Voluntary Sector Review*, 1 (1): 41-58. 2010.

HARRISON, M. *Achievements and options: black and minority ethnic housing organisations in action*. Leeds, Armley Publications, 1991. 130 p.

HOUSEMARK. *Embracing diversity: A good practice guide* [online] [Accessed at: 9 oct 2011] Available in: <www.kier.co.uk/uploaded/publications/Embracing%20Diversity.pdf>. 2008.

HOUSING Corporation and Chartered Institute of Housing. *Housing needs and aspirations of ethnic minority communities*. London, Housing Corporation, 2008. 16 p.

HYNES, P. and Thu, Y. M. *To Sheffield with love*. In: *Forced Migration Review*, (30): 49-51. 2008.

INSIDE Housing. *Online Forum on aids and adaptations for Asians* [online] [Accessed at: 14 July 2011]. Available in: <<http://www.insidehousing.co.uk/ForumThread.aspx?threadcode=805>>.

KEITH, M. *Racialization and the Public Spaces of the Multicultural City*. In: MURJI, K. S. *Racialization: studies in theory and practice*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, pp: 249-270.

LAND Registry. *House prices* [online] [Accessed at: 14 july 2011]. Available in: <www.landreg.gov.uk/house-prices>. 2011.

LAW, C. M. *The Growth of Urban Population in England and Wales, 1801-1911*. In: *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, (41):125-143. 1967.

LDA Design. *Masterplanning Burngreave and Fir Vale: Final Report*. Leeds, Transform South Yorkshire, 2005. 90 p.

LEATHER, P. *et al. National evaluation of the HMR pathfinder programme: Baseline report*. London, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2007. 233 p.

LUTHRA, M. *Britain's black population: Social change, public policy and agenda*. Aldershot, Ashgate, 1997. 456 p.

MARKKANEN, S. *et al. Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research*. In: Understanding Demographic, Spatial and Economic Impacts on Future Affordable Housing Demand: Paper Seven -- BME Housing needs and Aspirations. London, Housing Corporation, 2008. 227 p.

MERIDIEN pure. *Community profiling for neighbourhoods directorate: Summary findings*. Sheffield, Sheffield City Council, 31 July 2006. 14 p.

MODOOD, T. *Culture and identity*. In: MODOOD, T. *et al. Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage*. London, Policy Studies Institute, 1997, pp: 367-391.

MODOOD, T. *et al. (eds.) Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. London, Policy Studies Institute, 1997. 448 p.

NASHAYMAN Housing Association. *What makes successful 'mixed communities'? Final report*. Newcastle, Home Housing Group, 2010. 64 p.

OKORO, T. *Housing in use: Flexibility and constraints - actual and preferred utilisation of domestic space by asian households*. London, Royal Institution of British Architects, 1991. 53 p.

OKORO, T. *Bodies in Space: Asian Households in British Homes - Socio-cultural aspects of domestic space-design and use*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Westminster, 1995.

PEACH, C. *Britain's Muslim population: An overview*. In: Abbas, T. (ed.) Muslim Britain: Communities under pressure. London, Zed Books, 2005, pp: 18-30.

REEVE, K. and Robinson, D. *Beyond the multi-ethnic metropolis: Minority ethnic housing experiences in small town England*. In: Housing Studies, 22 (4): 547-571. 2007.

REX, J. and Moore, R. *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1969. 320 p.

ROYCE, C. *et al. Set up to fail? The experiences of black housing associations*. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1996.

SAGGAR, S. and GEDDES, A. *Negative and positive racialisation; Re-examining ethnic minority political representation in the UK*. In: *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26 (1): 25-44. 2000.

SHEFFIELD City Council. *Neighbourhoods Investment* [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/council-meetings/cabinet/agendas-2004/agenda-28-april-2004/neighbourhoods-investment>>. 2004.

SHEFFIELD City Council. *Minutes of cabinet meeting 29 nov 2007* [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/council-meetings/cabinet/agendas-2007/agenda-12th-december-2007/minutes-28th-november-2007>>. 2007a.

SHEFFIELD City Council. *Sheffield's BME Housing Strategy 2008-10*. Sheffield, Sheffield City Council, 2007b.

SHEFFIELD City Council Strategic Resources and Performance Scrutiny Committee. *Agenda*. [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/council-meetings/archive/strategicresourcesandperf/agendas-2009/agenda-11th-june-2009>>. 2009.

SHEFFIELD Forum. [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.sheffieldforum.co.uk/index.php>>. 2011.

SHELTER. *Full house? How overcrowded housing affects families*. London, Shelter, 2005. 52pp

SURVEY OF ENGLISH HOUSING. Live table S195: Type of accommodation by tenure by year property built. [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <<http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingsurveys/surveyofenglishhousing/sehlivetablestrendstenure/>>. 2008.

SWANTON, D. *Sorting bodies: race, affect, and everyday multiculturalism in a mill town in northern England*. In: *Environment and Planning A*, (42): 2332-2350. 2010.

SZILARD, L. *Report on "Grand Central Terminal"*. In: *SZILARD, L. The voice of the dolphins*. London, Sphere Books, 1967, pp: 101-107.

TAN, S. *The Arrival*. London, Hodder Children's Books, 2007. 128 p.

TOMLINS, R. *Housing experiences of minority ethnic communities in Britain: An academic literature review and annotated bibliography*. Coventry, University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, 1999. 246 p.

VOLUNTARY Action Sheffield. Website [online] [Accessed at: 9 sep 2011] Available in: <www.vas.org.uk>. 2011.

WILSON, W. *Housing: overcrowding*. London, House of Commons Library, Social Policy Section, 2010. 27 p.

WOHL, A. *The Eternal Slum: Housing and social policy in Victorian London*. London, Edward Arnold, 1977. 416 p.