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SYNOPSIS

A major factor in the shift in favour of house rehabilitation and away from comprehensive clearance and redevelopment has been the belief that rehabilitation is much less socially disruptive. This assumption has been little tested. By examining an area of Glasgow subject to considerable house improvement, this dissertation seeks to identify the social and community impacts of rehabilitation. Does rehabilitation benefit existing residents? Do households leave the area as a result of rehabilitation and, if so, where do they go and how do they rate their post-move housing conditions? Who replaces them? These are some of the questions the dissertation addresses.

CHAPTER 1 examines the thinking behind the move from clearance to improvement while CHAPTER 2 reviews both American and British literature on the social aspects of rehabilitation. CHAPTER 3 deals with the legislative side of house improvement and the changing emphases of successive policies. The impact of legislative changes on the quantity and impact of improvement work is also considered. CHAPTER 4 consists of a brief description of the study area itself and an outline of the development of improvement activity within it while CHAPTER 5 sets out working hypotheses and develops a possible methodology for the study of the social impact of rehabilitation. CHAPTER 6 is an analysis of results drawing together the various data sets used into a generalised overview. Supporting the factual data, CHAPTER 7 summarises discussions with various public and private agencies and local community groups about the operation and results of improvement policy. CHAPTER 8 extends the discussion beyond the confines of the study area by developing a more generalised model of neighbourhood change and household movement as affected by rehabilitation. On the basis of a set of indicators of neighbourhood change, other areas of the city are identified where rehabilitation pressures are likely to be greatest. A number of policy recommendations emerge from a closer examination of the model.
Acknowledgements

Thanks are due firstly to my supervisor, Jean Forbes, for her constant help and encouragement and to the many people who assisted in the collection of data, especially the staff of Reidvale Housing Association, the Private Sector of Glasgow District Housing Department, Duncan Maclennan, Isobel Robertson and Mary Latham. Much appreciation also to my typist, Mrs. Hilda Walker, for giving the dissertation an air of academic respectability which it might otherwise have lacked. And thanks finally to family and friends for never admitting to being too bored with the whole thing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER 1**
: INTRODUCTION 1
  - 1.1 Introduction
  - 1.2 Costs and Benefits
  - 1.3 Gentrification
  - 1.4 Dennistoun

**CHAPTER 2**
: LITERATURE REVIEW 4
  - 2.1 American Research
  - 2.2 British Research

**CHAPTER 3**
: HOUSE IMPROVEMENT: THE LEGISLATION 15

**CHAPTER 4**
: THE STUDY AREA 24
  - 4.1 History
  - 4.2 Local Plans
  - 4.3 House Improvement

**CHAPTER 5**
: METHODOLOGY 35
  - 5.1 Survey
  - 5.2 Secondary Data Sources

**CHAPTER 6**
: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS 42
  - 6.1 Housing Department: Improvement Grant Files
  - 6.2 Reidvale Housing Association
  - 6.3 1974 Migration Study
  - 6.4 Cheaper End Study
  - 6.5 Summary

**CHAPTER 7**
: LOCAL DISCUSSIONS 73
  - 7.1 Planning Department
  - 7.2 Housing Department
  - 7.3 Reidvale Housing Association
  - 7.4 House Improvement and Clearance Section
  - 7.5 ASSIST
  - 7.6 Building Societies/Estate Agent/Bank
  - 7.7 Community Council
CHAPTER 8 : A MODEL OF NEIGHBOURHOOD CHANGE

8.1 : Filtering
8.2 : Neighbourhood Recovery
8.3 : Pump-priming
8.4 : Indicators of Neighbourhood Change
8.5 : Model of Population Movement
8.6 : The Future
8.7 : Summary
8.8 : Recommendations

Appendix

Bibliography
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objectives of Improvement Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grants to Private Owners</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Govanhill: Characteristics of Residents</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scotland: Number of Dwellings subject to Grant-aided Improvement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Study Area</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Tenure</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Changes in House Tenure, 1979-84</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Dennistoun/Haghill: Existing Housing Provision</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Value of Improvement Grants</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Work undertaken with the aid of Improvement Grants</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Occupation Changes in Units not subject to Improvement Grant</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Characteristics of In-movers</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reidvale Out-movers: Destination</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Location of Applicants</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reasons given in support of applications</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Location of Applicants</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Secondary Reasons in support of Application</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Size of In-mover Households</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Apartment Size</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reasons for Move</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reasons for Move</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Size of Out-mover households</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Apartment Size</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Distribution of In-movers</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Distribution of Out-movers</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Moves from local authority housing to owner-occupation, 1974</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Number of House Transactions, 1972-80</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dennistoun: House Transactions, 1972</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dennistoun: House Transactions, 1980</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Mean Price of House Transactions, 1972</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Mean Price of House Transactions, 1980</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Dominant Source of House Finance, 1972</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Dominant Source of House Finance, 1980</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Source of house finance by 100 metre grid-square</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Number of Improvement Grants, 1975-80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dennistoun: Value of Improvement Grants, 1975-80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 39. Distribution of Improvement Grants, 1975-80 71
40. Neighbourhood Life-Cycle 84
41. Model of Neighbourhood Change 94
42. Schema of Household Movements 98
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"... it is a fact that the act of improvement of a typical tenement building will result in one third of the families of the tenement losing their homes through no fault of their own." (Currie 1974 : 55)

1.1

The 1970's witnessed growing concern for the inner areas of Britain's conurbations. Critical examination of the post-war emphasis on wholesale clearance and redevelopment resulted in a review of the traditionally minor role of rehabilitation in ameliorating housing conditions. While the fundamental role of the rehabilitation programme has been modified through time, it has always been claimed that improvement of the existing housing stock avoids certain of the major excesses of the "bulldozer" approach, especially the length and expense of clearance and the social disruption inflicted upon existing communities. Popular wisdom holds that improvement is less socially disruptive than clearance. Such wisdom has unfortunately too often been based on ill-conceived ideas of the purpose and process of improvement and anecdotal evidence about the social impact of rehabilitation policy.

The dearth of research reflects a number of factors. The 1974 Housing Act resulted in a new approach to house rehabilitation, especially of the kind carried out by Housing Associations in Housing Action Areas. Many of these programmes have been in operation for only seven or eight years and any attempt to assess their social impact before now might have proven premature. In addition such research is often thwarted by the problems of definition which surround any study of 'social matters' and 'community ties'. Having successfully negotiated the definitional problems, there are still considerable practical difficulties in designing and implementing a research methodology to address the proper questions.

Nevertheless it is felt that sufficient time has passed in the life of the improvement programme to seriously examine the social impact of rehabilitation. This is not seen primarily as an exercise in destructive criticism but as an attempt to shed some light on a topic which, if ignored, may render improvement policy open to the same kinds of criticisms levelled at slum clearance in the late 1960's. It was from conventional wisdom based on unquestioned assumptions that many of the oversights of that time arose.
It is only in recent years that planners have come to accept that they serve a multitude of public interests rather than the single monolith by which they have traditionally justified much of their work. Very little work has been done in the identification of the different groups involved in the improvement process and in the costs and benefits accruing to them. It has been assumed that, whatever its faults, improvement is "better" than clearance. It is time to examine these assumptions much more critically.

American research has indicated that, in contrast to a long period of decline, inner areas of certain large cities are undergoing a process of self-regeneration characterised by an inflow of younger upper-income persons into older, cheaper inner city housing suitable for rehabilitation. While the reasons for and scale of this movement are still somewhat vague, there does seem to be a reawakening of interest in the idea of inner city living. In Britain, such 'gentrification' has largely been restricted to London but as inner city policy develops, it is expected that inner city areas will be much more closely scrutinised as future locations for residential development. Dennistoun, by virtue of its inner city location, is the kind of area on which such future interest might focus.

Dennistoun was chosen as the study area for a number of reasons. It is a physically well-defined part of Glasgow's inner city which has been subject to a variety of improvement projects since the early 1970's. Its location is of particular interest firstly because of its proximity to the city centre and secondly because of its wider setting in the east end of the city. The scale of urban problems confronting the east end were recognised with the establishment in May, 1976 of the Glasgow Eastern Area Renewal (GEAR) programme, the largest urban renewal project of its kind in Europe. Although Dennistoun itself falls outside the GEAR boundary, it has been subject to many of the same influences in the course of its development.

The study area acts as somewhat of a focus for migration in the east end of the city. In part this is explained by the existence of a well-developed housing market in Dennistoun. So far little attention has focussed on the role of house improvement in influencing patterns of population movement. An understanding of this process would be invaluable if future residential policy took greater note of established inner city areas.
This dissertation seeks to identify population movements in and out of Dennistoun and their relationship, if any, to the improvement programmes in operation there: Who is moving in or out and why? Where do they come from and go to? What has been the impact of the improvement programme and on whom? The answers to these questions lie at the heart of the study.

It is hoped to build up a theoretical model of the migration flows which characterise an inner city area like Dennistoun. In reconstructing the pattern of movement, it should be possible to estimate the social impact of rehabilitation and, where appropriate, to make policy recommendations. It will also be possible to determine if the Dennistoun story is unique or whether the approach employed there can be applied in other inner city areas threatened by deterioration and decline.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Much of the work on the improvement of inner city areas comes from American sources and is not directly comparable to the British situation. Britain, for example, has seen much more public than private rehabilitation while the reverse has been the case in the United States. The 1980 Housing Act, however, emphasised the Government's desire to increase the contribution of the private sector to improvement activity and it is useful to examine the nature of renewal now characterising a number of major North American cities. In addition, public sector improvement in Britain has traditionally been viewed as a means of stimulating voluntary private sector rehabilitation. An understanding of the process of private sector improvement would identify where public intervention could most successfully result in improving the condition of our older housing.

Preliminary results of the 1980 U.S. census indicate that the loss of population from American cities is continuing. It is therefore somewhat surprising that recent research has focussed not on the movement out of people from inner city areas, but on the movement in of others, the so-called 'back to the city' movement (Gale 1979). Interest in this movement is two-fold. Firstly, incomers differ in a variety of ways from outmovers resulting in changes in the socio-economic character of older neighbourhoods. Secondly, few incomers move into newly built structures and thus they are making use of existing older houses in which other people used to live. To distinguish between the social impact of private and public improvement programmes the terms displacement and relocation have commonly been used. Displacement refers to the involuntary movement of people from their homes as a result of spontaneous neighbourhood revitalisation while relocation refers to the rehousing by public authorities of those forced to move by publicly financed programmes of urban redevelopment and renewal.

The phenomenon has its roots in the inflationary and recessionary pressures which have characterised much of the last decade. Since the mid 1950's, the growth of U.S. cities has occurred mainly in the form of suburban sprawl. But during the 1970's the very conditions which stimulated spread have provoked a new interest in the inner city as a residential area. Recessionary pressures have hit hard at the construction industry and inflationary rises in the costs of building materials
and house construction have pushed the price of a new suburban home beyond reach of the burgeoning number of first-time house buyers. Increased energy and commuting costs have forced many potential buyers to look inwards towards established inner city areas resulting in increased competition for a fixed quantity of existing inner city housing. There is also a new 'chicness' associated with inner city living, a rejection of the perceived monotony and sterility of the suburbs in favour of the animation of city life.

The change in housing market conditions has made inner city neighbourhoods highly attractive to both individual buyers and property speculators. In addition, local authorities have sought to bring about the joint effort of both public and private sectors in inner city renewal and in a number of cases public funds have been used to 'pump-prime' subsequent private investment. Renewal has swept away some neighbourhoods while in others the effects of nearby redevelopment have spilled over, bringing often unexpected and undesirable changes. City governments have openly encouraged the return of middle class residents in the belief that this would help ameliorate the physical, social and economic problems of inner city areas.

Persons displaced by publicly funded programmes are eligible for compensation for the financial costs of their enforced move. But the degree of publicly induced relocation has declined sharply with the scaling-down of urban renewal and highway construction programmes through the early 1970's. On the other hand, privately sponsored rehabilitation has been increasing and those displaced by private forces receive no such financial aid in finding new accommodation. Their plight is attracting increasing research interest.

In a survey carried out for the Urban Land Institute (Black 1975), Black stated that almost half of all central cities were undergoing some degree of private market housing renovation, especially the very largest cities (500,000+) and those dominated by white-collar employment. While the numbers involved were not yet great, there was considerable potential for future increase especially given the influence of changing demographic conditions. By 1974, 57% of U.S. households were single person adults.

"... an important shortcoming is that all the studies, so far undertaken have been concerned with improvement proposals in a particular locality and an emphasis on case study has so far contributed little to a wider understanding of the problems involved or to the general principles which should guide public action." (Spencer and Cherry 1970:57).
British research has proceeded along somewhat different lines from that in the U.S. Studies of gentrification have largely been restricted to London (McCarthy 1975) and most relate to the situation in existence before the introduction of the 1974 Housing Act. They must be viewed against a background of conditions which have subsequently changed. Since 1974, more attention has been focussed on public rather than private improvement, especially in Housing Action Areas, but the results have provided generalised descriptions rather than detailed study of particular topics.

The most complete overview is from Balchin (Balchin 1979) drawing together a number of hitherto independent areas of the literature. His major hypothesis is that house improvement has not been as benign as suggested by those who urged a move from clearance to rehabilitation on social grounds:

".... communities were being destroyed as quickly as if major clearance schemes had been undertaken - many former residents doubling-up in increasingly multi-occupied dwellings, becoming homeless or moving elsewhere, often without trace" (Balchin 1979:23)

Indeed rehabilitation could be more destructive of communities than clearance since at least under the latter local authorities had a duty to rehouse those affected. Where an authority had to rehouse persons displaced by private grant-aided improvement, it was in the ludicrous position of paying money to those displaced as a result of activity which, at least in part, depended on grants of money from other government departments!

Improvement grants had tended to benefit better-off owner occupiers and property speculators rather than existing residents with the latter experiencing winkling and harassment. This reflected a critical contradiction between a policy to upgrade areas physically and one concentrating aid on the existing residents of such areas. This in turn rested on the only very imperfect operation of filtering, on which most of the argument in favour of improvement per se was based.

For parts of Inner London, Balchin attempted to identify a relationship between the distribution of improvement grants and the distribution of selected socio-economic indicators. Deriving a Rehabilitation-Need Index as a composite indicator of where rehabilitation was most necessary, he concluded a fairly low correlation between the Index and the spatial distribution of improvement grants. Improvement did not appear to be assisting those in greatest housing need. The analysis was repeated for
the distribution of improvement grants in General Improvement Areas and Housing Action Areas but in this case grants were related to a Rehabilitation-Potential Index. The results indicated a high correlation between the two with grant approval much more related to demand than to need. Again, improvement was not benefitting those in greatest need:

"These changes suggest that in general the processes of gentrification were already occurring prior to the considerable increase in improvement grant provision brought about by the Housing Act of 1969" (Balchin 1979:171)

A study was also made of socio-economic change in the General Improvement and Housing Action Areas of West London, hoping to isolate any relationship between improvement activity and socio-economic change. Improvement was associated with an increased proportion of owner occupation, subdivision and younger families at the upper end of the socio-economic scale. There was a more positive relationship between grant approval, house improvement and social change:

".... improvement grant housing was subject to the effects of gentrification to a considerably greater extent than those dwellings not receiving grant" (Balchin 1979:219)

Both types of area tended to have a higher percentage of newer residents than similar control areas, reflecting the impact of improvement on levels of population movement.

In a similar study of two housing areas in Edinburgh (Kersley 1974), it was concluded that there was little evidence to link gentrification with the availability of improvement grants. While many of the inmovers were characteristic of those involved in gentrification (young, upper income, professional), it proved very difficult to isolate the contribution of improvement grants to the process of social change. Along with a central location,

"Gentrification was directly related to architectural form and house size; physical environment; high percentage of owner occupation and relatively cheap housing; and the households position in the family life-cycle" (Kersley 1974:V)

Hamnett (Hamnett 1973) believed renovation to be the physical expression of a social process and that improvement grants provide a reasonably precise reflection of gentrification, its extent and distribution. Social change, as revealed in the Census returns for 1961, 1966 and 1971, was related to indicators of housing quality, social class composition and location. By linking social change to the distribution of improvement grants, Hamnett concluded that gentrification had resulted in a diminution in the size of the private rented sector, especially in
areas near the city centre or higher status areas within the inner city. Since such activity was highly lucrative, many developers would continue to pursue it even in the absence of improvement grants considering these merely 'icing on the cake'.

The value of improvement grants as an indicator of gentrification has been questioned (Dugmore and Williams 1974). A number of local authorities provide loans to cover low-income owner occupiers' share of improvement costs, distorting Hamnett's model of grant-aid favouring only the better off. In addition, the number of grants going to property developers has declined due to delays in procedure, controls and the declining real value of grant-aid. While grants could aid middle-class pioneer gentrification, this should not be overstressed, grants being only one factor in a much more complicated picture. Gentrification was a response to a variety of conditions in a complex housing market of which improvement grants were only one. Future research should consider the role of all institutions affecting the housing market.

Williams (Williams 1976) felt that research had focused too greatly on the demand side of the gentrification equation resulting in a failure to consider the variety of influences on any housing market. Attempting to identify the mechanisms of population change associated with private sector house market institutions, Williams related certain indicators of the social structure of residential areas to aspects of the supply of property and house finance. He concluded that such institutions, especially building societies and estate agents, played an influential role in determining trends of social change in given areas. In the case of Islington, Williams concluded that the availability of improvement grants had certainly increased demand for housing in the area but that they had not originally caused that demand.

McCarthy (McCarthy 1975) posed three main questions regarding the consequences of grant-aided improvement:

(i) to what degree do existing residents benefit from rehabilitation?

(ii) if not, why do they move out and where?

(iii) do in- and out-movers exhibit different social characteristics?

A random sample of one in four grants in twelve Inner London boroughs was selected from the first quarter of 1972: of these 46% were improvement grants, 32% conversion grants and 22% standard grants. The analysis revealed that improvement had not in fact benefited existing
residents, 68% of all grants being associated with the movement out of existing households before improvement work began. This figure rose to 90% when only conversion grants were considered. Prior to grant approval, 774 households occupied the 424 sample properties; after improvement only 229 of the original households remained i.e. 72% of original households had moved away.

McCarthy also compared the characteristics of pre- and post-improvement residents. Newcomer groups were on average younger, more affluent, had more economically active heads of households and more households in the higher socio-economic groups than the continuing occupant groups. New tenants paid up to four times as much rent as continuing tenants. There was a trend towards increased owner occupation associated with improvement resulting in expected changes in socio-economic characteristics. 'Stayers', both owner occupiers and tenants, shared the profile of out-movers.

Of the 534 outmoving households, only 162 (30%) were successfully traced and only 102 (19%) were successfully interviewed. Over half of respondents expressed greater satisfaction with their post-move accommodation although 16% of all households made multiple subsequent moves. Owner occupiers tended to move to outer London or beyond while private renters moved in the same borough or elsewhere in Inner London, generally involving a shift from the private rented to the local authority sector. Those rehoused by local authorities tended to remain in the same borough. While not all of these moves would have been involuntary, McCarthy concluded that rehabilitation,

"... acted as a social sieve, selecting particular types of households to move into improved dwellings." (McCarthy 1975:4)

The passage of the 1974 Housing Act moved research attention towards Housing Action Areas and the role within them of Housing Associations. Roberts (Roberts 1975) outlined three strands of central government thought on improvement which have dominated at different times: reformist, functional and social preference. He highlighted the outstandingly uncontroversial political environment surrounding improvement as a continuing deficiency in the overall programme. As a result, the possible contradictions between the three policy strands had been ignored.
"officially, the aim has been home improvement on a large scale, measured in physical terms; unofficially, various vague social objectives have been implied...There can easily be conflict between the two high level objectives....Many of the dilemmas of house improvement policy stem from the failure to recognise this potential conflict, let alone a failure to resolve it." (Roberts 1975:51)

In terms of gentrification, Roberts thought it unlikely that improvement alone influenced patterns of social change since these reflected a variety of social, economic and demographic forces. Indeed such forces were likely to be far more powerful than the mere provision of improvement grants:

"In so far as improvement is stimulated by broader social and structural forces, it might be more productive to promote it in selected areas by modifying these forces (e.g. by altering transport patterns, making a locality more accessible to the town centre) than be direct financial incentives" (Roberts 1975:93)

Attention was also drawn to the role of improvement in attracting young people who viewed rehabilitated property as a reasonably cheap and convenient first step on the ladder to better housing conditions.

Basset and Short (Bassett and Short 1978) believed that grant-aided improvement acted as a lubricant in the process of gentrification. However it was not felt that grants were the prime reason for gentrification and by comparing a set of derived 'neighbourhood types' with the distribution of grants Bassett and Short concluded a differential impact of improvement policy on different neighbourhood types. Grant expenditure largely flowed to those areas where a combination of market forces made investment profitable. (Bassett and Short 1978:339). This
reaffirmed Williams' findings that improvement would have occurred in certain areas even without the availability of improvement grants and that in either case it failed to benefit existing residents. Indeed, in terms of Housing Action Areas, Bassett and Short hypothesised that such improvement activity might simply displace certain housing problems to adjacent areas.

Improvement has of course received criticism not only for its operational problems but also for the whole political philosophy considered to be behind rehabilitation (National Community Development Project 1975). The basis of the argument is that the large-scale provision of decent housing conditions can only be effectively achieved through the public sector:

"....the switch to house improvement, given the political and economic climate in which it has evolved, represents a fundamental shift of resources away from the provision of working class housing." (NCDP 1975:6)

Voluntary private improvement is inevitably determined by the interplay of only ownership and finance. Thus it will never be massive in volume nor will it favour those in greatest housing need. Many owners would only be willing to improve with further massive injections of public money and this would be an unacceptable use of public funds.

While there had been no dramatic break-up of communities, residents' groups had reported a decline over the last six years:

"And this has led to a decline in their commitment to the area and thus to a slower, but equally effective, disintegration of the community because long-standing residents are leaving" (NCDP 1975:12)

NCDP's greatest criticism was that rehabilitation had come to be seen as a direct alternative to clearance rather than complementary. Thus the real comparison should not be between improved and un-improved housing but between new and improved housing:

"The most prominent feature of the improvement programme so far has been the repeated use of devices that are in effect a diversion from the main problems of house improvement in working class areas...." (NCDP 1975:22)

The main empirical study of improvement grants in Scotland was published in 1974 (Duncan et al 1974).
From 1967-73, the increase in the total value of grants to private owners was largely due to increased expenditure on discretionary grants, from 67% to 91% of all grants. There was an associated decline in the number of standard grants approved. With the exception of 1969, the percentage of discretionary grants flowing to landlords and others remained fairly consistent at around 20%. Thus the vast majority of improvement grants flowed to private owner-occupiers. However, in terms of the value of expenditure, the owner occupied sector has since 1968 been losing its dominance in favour of local authority improvement work. By 1973 local authority expenditure was, for the first time, in excess of that for the owner occupied sector.

Duncan also considered the role of housing associations in Scotland (Duncan and Cowan 1976). They dismissed the improvement provisions of the 1960's:

"...either nothing happened or, where it did, a new socio-economic group paying higher rents ended up in occupation. The notion of bringing about improvements for the benefit of existing residents simply did not hold" (Duncan and Cowan 1976:9)

They emphasised the confidence-giving role of improvement area designation although doubted whether this was readily quantifiable. Concern was expressed at the level of local authority acquisition associated with improvement. Municipalisation of the stock for improvement had not been the intention of the framers of the legislation, preferring that most of the work be carried out by volunteer private owners. Since the job of wholesale improvement would be far too costly for local authorities alone, they should concentrate on what they could do best. "A major role for local authorities would be as catalysts of improvement."

(Duncan and Cowan 1976:33)
In the first monitoring of the impact of Housing Action Area designation (Scottish Development Department, Housing Research Unit 1980), it was concluded that, contrary to expectation, improvement did not completely protect communities from disruption:

"....there are signs that area improvement does result in some areas in certain effects, similar in nature although not in degree, to those criticised in conjunction with clearance programmes." (SDD/HRU 1980:72)

A further part of the study consisted of an analysis of out-movers (Ritchie 1979). Examining the situation in six Housing Action Areas and five control areas, the report concluded that designation had affected traditional patterns of population movement:

"....levels of movement have been higher in Housing Action Areas than in equivalent comparison areas....This suggests that area improvement programmes have increased usual levels of outmovement and have not completely protected 'communities' from dispersal as was hoped" (Ritchie 1979:i)

87% (135) in-movers were successfully interviewed but only 38% (126) of out-movers. Interviews with existing long-term residents were used as a rather dubious surrogate for out-movers. The analysis revealed that the part of the population which had been lost included a higher proportion of the more mobile groups such as the young, professional households and students. In-movers were dominated by newly-formed households, especially young married couples. Most moved from nearby and only one third made use of improvement grants although most knew of the availability of grant aid. The main attraction was the type or cost of housing available rather than directly related to the improvement process in Housing Action Areas.

Outmovers tended to be associated with a considerable degree of tenure change, over half of former owner occupiers moving into rented accommodation. 40% moved to the city periphery while 36% moved to other areas of the inner city, 25% remaining in the immediate vicinity of the study area. Thus there was not the widespread geographical dispersal of residents associated with clearance. At least half of movers associated their move with improvement while a third, especially in the private rented sector, felt they had little choice but to move. Despite the widespread perception of 'forced' movement, there was little evidence to suggest that the improvements required had been the cause of owners leaving the study area.

Similar work in the Govanhill area of Glasgow (Mason 1976) revealed that of the 44% (32) of owner occupiers who had moved out of Housing Treatment Areas in a 2½ year period very few left as a direct result of improvement work. The majority had intended to move out anyway, regardless of
rehabilitation. There were distinct differences between those who sold up and left, those who sold but stayed and those who did not sell:

Govanhill : Characteristics of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3</th>
<th>Sold/Left</th>
<th>Sold/Stayed</th>
<th>Not Sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE 40 ys.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HOUSE SIZE  | 2 apartment | 73          | 78  | 65  |
|             | 3           | 24          | 22  | 35  |
|             | 4           | 3           | 0   | 0   |

| HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION | Single person | 8 | 23 | 33 |
|                       | Household with children | 76 | 38 | 42 |

(Mason 1976)

Only 58% of out-going owner occupiers remained in the owner occupied sector, 16% becoming local authority tenants and 26% moving to New Towns. Almost half were dissatisfied with their new conditions. Again, 42% moved elsewhere in Glasgow. Mason concluded that "...the process of rehabilitating tenement property undoubtedly causes hardship to the occupiers, both owners and tenants" (Mason 1976). He also voiced concern over the impact of Housing Association activity on the availability of tenemented property for young married couples and people who need short-to-medium term accommodation.
Chapter 3

HOUSE IMPROVEMENT : THE LEGISLATION

Improvement legislation is of much longer standing than widely realised. In the Scottish context, the publication of the McTaggart Report (Scottish Housing Advisory Committee 1947) represented the first post-war review of housing conditions. While not unfit, 3/4 of Scottish houses were seriously deficient in standard amenities and the Report recommended the subdivision of large houses and flats, the modernisation of self-contained units and the combination of smaller units with an emphasis on publicly led action. Full modernisation would be to the same standards required for new housing and would ensure at least twenty years additional life for the existing housing stock. Improvement, on the other hand, would focus on the worst defects of existing housing, providing at least 5 years additional life. In both cases McTaggart believed that the modernisation of houses could be of positive service in the maintenance and rejuvenation of existing communities. However, the Report clearly favoured viewing modernisation as the improvement of physical housing conditions rather than the provision of better conditions for the existing residents of deficient housing. The possible contradictions between these two objectives have underlain much subsequent improvement legislation and are still largely unresolved.

The 1949 Housing (Scotland) Act introduced the payment of Improvement Grants to owner occupiers and landlords, payable only on housing with a thirty year life, for improvement expenditure between £100 and £600. The value of the grant was set at 50% of the owner's approved costs and landlords, to recoup part of their expenditure, were allowed to raise rents by 6% of their share of the costs. Payment of grant was conditional on the dwelling providing accommodation for thirty years at a new 16-point standard of acceptability. From 1949-54 only about 4,000 improvement grants per annum were granted and the 1954 Housing (Repairs and Rent) Act introduced a number of amendments to increase the volume of improvement work. A new 12-point standard was introduced and the minimum life of the improved house was reduced to fifteen years. The upper limit on approved costs was waived but a maximum grant level of £400 was introduced and landlords were now allowed to increase rents by 8% of their costs. As a result of these changes, the number of grants approved from 1954-9 increased to 40,000 per annum.
The 1959 House Purchase and Housing Act ushered in a new simplified scheme of standard grants for the provision of five standard amenities (bath/shower, wash-hand basin, hot water supply, internal WC, food store). Whereas all grants had previously been paid at the discretion of the local authority (i.e. discretionary grants), the new standard grants were available by right for houses with a minimum life of fifteen years. The maximum grant payable was set at £155 or half the approved costs of the work, whichever was lower. Discretionary grants were made available for the conversion of large houses into self-contained dwellings (i.e. conversion grants) and for the first time local authorities were permitted to make loans towards the owner's share of approved costs. Landlords were now allowed to increase rents by 12.5% of their share of the costs. These amendments resulted in 130,000 grants being approved in 1960. Although standard grants immediately became dominant (70% 1961) they represented only 6% of the total by 1979.

In a White Paper of 1963 (Min. of Housing and Local Government 1963), the Government outlined its intention to increase the number of houses improved to 150-200,000 per annum and to vary the required standards of improvement by introducing grants for partial improvement, patching and repairs and maintenance. Urban renewal was to be a task involving the concerted effort of both public and private sectors. The Government saw a growing role for housing societies and associations in improvement and outlined the setting up of a Housing Corporation to finance, advise and oversee the activities of such voluntary local bodies. Accordingly, the 1964 Housing Act made standard grants available for a new 3-point standard and, although the emphasis still lay on the voluntary improvement of houses by owners, local authorities were given the powers to serve compulsory improvement notices. The new Act also introduced the idea of area-based improvement in areas where 50% of houses lacked one or more standard amenities. Until this time, grants were available for the improvement of individual houses regardless of their location. Increasingly, Government felt this to be an uneconomic use of resources, favouring the concentration of expenditure in identified areas and a more cost-effective approach to the problem. It was also felt that carefully targeted spending would be more likely to stimulate the voluntary improvement upon which the whole programme rested.

The Report of the Dennington Committee (Min. of Housing and Local Government (1966 (a)) imparted further momentum to the improvement programme.
The Committee realised that, at current levels of clearance, it would take more than forty years to remove the worst housing. It was intolerable to condemn people to such conditions for so long if intermediate improvement could help ameliorate the worst excesses. While emphasising the need for a comprehensive approach, the Committee accepted that voluntary improvement had not produced the desired volume of work and recommended greater local authority involvement in compulsory improvement and maintenance.

The 1967 publication in Scotland of the Report of the Sub-Committee on Unfit Housing (Scottish Development Department 1967) provided an opportunity for a review of almost twenty years of operation of improvement policy. The Report outlined four main reasons for the disappointing performance of improvement in Scotland. Firstly, there were the inherent difficulties of improving Scottish tenements including problems of multiple ownership and the need to rehouse existing residents as a result of reducing the total amount of accommodation by providing all the standard amenities. The level of grant was felt to be too low to encourage voluntary improvement, especially for private landlords who could only recoup part of their expenditure on improvement through increased rents. A number of local authorities were also ideologically opposed to the whole idea of improvement grants, viewing it as undesirable to spend public money on private property.

In the face of these difficulties, the Report suggested a new 10-point standard of 'satisfactoriness' and the distinction between full and temporary improvement. The latter would try and make slums liveable pending their demolition. For the first time it was recognised that an improvement programme required support from a complementary programme of sustained maintenance and recommended that all the various strands of improvement policy be unified in a single comprehensive Housing Plan. The new Tolerable Standard, increased incentives for rehabilitation and concentration on an area approach would all be part of the new strategy.

The Cullingworth Report formed the basis of a 1968 White Paper (Scottish Development Department 1968) committed to increasing the share of existing housing expenditure allocated to rehabilitation. While total housing investment would remain at the same level, a greater share would be focussed on improvement work, bringing about the desired shift in the traditional balance between clearance and rehabilitation.

Most of these recommendations were taken up in the 1969 Housing Act. The Act represented a major advance in improvement legislation, particularly
the much more explicit area-based orientation of policy in the form of General Improvement Areas. The precedent had been set in the 1968 Housing (Financial Provisions) Act which introduced Housing Treatment Areas and a new system of exchequer subsidies to local authorities to offset part of their costs for improvement. This was the first commitment of central government funds for improvement other than through the payment of improvement grants to private owners.

General Improvement Areas (GIA's) were introduced as a means of concentrating local authority resources in areas of basically sound housing but which lacked basic amenities. They were not supposed to be in areas where deterioration was so advanced that recovery was impossible nor where private market forces alone might be expected to result in spontaneous improvement. Houses in GIA's qualified for an enhanced level of grant-aid and a new grant of £200 per dwelling was introduced to partially offset the costs of general environmental improvement. The emphasis of the Act lay on the stimulation of voluntary improvement with simplified procedures for grant payment, a relaxation of grant conditions and higher grant levels: "persuasion and voluntary action must be the guiding principle in General Improvement Areas" (MHLG Circular 65/69). The maximum amount payable as a standard grant increased to £200 while discretionary grants were renamed improvement grants with a maximum value of £1,000. Approved works of repair and replacement become eligible for grant aid and special grants were introduced for the provision of basic amenities in multi-occupation housing.

As a result of these legislative changes, the volume of improvement work expanded rapidly and, by 1970, approvals for grants to private owners were running at the rate of 115,000 per annum. However, this increased activity resulted in a number of undesirable consequences. Since there were few limiting conditions on the availability of grants and no obligation to repay grants if the property were subsequently sold, grant-aided rehabilitation became highly profitable for property speculators especially during the years of the property boom. Particularly in London this activity resulted in the harassment of tenants and the displacement of existing residents (Shelter 1972). A further impetus to improvement came in 1971 with the introduction of 75% grants for housing in Development and Intermediate Areas. Although these higher rates were introduced as part of a regional policy package rather than for purely housing reasons (they were abandoned after two years), the net result
was to raise the level of grant approved to a peak which has not sub-
sequently been approached. In 1973, 361,000 grants were approved in
England and Wales with a further 93,000 in Scotland.

In view of these developments, the Government asked the Expenditure
Committee to review the operation of the improvement grant system under
the 1969 Act. The review concentrated on identifying who had received
improvement grants, the effect of grant-aid on the nation's housing
stock and whether the objectives of the Act were being fulfilled. Even
the committee found difficulty in defining the basic objective of
improvement policy:

"....improvement is a housing technique which attempts
to meet the needs of existing residents of an area and
prevents the blight of a neighbourhood....as well as
the social disruption of communities caused by the
eventual clearance." (10th Report, Expenditure Committee
1973:iv)

"The major issue of the inquiry has been how to ensure
that the areas of bad housing conditions are improved more
rapidly" (10th Report, Expenditure Committee 1973:xviii)

Only indirectly did the Committee accept that these objectives might
not be compatible. It confirmed the belief that most grants had been
given in circumstances where improvement would have occurred anyway,
a combination of market forces making such investment profitable.
Thus they proposed much stronger powers of local authority compulsory
improvement, virtually a municipalisation of improvement activity,
turning away from the voluntary emphasis which had underpinned all
previous legislation.

In April 1973, two White Papers (Dept. of Environment 1973(a);
Scottish Office 1973) revealed the growing importance of improvement
in the overall context of the Government's housing policy. Both
emphasised the need to widen the choice of tenure, especially owner
occupation, by increasing the availability of house finance for first-
time buyers. This would be achieved within an expenditure level not
expected to rise over the following five years. The White Paper of June
1973 (Dept. of Environment 1973(b); Scottish Development Dept. 1973)
were intended to stimulate the volume of improvement work while making
more selective use of grant-aid to focus on areas of worst housing
conditions. The English version introduced the idea of cellular or
gradual renewal, implying the need for different standards of rehabili-
tation within the overall improvement process. Both favoured the continued
development of area-based strategies and the Scottish version recomm-
edended rateable value conditions to overcome the problem of grant-aid
flowing to better quality housing. It also renamed standard and dis-
cretionary improvement as intermediate and full standard respectively.
For the first time, it was emphasised that improvement should focus on
people rather than housing per se:
"...minimise disruption of existing communities." (SDD 1973:16)

"The Government is concerned to ensure that action taken,...
is in the interests of residents." (Dept. of Environment 1973:7)
These White Papers and the Government's Observations on the Report of
the Expenditure Committee (Dept. of Environment 1974 (a)) formed the
basis of a revised improvement policy presented in the 1974 Housing
Act. In response to the shortcomings of General Improvement Areas,
the Act introduced Housing Action Areas for demolition, improvement or
a mixture of both. Housing Action Areas (HAA's) were defined as fairly
small areas (300 houses) in which housing and social stress combined to
produce conditions not amenable to action under the longer-term GIA
legislation, especially in areas dominated by sub-standard owner
occupied and privately rented accommodation. They were to focus
resources on the worst areas in the hope that they could be rescheduled
GIA's after a concerted attack on immediate conditions.
In physical terms, HAA's were required to have 50% of their houses
below the tolerable standard and/or 50% lacking more than one basic
amenity: each building in the HAA had to contain at least one such
house. In keeping with the identification of areas for priority
treatment, the structure of grant payment was altered in favour of
HAA's : 75% in HAA's, 65% in GIA's and 50% elsewhere. In all cases
these could be increased 15% in cases of 'financial hardship' as
defined by the local authority. Recognising the growing importance of
disrepair, the Act introduced a grant to help solely with the costs of
repairs in GIA's and HAA's. Indeed under the 1978 Housing (Financial
Provisions) (Scotland) Act a house may be included in a HAA solely by
virtue of its need for repair. Eligible expense limits for grants
were raised to £3,200 for improvement, £1,500 for the provision of
basic amenities and £800 for repairs.
The thinking behind the new approach to renewal was outlined in a
series of Circulars signed by the aptly named Mr. Lazarus (Dept. of
Environment Circulars 13/75, 14/75). Gradual renewal would avoid
crash programmes of redevelopment:
"It is a continuous process of minor rebuilding and renovation which sustains and reinforces the vitality of a neighbourhood in ways responsive to social and physical needs as they develop and change." (Dept. of Environment, Circular 13/75: 5.23)

Housing Associations would have a vital role to play as the 'third arm' of housing provision and would be financed through the Housing Corporation by a new Housing Association Grant (HAG). In view of abuses of the 1969 Act, the new legislation introduced a series of conditions on the availability of grant-aid, including rateable value limits for eligibility and certificates of future occupation which bound owners to ensure that property improved with the aid of grant remained occupied by the original residents. If improved property were sold within five years of grant approval, part of the grant would be subject to repayment. Housing Association tenants were subject to 'fair rent' legislation and anyone displaced by Association activity was eligible for home loss compensation under the terms of the 1973 Land Compensation Act.

The new Act identified three major tools for rehabilitation: grants to private owners, local authority powers to compel private landlords to improve or repair and local authority or housing association acquisition and renovation. In each case, the amount of grant payable depended on three factors. Firstly, the local authority had to define the 'allowable works' i.e. the work considered eligible for grant-aid. Since this was subject to the discretion of the local authority, it resulted in variations in the level of grant paid by different authorities for the same work. Secondly, central government set 'eligible expense limits' for the maximum cost of allowable works. Finally, 'appropriate percentages' were calculated i.e. the percentage of work eligible for grant aid which would actually be paid as grant. Again, the percentages were set by central government.

As a result of public expenditure reductions in the 1970's and the reintroduction of conditions on grant availability, the level of house improvement fell dramatically from a peak of over 300,000 in 1973 to just over 100,000 in 1975. Only the growth of public sector improvement helped bolster the total volume of improvement work. In 1979, fewer private sector grants were approved than in years preceding the 1969 Act. Central government moratoria on public housing programmes have hit hard at improvement policy and many authorities and housing associations have neither the resources to implement existing rehabilitation programmes.
not to meet the demand for private improvement grants other than to 
fulfill their statutory regulations. According to plans there should 
currently be half a million houses in HAA's. In June 1980 the figure 
stood at 150,000.

From 1979-82, the Government intend to withdraw £4 billion of 
housing investment; 40% of local authorities are now restricting 
approval of improvement grants, resulting in a 75% reduction in area 
 improvement programmes. Yet recent evidence has suggested that without 
an additional £3½ billion investment in house renewal, one third of the 
pre-1914 housing stock will deteriorate to the point of a crash slum 
clearance programme by the mid 1980's (Planner Nov./Dec.1981). The 
current National House Condition Survey is expected to reveal the 
existence of over 3 million substandard houses and an accelerating rate 
of urban decay requiring an annual programme of renewal or rehabilitation 
of 400,000 units per annum over the next ten years.

"If this goes on we'll see the return of the bulldozer 
with its disastrous social effects. Improvement policies 
are simply failing to keep pace with deterioration."
(Guardian 5/2/82)

One M.P. has recently suggested the need for a programme of 2 million 
home improvements over the next four years, funded by 90% grants.
(Guardian 5/2/82).

Against such a background of accelerating decline and curtailed 
expenditure, the 1980 Housing Act seeks to stimulate improvement, 
emphasising the role of self-help and greater private sector involvement. 
New levels of grant were announced in December 1981 (Roof March/April 
will be £556m although the vast majority of this is for the completion 
of work already approved, leaving only £37m for new programmes of 
building and rehabilitation (Guardian 20/1/82).

It is perhaps too early to comment on the impact of the 1980 Act. 
But it has been suggested that the repeal of the condition of grant 
repayment if a property is sold within five years of improvement will 
provide a recipe for gentrification and property speculation of the 
type witnessed under the 1969 Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>27,853</td>
<td>7,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>32,846</td>
<td>16,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>70,279</td>
<td>22,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>43,973</td>
<td>24,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>25,195</td>
<td>8,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>35,916</td>
<td>7,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>56,732</td>
<td>7,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>46,217</td>
<td>8,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>37,541</td>
<td>10,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>25,120</td>
<td>12,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (1st Quarter)</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Scottish Development Department 1981: 23,25)

Figure 4  Scotland: Number of Dwellings subject to Grant-aided Improvement
Chapter 4

THE STUDY AREA

4.1 The Dennistoun area (Fig. 5) is well defined both physically and in terms of its characteristics when compared to the immediately surrounding locale. To the west, it is bounded by the Necropolis Hill and an area of mixed industrial land use dominated by the factories of Tennent-Caledonian Breweries and W.D. and H.O. Wills Limited. The northern boundary is marked by the line of Alexandra Parade, formerly a major east-west thoroughfare through the east end of the city but now overshadowed by the M8 Glasgow-Edinburgh motorway further to the north. Although located to the north of Alexandra Parade, Milnbank has been included in the study area as it shares many of the improvement characteristics of the area further south. In the east, the northeast-southwest trending line of Cumbernauld Road separates the two communities of North Dennistoun and Haghill and, despite traditional rivalries between the two, Haghill has been included in the study area as indeed it is in the Local Plan which covers part of the area. To the south, the lines of Gallowgate and the Glasgow-Coatbridge railway act as clear physical divides. Major lines of communication cut east-west through the area separating a dense grid network of internal streets. Duke Street has successfully retained its function as a major neighbourhood shopping centre as witnessed by the recent opening of a Safeway Superstore.

Perhaps more important than Dennistoun's physical characteristics are its location and its unique character in terms of the wider east end locale. As the map indicates, Dennistoun lies just east of the city centre sandwiched between areas of nineteenth century industrial and residential land use. As in many West European Industrial cities, the city centre has tended to expand westwards into areas of formerly middle and upper income housing while the eastern sector has come to be regarded as something of a twilight area of mixed land use. However, Dennistoun stands out as an exception to the traditional pattern of inner east end stagnation and decline. It has indeed been called an "island in the east end" distinctly different from other parts of the east end, many of which now fall within the GEAR area. It had in 1971, for example, the sixth highest level of owner occupation of any Glasgow ward, in strong contrast to the virtual domination of local authority housing in much of the rest of the east end.
It has had a somewhat peculiar history of development and part of it comprises the only conservation district in the eastern half of the city. As noted previously, the West European industrial city has tended to develop its better residential accommodation in the west end resulting in a social polarisation clearly marked by an east-west spatial divide. Glasgow is a fine example. Middle and upper income residential expansion occurred in the west end, associated with the development of cultural facilities like the University and the Botanic Gardens. However, a number of speculative developers did attempt to develop in other directions. On the south side of the river, Messrs. Laurie and Harley attempted to develop middle-class residential suburbs in the areas of Gorbals and Laurieston. For a variety of reasons this south side development never succeeded. Dennistoun is, in many ways, the Woodlands or Laurieton of the east end, although never as successful as the former nor subject to the decline of the latter. It is interesting how a number of these early up-market areas have subsequently become prominent in the city's programme of rehabilitation.

In the 1830's, John Reid, a wealthy Glasgow merchant, purchased several estates in the east end of the city with the intention of creating a new model residential suburb southeast of Glasgow Cathedral. (Black and Whyte 1975). The plans were never fulfilled and, after Reid's death in 1851, his estates were acquired by a city banker Alexander Dennistoun, whose own home was at nearby Golfhill. Dennistoun undertook to implement Reid's scheme and engaged a leading city architect of the time, James Salmon, to draw up a feuing plan. Salmon's plan was to combine Dennistoun's and Reid's properties into a single 200 acre site of drives, crescents, terraces and villas creating the new suburb of Dennistoun. Construction began in 1860 and many of the early streets were named after the pre-existing estates of members of the Dennistoun family.

But by the 1870's, two factors had combined to undermine further development in Dennistoun. Firstly, as in Laurieston, the middle classes did not respond to Dennistoun's speculative development, preferring the leafy and fragrant environs of the west end to the industrial nuisance of the east. In addition, the rapid development of heavy industry in the east end and the associated need for labour in close proximity led to a burgeoning demand for land for working-class housing. Salmon's plan for a suburb of elegant villas and terraced squares was largely abandoned and only four of the original blocks were
completed (Seton, Oakley, Clayton and Broompark Terraces) with a number of individual villas in Circus Drive, Westercraigs and Craigpark. From 1870 the new model residential suburb was blanketed under a rigid grid-iron pattern of above average quality tenement blocks. The distinction between the two areas is still evident and provides a further point of interest in the study of improvement activity.

The Dennistoun Conservation Area, designated by the Secretary of State in 1975, covers much of the original area of Salmon's plan and comprises two-storey sandstone villas set in large gardens intermixed with terraces facing into grassed squares. Building of special architectural interest are Blackfriars Parish Church in Westercraigs and the Assembly Hall in Craigpark. The Conservation Area carries a Category C classification in terms of its architectural and historical significance.

Since the early years of this century Dennistoun has partly shared in the decline of inner city areas in general and the east end of Glasgow in particular. During the 1960's it escaped the worst excesses of the comprehensive Development Area approach to slum clearance and renewal, largely because its housing was of a higher standard than in surrounding areas. Under the city's 1965 Development Plan, Duke Street was to become a major radial traffic route necessitating the relocation of retailing activity to Bellgrove. However, by 1974 attention had switched to the Gallowgate because of a desire to retain Duke Street as a major retail focus for the inner east end and the preponderance of high quality, nineteenth century tenements and facades. In terms of housing tenure, the area retained its distinction from surrounding areas although, as in other inner city neighbourhoods, dominance of the private rented sector was replaced by dominance of owner occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 6</th>
<th>House Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,019</td>
<td>7,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Matheson 1978: 128)

Today the area is, somewhat inexplicably, covered by two Local Plans: Dennistoun and North Dennistoun - Haghill. The former is much the smaller with an area of 21.4 hectares and a 1977 population of 4,860. By 1983 it is projected that population will have declined by 39% since
the 1971 Census and a further decline of 10% is expected within the next ten or fifteen years. Large as this fall has been it is not as great as a number of adjacent areas subject to redevelopment.

The Report of Survey (Glasgow District Council 1977) outlines three main objectives for the area:

To promote Duke Street as a district shopping centre
To improve the Residential environment
To improve community facilities suitable for a district centre

The local plan area comprises two distinct areas of housing. South of Duke Street the property is tenemental with 1,148 dwellings in Housing Action Areas supervised by Reidvale Housing Association. Rehabilitation work is expected to be completed by 1984/5 at which time the number of dwellings will have been reduced to 900 as a result of amalgamations. North of Duke Street much of the housing is above the standard at which Housing Action Area designation is possible, including parts of the area of terraces and villas within the Conservation Area. Both areas have a high percentage of owner-occupied and privately rented accommodation compared to the Glasgow average although two divergent trends are occurring in terms of their tenure pattern. South of Duke Street, the owner occupied and privately rented sector are in decline as a result of the municipalisation of stock under the improvement programme of Reidvale Housing Association. North of Duke Street, however, the owner-occupied sector is growing at the expense of the privately rented: "This is the direct result of sale by landlords for owner occupation" (Glasgow District Council 1977 : 6).

The area as a whole is characterised by a mismatch of household and house size. There is a large percentage of one and two apartment dwellings compared to the city average (92% in South Dennistoun) yet only about half of these will be required by future residents. Conversely, the present population requires some 400 two/three bedroom houses yet, before rehabilitation work commenced, only 215 such units existed.

The North Dennistoun-Haghill Local Plan area is much larger than its southern neighbour, covering an area of 218 hectares with a 1980 population of 17,401. From 1971-9, population declined by 5,900 or 3% per annum compared with annual losses of 7% and 1.3% for GEAR and Glasgow respectively. Projections suggest stability or modest increase of population to 18,170 in 1984. Despite population loss average household size has remained fairly constant at 2.62 persons, reflecting
a 25\% decline in the number of households and a reduction of 27.4\% in the number of addresses appearing in the Valuation Rolls. The area is marked by a lower vacancy rate than the city average indicating higher market demand; in October 1973, 98.3\% of houses were occupied. The current population is characterised by a lower percentage of young people and a higher percentage of retired persons than the city average. Households in the study area tend to be smaller reflecting the population structure and the size distribution of accommodation units.

The tenure structure of North Denniston-Haghill is the reverse of that for the city as a whole: 2/3 in the private sector and 1/3 in the public. The private sector is dominated by owner occupation but even the private rented sector is considerably larger than the city norm. From 1971-9, the public sector increased from 25\% to 37\% of the stock although this was mainly due to the clearance of privately owned or rented accommodation rather than a result of new-build public housing. It is expected that the 1984 housing stock will be 6,841 units, an increase of 177 over the 1979 figure. This will however be a net figure, comprising an increase of 415 units through new-build and the loss of 115 units through demolition and a further 123 due to rehabilitation carried out by Milnbank Housing Association. Projected tenure changes from 1979-84 will not result in any significant alternation to the existing pattern which is, as stressed earlier, almost unique for the inner east end of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 7</th>
<th>Changes in House Tenure, 1979-1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>1979-84 Change (No.) 1984 stock No. 1984 stock % 1979 stock %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>+242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Special Housing Association</td>
<td>+130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>+253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>+177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Glasgow District Council 1980:27)
Figure 8 indicates the existing provision of housing in this part of the study area.

97.5% of the units are flatted with only 2.5% either detached or terraced. The latter are almost exclusively (85%) located in the Conservation Area. Of the area's 4,400 tenement dwellings, 36% fail to meet the tolerable standard and within the designated Housing Action Areas for improvement it is expected that some 25% of the existing stock will be lost during rehabilitation. Even if there were no vacancies after rehabilitation was completed the loss of \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the stock would represent a substantial loss of population as a direct result of improvement.

56% of the population are of working age, a figure comparable with the Glasgow average but much higher than that of neighbouring GEAR. Unemployment rates are slightly below the city average and economic activity rates slightly higher. The employment structure in 1978 was dominated by manufacturing employment, especially food, drink and tobacco, although distribution and service employment accounted for some 23% of those employed. When individual Standard Industrial Classes are considered, food/drink/tobacco and other manufacturing are ranked first and second respectively with 47% and 14% of the working population. Surprisingly, the third largest industrial class was Professional/Scientific Services with 11% of the workforce. Levels of car ownership are similar to the Glasgow average (0.25 cars/household) except in the area bounded by Craigpark, Alexandra Parade, Armadale Street and Duke Street (i.e. the Conservation Area) which had a 1971 rate of 0.6 cars/household. These figures suggest that, as in the case of house tenure, the study area is sufficiently different from its surrounds to warrant more detailed examination.

4.3 It is necessary to sketch here the origins of improvement in Dennistoun, its scale and the current actors. Until 1969 Glasgow Corporation viewed clearance as the solution to the city's housing problem. Along with the defects noted previously, clearance tended to be a somewhat self-regenerating process largely because of the technology of clearance and the associated scheduling of programme activity. As soon as the intention to clear was confirmed, both routine maintenance and the granting of local authority home loans ceased. In combination these had the result of intensifying the structural deterioration of existing housing and discouraging possible inmovers. Intensification of the downward spiral made demolition inevitable, although often for a different set of reasons than those originally identified.
Figure 8 North Dennistoun/Haghill: Existing Housing Provision (GDC 1980:16)
In the late 1960's, three events focussed attention even more actively on the need to consider a change in emphasis away from clearance towards the rehabilitation of the existing stock. The publication of the Cullingworth Report (Scottish Development Dept. 1967) revealed an unfitness problem much worse than had been realised and recommended increasing the share of housing expenditure allocated to rehabilitation. The Glasgow storm of 1968 wreaked enormous damage on the city and revealed a hitherto unmet responsibility of the local authority to ensure decent housing conditions for residents of the private sector. Structural damage caused by the storm was particularly severe in areas of tenemental housing characterised by high levels of owner occupation and private renting. Of the £8 million the Corporation spent on 'mopping-up' operations, nearly £6½ million went to private sector property, breaking with the city's traditional political animosity towards that sector. Finally, the implementation of the 1969 Housing (Scotland) Act provided the first real opportunity for area-based improvement.

The combination of these events resulted in 1970 in the formation of a House Improvement and Clearance Section within the Corporation of the City of Glasgow. As a new department with only a vague idea of its role and objectives, the Improvement Section instigated a survey of the city's housing stock assisted by an architect seconded from the Scottish Office. The survey focussed on areas already earmarked for clearance under the city's Comprehensive Development Area programme, the so-called 'white areas' of the 1965 Development Plan. The city had already undertaken a number of experimental improvement projects itself, most notably the Old Swan Project in Pollokshaws. While such projects proved that, with sufficient time, the Corporation was capable of successful renovation, it became obvious that the financial and social costs were high, perhaps as high as those associated with clearance. Municipalisation of the stock with the rehousing of original residents elsewhere and little prospect of their eventual return was not the answer. A catalyst or third force was required to promote an alternative means of implementing improvement work. That catalyst emerged in the form of an organisation called ASSIST.

ASSIST is a unit of the Department of Architecture at Strathclyde University, founded by Raymond Young (now Chairman of the Housing Corporation in Scotland) and combining practice, research and teaching. It operates as a non-profit architectural practice and in designing rehabilitation schemes normally works from local offices, ensuring
close contact with the community and allowing immediate and personal
contact with the client organisation, e.g. local housing associations.
ASSIST's earliest work was in tenemental improvement in Taransay
Street, Govan. The success of this locally-based project suggested
a possible way forward for the city's improvement programme as a
whole through the development of community-based improvement schemes
although this was not to reach full fruition until the burgeoning
growth of Housing Associations following the 1974 Housing Act.

There seems to be no particular rationale behind the Improvement
Section's choice of Dennistoun as an area for early improvement activity.
In 1969, the city's Planning Department carried out a house survey, by
ward, which revealed some 110,000 units below the Tolerable Standard.
Coding the results of the survey by city street-blocks and allocating
subjective weightings for different points of the tolerable standard,
it proved possible to develop a rough and ready indicator for deciding
between areas for clearance and areas for rehabilitation. When this
methodology was subsequently abandoned, the decision rule became an
ad hoc combination of the percentage of below tolerable standard units
and the level of pre-1968 rates. The latter figure was used because
amenity value was taken into account for rating purposes before this
date. The new indicator provided a crude league table of house
conditions which identified the old nineteenth century burgh cores
which had become part of the city proper through urban expansion as
being in the worst condition.

Dennistoun did not rank too badly on either of these indicators.
However, at the time the Corporation were searching for areas in which
to experiment in rehabilitation work, local pressure from Dennistoun
residents succeeded in bringing the area to the attention of the
Improvement Section. In 1973 the local community worker, Ashok Ohri,
initiated the Reidvale Residents' Association. A sub-committee was
formed to press for the designation of Reidvale as a Housing Action
Area for improvement which resulted in the 1974 formation of the
community-based Reidvale Housing Association. Subsequent pressure
resulted in the setting up of Milnbank Housing Association in the
northern part of the study area. Through the Reidvale Residents'
Association, a request was made to the Corporation for assistance in
a programme of tenement backcourt improvements. The Improvement Section
were anxious to take advantage of this early opportunity to apply the
ASSIST model of rehabilitation and assistance was made available for the scheme as an open demonstration of local authority interest and commitment. Under pressure from the success of the back-court scheme and the stimulation of local interest and aspirations, the Corporation felt committed to expand the rehabilitation programme in Dennistoun. While there was little rationalisation at the time in the choice of Dennistoun, the programme had to move rapidly to ensure that the option to retain existing housing was not lost due to further physical deterioration.

To-day there is a considerable degree of improvement activity in Dennistoun both in the form of private improvement grants and the work of the area's Housing Associations. One of the two District Council Environmental Improvement Pilot Projects is located in the block bounded by Finlay Drive, Armadale Street, Garthland Drive and Whitehill Street. In addition, various areas of public housing, within the study area fall within the scope of the District Council's modernisation programme. Since November 1979 council tenants have also been eligible for special Tenants Grants to cover improvements to kitchens, bathrooms and heating (Planning Exchange 1981). The majority of private improvement grants have been for the provision of standard amenities although some conversion grants have been paid for the larger villas within the Conservation Area. The Private Sector section of the Housing Department, the section responsible for the approval and monitoring of grants currently views the Dennistoun housing problem as mainly one of repairs. Thus in 1978, a large part of Dennistoun became a 'Repairs Area'. Although this designation has no statutory basis, eligible applicants may receive repairs grants of up to 50% of the costs and there is a free environmental improvement grant for stonecleaning and back court improvements. Much of this work has been carried out through the office of ASSIST located in Dennistoun. The District Council have also recently introduced a Shops Repair Scheme under which independent traders can apply for financial loans to carry out improvements in areas where the Council is promoting or supporting rehabilitation.
Chapter 5
METHODOLOGY

5.1 Very little work has been done on the development of a suitable methodology for the study of the social impact of improvement activity. Part of the dissertation has therefore been devoted to formulating such a methodology, identifying available sources of data and gaps in existing information. While the methodology finally derived is by no means perfect, it is hoped that it will serve as a basis for future work by highlighting what research is and is not possible with existing data and where the collection and regular monitoring of other data would be of greatest assistance.

Before examining the methodology in greater detail, it is necessary to clarify what exactly is being attempted. The hypothesis is that improvement activity results in a reduction in the provision of accommodation in a given area due to the amalgamation of existing units into larger ones. For example, in the Reidvale area of Dennistoun it is projected that some 25% of existing units will be lost due to rehabilitation. It is further hypothesised that such a decline will inevitably be associated with a loss of population. These hypotheses generate a number of research questions:

What level of population loss is associated with rehabilitation?

Do the benefits of rehabilitation flow to existing residents or newcomers?

Where do those who move out go? Why? What are their post-move housing conditions?

Where do in-movers come from?

How socially disruptive is the above process?

It is possible to approach these questions in a variety of ways. Census data can be used to give a statistical picture of the study area and comparison of successive census results can reveal some of the answers to the above. However there is always a danger that statistical generalisation may mask certain changes especially if they are difficult to isolate:

"....the degree of social change which can be attributed to improvement programmes is something which is not easy or even perhaps possible to measure. Any such measurement would have to disentangle the effect of improvement from patterns of change due to other factors"

(House of Commons, Expenditure Committee 1973: 194)
In addition, the ten year lag between censuses is often too coarse for isolating subtler change. Thus while census materials provide a necessary basis for such studies they are alone inadequate. For this reason displacement studies tend to be based on a questionnaire survey rather than on statistical generalisations for given neighbourhoods.

The questionnaire survey approach is however fraught with a number of difficulties. In outline, the process seems fairly simple. Ideally, a displacement survey consists of three distinct phases. Firstly a blanket household survey is carried out for every unit in the study area. After a certain period of time has elapsed (and there is much disagreement as to what time is suitable!) a second blanket survey is carried out of the same addresses. This would identify those addresses where a change of occupancy occurred. The third phase of the survey would be to trace outmovers to their new location to learn where they had gone, why and the condition of their new accommodation. Comparison of in- and out-movers and the reasons for the move would allow a decision to be made on the occurrence or non-occurrence of displacement.

There are two major problems with this approach. It would require a great deal of surveying: blanket coverage for, say, Dennistoun would involve 6,500 individual household surveys. In addition, many of the moves identified may have been for reasons completely unrelated to improvement work. It is obvious that some sampling technique must be employed but not even the choice of sampling framework is as straightforward as it seems.

In general, questionnaire analysis in the social sciences makes use of random sampling techniques. However, it is felt that for studies of displacement this is an inadequate and misleading way to generate a sampling framework. In displacement studies the major emphasis is on identifying those properties where displacement may have occurred while a purely random sample would be desirable for subsequent statistical analysis of interview results, it would not necessarily include those properties where displacement was most likely to have occurred. This could well result in an under-estimation of the level of displacement in the study area. Thus the sample requires to be drawn in a way which is more closely related to the objectives of the study.

A further complication relates to the time-period under study. Very little is known about how long it takes for displacement to occur
and the arbitrary choice of beginning and end points for the survey would be unlikely to match exactly the duration of the process. This is a particularly acute problem when one objective of the study is to provide public policy makers with indicators of early displacement activity. To a large extent the temporal problem is unresolved and in most studies the time-period is determined as much by intuition and the availability of data than by a clear understanding of the critical stages of the displacement process.

In selecting the survey sample this dissertation makes use of the distribution of improvement grants as a sampling framework for the identification of possible cases of displacement (McCarthy 1975; Hamnett 1973; Kersley 1974). Although doubts have been raised as to the suitability of using improvement grants in this way, they are used here in the absence of a more suitable surrogate. They do at least provide a more manageable sample than a simple listing of changes in occupancy. However, they fail completely to identify any improvement work which may have been carried out without improvement grants. There is no systematic recording of either the location or volume of non grant-aided improvement and indeed virtually nothing is known on the national level about the relative significance of grant versus non grant-aided work. This is a continuing shortfall in existing data.

Even when the sample has been selected, the actual process of surveying is by no means an easy matter. The survey itself may conveniently be divided into an on-site stage (existing residents) and an off-site stage (former residents). The on-site stage is, supposedly, the most straightforward. Having identified the property on which an improvement grant has been paid, the name of the existing resident is found from the Valuation Roll and a survey is carried out.

It is the off-site stage, the tracing of former residents, that provides the most severe methodological difficulties. To begin with, all that is available is an address for which an improvement grant has been approved. Where the date of grant approval is also available, examination of the Valuation Roll for the relevant year provides the name of the resident at that time. Comparison of the name of former and existing resident reveals whether a change of occupancy has occurred since payment of the grant. Indeed in this dissertation a similar comparison is also made for the year immediately preceding payment of the grant.
Where a change of occupancy has occurred, how is the former resident traced? This is the most difficult part of the survey process associated with displacement studies. All that the researcher has is a name and a former address. There are a number of possible sources which might result in the successful tracking down of a former resident and each is useful in different circumstances. But there is no single source which can be tapped and therefore the whole process is slow and rather messy with inconsistencies, overlaps and peculiarities among the various listings.

Where the outmover has been rehoused by the local authority, there is at least the possibility of finding a forwarding address. Outwith the public sector, which is after all only \( \frac{1}{3} \) of the Dennistoun stock, this is much more problematical. For owner occupied transactions, the Register of Sasines provides a record of buyer and seller names for each transaction but there is of course no forwarding address for the seller. Assuming the out-mover remained in the owner occupied sector, tracing would require a scan of the relevant sections of the Register searching for a single name amongst many hundreds. Where the move out is into the private rented sector there is no formal recording of it at all. Thus in many cases various surrogate listings must be used: old and new telephone directories, Post Office forwarding addresses, Valuation Rolls, knowledge of existing residents and neighbours about former occupants.

Frequently this data is inadequate or out of date and people may have moved on again after the original move. As a result of these difficulties, the percentage of persons successfully traced is generally low. In addition, the time taken to identify who is to be surveyed and their current location is often excessive in terms of the time available for the rest of the research. Both difficulties have been encountered in this study. At each stage of the survey process, the problems proved increasingly intractable and eventually the questionnaire approach was abandoned. While this was unfortunate it did not undermine the basic objective of the study. Indeed preliminary results of the analysis suggest that only a very small number of outmovers could be identified, let alone interviewed.

In the absence of large numbers of individual questionnaire results, it proved necessary to make use of a number of sources of secondary data. It is still felt that even this data sheds important light on the impact of improvement on population movement as it will still prove possible to describe movement in and out of Dennistoun and to
relate these patterns to improvement activity as indicated by the
distribution of improvement grants.

5.2

Six main sources of secondary data were used in the study.
(a) Census: A number of the problems associated with the use of
census material have already been noted but it does still
represent a major source of both demographic and socio-economic data.
The 1971 census is now ten years out of date and the more detailed
results of the 1981 census are not expected before April 1982.
However, various attempts have been made to update the data
contained in the census and, where possible, this more current data
has been used. In Strathclyde region, the 1976 sample household survey
and the annual update of the electoral register provide further sources
of data. In addition, basic data for the City of Glasgow was available
on computer file by 100 meter grid square from a previous research
project carried out at Glasgow University. Unfortunately, there were
inevitable discrepancies between both the basic spatial units used
for data collection and presentation and the subject matter covered
in these additional sources.

(b) As a result of work undertaken by the Department of Town and
Regional Planning, Glasgow University for the Central Research Unit
of the Scottish Development Department (SDD/CRU 1980) data was also
available relating to intra-urban migration in Greater Glasgow. The
data related mainly to the 1971 Census and to housing information
compiled for 1974. It was compiled from an examination of local
authority records and the Register of Sasines and provides a useful
picture of movement within the public and owner occupied sectors.
However, the data set is particularly weak in terms of movement in the
private rented sector which is a not insignificant part of the
Dennistoun stock. Only movement within the Greater Glasgow area is
recorded. This is particularly troublesome since a considerable
proportion of the movement into owner occupation is associated with
suburbs immediately adjacent to but outwith the city boundary. The
data was again available by 100 meter grid square and it proved
possible to isolate the Dennistoun area and abstract details of in-
and out-movement. Although not tied to an individual address, the data
provided origins and destinations for each move and information on
family size, household characteristics and housing conditions.
Further data relating to the study area was abstracted from a data bank collected in connection with a study of the 'cheaper end' of the housing market in Glasgow (Maclennan 1975). The following information in particular was available:

i) the distribution, type and value of improvement grants in Glasgow from 1975-80. This was available by both 100 meter grid square and individual address. Unfortunately given the tenemental character of much of Dennistoun's housing stock, the individual addresses gave only the street name and number and it proved impossible to identify which flat on which floor had actually been subject to improvement without cross-checking from another source.

ii) the numbers of owner occupied transactions and their average value for 1972 and 1980.


The District Council provided two different types of data. Contact with the Planning Department produced basic updated demographic and socio-economic data collected as part of the preparation of the two Local Plans which cover the study area. The private sector division of the Housing Department is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of improvement grants and access to their files aided confirmation of the precise location of approved grants. Unfortunately it is section policy to hold files for only five years and all information relating to grants approved in 1975, 1976 and 1977 have been destroyed. In addition, many of the files relating to 1980 had been forwarded to the Scottish Development Department in Edinburgh to be recorded in a central register of grant approvals and were thus not available for inspection.

The data outlined in (c) above did at least provide an address which had been subject to an improvement grant. While awaiting confirmation of the precise flat involved, it was decided to make use of the Valuation Rolls to identify the owners, residents and rateable values of all properties listed in the original file even although it was known that not all of these had been affected by improvement. The same data was collected for the years immediately preceding and following the year of grant approval. This resulted in the collation of a considerable amount of data on changes in occupancy and, while not necessarily related to improvement, was a valuable update sample.
of the 1974 migration study and a further indication of population movement associated with the study area.

(f) Contact with Reidvale Housing Association produced information on former residents. When a resident moves out of Association property, a note to that effect is entered in the resident's file and this is then stored separately along with those of other ex-residents. Examination of these files revealed that in certain cases both a forwarding address and the reason for the move had been recorded. All cases involving referral to the local authority for rehousing were listed along with the new address. The major weakness of the data was for those who moved out into the private sector and very little information was available for such movers. The Housing Association also provided an analysis of those moving into the Reidvale area and those who had applied to move in. The information comprised the geographic location of both groups and a breakdown of the reasons given for moving.

Understandably, the Housing Association were not in favour of their former tenants being subject to individual questionnaire survey. While this was unfortunate, the Housing Association files providing the largest single source of addresses for outmovers, it was felt that the analysis carried out by the Association and discussions with the staff revealed perhaps as much as the survey would have done. It should be remembered that Reidvale is only one part of Dennistoun and that conclusions drawn there might not be applicable for other parts of Dennistoun less affected by Housing Association rehabilitation.

Despite the failure to carry out the kind of individual questionnaire survey originally envisaged, it is felt that these six sources of data provide as comprehensive an information system as could have been achieved within the time constraints of the dissertation. Even the identification of existing deficiencies in the data available should be of use in subsequent research.
Chapter 6

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The results are derived from combining the various sources of data described in the methodology chapter. Before summarising the result, it will be necessary to examine each data set individually.

6.1 Housing Department: Improvement Grant Files

From September 1975 to May 1980, 125 improvement grants were approved in the study area at an average value of £592.

Figure 9 Value of Improvement Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ 0-100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-250</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,000</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean was somewhat skewed by two grants considerably in excess of £1,000: £13,750 and £6,300 respectively. Both of these were associated with the conversion of larger properties into self-contained flats rather than improvement per se. However the mode of the distribution was £500-1,000 and more than 50% of all grants approved were for sums in excess of this lower limit.

It also proved possible to identify the type of work for which grant-aid was paid.

Figure 10 Work undertaken with the aid of Improvement Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom facilities</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen facilities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 252* 100

* Does not add to 125 due to single grant being used for several different improvements.
It is evident that private improvement grants in Dennistoun are used for three main purposes: provision of basic amenities, electrical re-wiring, structural repairs. When viewed against the average value of grant payment, the typical works carried out are hardly characteristic of the more costly and comprehensive rehabilitation associated with gentrification. However it is equally evident that the scale of private improvement activity is not insignificant and, when added to the volume of Housing Association rehabilitation, affects a large proportion of the housing stock and the resident population.

Because of the limitations of the data set noted earlier, it was possible only to precisely identify 47 units which had been subject to grant-aid from 1977-80. Since it was hypothesised that improvement stimulated housing market activity and thus accelerated rates of in and out-movement, Valuation Rolls were examined to discover whether properties affected by improvement had experienced a change of occupancy either before or after grant approval. It is of course difficult to decide on an appropriate time-scale for the consideration of pre- and post-improvement occupancy. A date too far in the past may reveal a change of occupancy which has nothing whatsoever to do with improvement. Similarly, for more recent improvement grants, insufficient time may have passed for any change of occupancy to occur. It was arbitrarily decided to collect occupancy data relating to the years immediately preceding and following grant approval. This certainly eased the identification of those who moved out during rehabilitation but whether the passing of a single year is sufficient to adequately characterise any resulting in-movers is more problematic.

In 14 (30%) of the 47 cases identified, a change of occupancy did indeed occur either immediately before or after grant approval. Of course the fact that a change of occupancy occurred in a property subject to improvement does not necessarily mean that the two are causally related. It was therefore decided that the best way of examining the reasons behind the change of occupancy was by individual questionnaire survey of the 14 households identified as in-movers. This, of course, posed a further problem. While the 1981 occupant of a property receiving a grant in 1980 might reasonably still be expected to stay at the same address, this need not be so for grants approved in earlier years. In fact this proved to be the case for 6 of the earlier grants. In such cases the 1981 Valuation Roll was used
to identify the existing occupants and an attempt was made to carry out a survey with them as they also counted as in-movers into improved property. Even use of the 1981 Valuation Roll proved several entries to be out of date, people moving between 1981 and 1982. Where the name of a former resident was available, an attempt was made to trace their current whereabouts but, as noted previously, this proved such a time-consuming and, frankly, fruitless exercise that it was decided to concentrate on the survey of in-movers, gathering information on out-movers from other sources (Appendix 1).

To increase the sampling framework, it was decided to include all residents of properties in which an individual flat had been improved. As any change of occupancy identified in these would not be due directly to improvement, it would provide a control group allowing comparison of movement associated with both improvement and non-improvement. Those moving into unimproved property could be surveyed as part of the wider sample of in-movers. The size of this additional sample and the degree of occupancy change it exhibited are as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Occupancy Change (No.)</th>
<th>Occupancy Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sept.) 1975</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May) 1980</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, the improvement grant sample had a change of occupancy rate of 30% while the non-grant sample had a rate of 21%. This would indicate that improvement has resulted in a higher level of in-movement than experienced in the control group.

16 surveys were completed with in-movers: 5 with those affected by grant-aid and 11 control. The very small number of successfully completed questionnaires throws doubt on the general applicability of the results but it is felt that they at least indicate some of the major characteristics of in-movers.
### Figure 12 Characteristics of Inmovers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affected by Improvement Grant</th>
<th>Not Affected by Improvement Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence (Yrs)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure: Owner occupied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of head of household (Yrs)</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Rooms</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Tenure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Rooms</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for move:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for owner occupation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better post-move conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show the dominance of owner occupation amongst in-movers when compared to the former tenure. For both groups the move to Dennistoun is associated with a particular tenure shift. Indeed, a number of residents gave this as the primary reason for their move. The two other major reasons for movement were changed family status (often young couples setting up their first home) and the need for more space, both associated with changing stages of the family life-cycle. Inmoving households tend to be fairly small with younger heads of households as would be expected from the above. 50% of moves originated locally while the other half were from local authority estates in the eastern part of the city. The vast majority of inmovers felt that their housing conditions had improved as a result of their move. The limited data available did not suggest any marked difference in the characteristics of those moving into improved or unimproved property.
6.2 Reidvale Housing Association

Care must be exercised in analysing data collected from the Housing Association. Firstly, the Association covers only a small part of the wider study area and its characteristics cannot be directly applied to the larger spatial unit. In addition, there are obvious differences between rehabilitation work carried out under the auspices of a Housing Association and that undertaken with the assistance of private improvement grants. Under the terms of a Rehousing Agreement, the District Council is responsible for rehousing anyone displaced as a result of improvement. A problem encountered by the Association has been the acquisition of property from existing owner occupiers and private factors and naturally some resentment has been generated between the groups about the level of stock municipalisation. It proved possible to identify where outmovers went and, in a few cases, why, although the available data was not unexpectedly much stronger for those who moved into local authority housing than into or within the private sector.

The in-mover data is also subject to limitations. Reasons given in support of applications to move into Association properties are as expressed by applicants themselves and may not be entirely accurate.

Analysis of the results falls into two discrete sections.

(a) Out-movers: Of 331 out-movers (1978-80), only 108 (33%) had a forwarding address known by the Housing Association. Of these, 81 (75%) were rehoused by Glasgow District Council, and 16 (15%) privately. The destination of the 108 out-movers were as shown below:
Of note is the high percentage of non-local moves (30%) across the River Clyde. Most previous research has emphasised the barrier function of the river in terms of household movement. However, the moves to Rutherglen and Cambuslang are to south side areas closest to Dennistoun and to areas of recent local authority building. The popularity of the Dennistoun area with existing residents is obvious with over half of movers finding accommodation in the immediately surrounding area.

The Housing Association could only provide very sketchy data on the reasons behind out-movement. Discussions with employees of the Housing Association suggested two main reasons for out-movement. Most of those who moved out into the public sector did so because the Housing Association were unable to provide them with the right size of post-rehabilitation housing. In contrast, those moving out into the private sector viewed the prospect of sale to the Housing Association as an opportunity to obtain the market value for their house and move onwards and upwards. This was especially the case for young couples who had only recently moved into the property and now found that, with the prospect of family formation, a move to larger accommodation was desirable.

One point should be emphasised here. Once the rehabilitation is completed, the Housing Association is required to offer first refusal of the improved unit to the original resident who will have been decanted into local vacant housing pending completion of the work. It is only when the original resident indicates that he does not wish to continue tenancy and no other existing resident expresses an interest that the unit is available for re-letting. This obviously places great emphasis on the role of the Housing Association.
as allocator and landlord (Brailey 1981). In most cases the District Council retain the right to nominate up to 50% of the tenants for vacant units.

(b) In-movers: The in-mover data comes from an analysis of applications held by the Housing Association from people wanting to move into improved Association property. The data breaks down conveniently into two sets:

(i) Applicants without local connection. During the period for which data was available, the Housing Association received 447 applications to move into improved property. 330 (74%) of these were from persons without a local connection. However the location of these applicants still provides an indication of the distribution of demand for Reidvale accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Applicants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (local housing management office area)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Estates</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Easterhouse)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Glasgow District</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table quite clearly shows that the major source of demand is from within the inner east end itself and from a wedge stretching outwards to the eastern boundary of the city. Of especial interest are the large number of applications from the peripheral estates, particularly Easterhouse. Although no information is available on the tenure distribution of the applicants, it does seem fairly clear from their location that most are from persons currently living in local authority schemes in the eastern part of the city. If this is so, then improved inner city accommodation is attractive to a number of existing residents of the peripheral states. Such a trend might of course
Simply exacerbate the problems of the latter.

Figure 15 attempts to classify the reasons given in support of such applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be near work</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with existing accommodation/area</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed marital situation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest single group referred to dissatisfaction with existing housing. In view of the geographic distribution of applicants and their probable tenure distribution, this reaffirms the problems associated with some local authority estates, especially on the periphery. 7% noted a desire to be closer to their place of work, reflecting the shortage of job opportunities in the vicinity of the peripheral estates and the expense of daily travel to work from the edge of the conurbation by costly public transport. A further 13% listed changed marital status, mostly young married couples seeking their first home.

(ii) Applicants with a local connection. For a variety of reasons the Housing Association possess a number of vacant units once rehabilitation work is concluded. Although they do not operate an official waiting list, they do retain a file of application letters for improved property. Figure 16 outlines the spatial distribution of the 117 applications with local connections from September, 1977 to November, 1981.
Figure 16  Location of Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Local</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easterhouse</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possilpark</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwith Glasgow district</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dennistoun, mid East Housing Management Office Area.*

Once again the dominance of east end locations is evident with almost a fifth of applications from Easterhouse and the results confirm the pattern of distribution of demand for Reidvale property identified for unsuccessful applicants. The most notable differences between the two groups are the reasons given in support of applications. 50% of applicants with local connections noted previous residency within the study area and 46% mentioned existing relatives. 18% mentioned both. The strong emphasis which the Association place on community links is evident. Secondary reasons given in support of applications were as follows:

**Figure 17: Secondary Reasons in Support of Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with existing housing/area</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be near work</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed marital situation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bearing in mind the shortcomings of the Reidvale data set, two main conclusions may be reached. Firstly there is a clear emphasis on ensuring that the benefits of improvement flow to existing residents and, where this is not possible, to people who can demonstrate some kind of link with the area either through former residency or family ties. It certainly does not seem that this type of improvement is especially socially disruptive. Indeed, on the contrary, the evidence suggests a degree of community retention and even
rejuvenation. The extent to which this is due to improvement activity will be considered later.

Unfortunately, the Reidvale data reveals little about the type of people moving into and out of Housing Association property and nothing about the characteristics of those moving into the private sector. This type of information was collated from the results of a study of intraurban migration undertaken in Glasgow University (Scottish Development Dept., Central Research Unit 1980).

6.3 1974 Migration Study

The data collected from the 1974 migration study was particularly strong for moves in the public sector. While information on owner occupied moves was also available, a major weakness was the lack of private rented sector data, a not insignificant part of the Dennistoun housing stock. However, it did prove possible to abstract certain information on the characteristics of movers. Care is required about the definition of "in" and "out" movers. The former are defined in terms of a destination within Dennistoun while the latter are moves with Dennistoun the origin. In a number of cases both origin and destination were within Dennistoun and thus represented entirely internal moves. During the study period, 244 (18%) of the 1,349 total moves were of this kind.

(a) In-movers: For the 539 moves listing Dennistoun as destination, data was available on tenure at both origin and destination. In addition, household size, the number of rooms and reasons for a move were also abstracted although these related only to those moving from the public sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Scottish Special Housing Assoc., New Town, Unknown)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>539</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incomers are tending to reproduce the existing tenure distribution of the study area and the movement into owner occupation highlights the important role of Dennistoun in the provision of cheaper private accommodation. Over 40% of in-movers originate in the private sector and it is likely that most of these, especially in the private rented sector represent moves within the study area from one tenure to another. Almost $\frac{2}{3}$ of in-movers originate in the public sector and, as indicated by previous results, many of these come from east end local authority schemes. The movements out of SSHA and New Town accommodation are also of interest. It can only be hypothesised that these represent a move back of people (or their families) who formerly moved out of Dennistoun. In any event, the figures clearly indicate that movement into Dennistoun is generally associated with a change of tenure, especially into owner occupation. Only 3% of in-moves are to new lets, emphasising the dominance of existing provision in the Dennistoun housing market.

Incomers tend to be characterised by small family size (mean 2.13) when compared to outmovers (mean 2.62).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of in-mover households</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5 person</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost $\frac{1}{2}$ are single-person households, reflecting the high proportion of one and two apartment flats in the area. It is expected that many of these smaller flats will be lost as a result of amalgamation. The size distribution of existing households suggests the need for an additional 200 two and three bedroom units but the data for incomers suggests a somewhat different pattern of demand. Thus, while amalgamation into larger units may suit existing residents, it may not reflect the external demand which plays such a prominent role in the Dennistoun housing market. The physical effects of rehabilitation will have an obvious impact on demand for housing in the study area.

Incomers are, on average, moving into slightly larger accommodation than that which they left.
The desire for more space was no doubt part of the reason for a number of the moves.

67% of movers listed poor housing conditions as a reason for their move. Since almost half of in-movers originated in local authority housing, it can be deduced that a number of these moves were as a result of dissatisfaction with conditions in east end local authority estates. Despite the limitations of the data set, the most marked result of in-movement is the shift from local authority tenure to owner occupation. It seems that the majority of incomers are seeking a first foot on the ladder of owner occupation but it is unclear whether their decision distinguishes between improved and unimproved property.

(b) Out-movers: 610 moves were identified with origin in Dennistoun and 132 (16%) of these were internal. 538 (66%) of the moves were to re-lets while the remainder were to new lets, a much higher figure than the equivalent for in-movers. The overall pattern of tenure shift produced a number of points of interest.
Movement out resulted in almost the complete elimination of the proportion of households accommodated in the private rented sector. In addition, out-movement apparently resulted in a reduction in the level of owner occupation. This does not seem to support the picture of Dennistoun as a first rung on the owner occupied ladder for subsequent upward and outward movement! The paradox can only be understood in terms of the reasons given in explanation for the outward move, although these are biased towards public sector moves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Move</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment/Clearance</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with existing housing/area</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange/Transfer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Worker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local authority have a statutory responsibility to rehouse those moving as a result of redevelopment and clearance. It is hypothesised that dissatisfaction with existing conditions is partly a reflection of the need for larger accommodation when young couples reach the family-rearing stage of the life cycle. The shortage of suitable larger units within the study area would thus necessitate outmovement. For the 70% of movers already in the private sector, the search phase of that move would firstly focus on an upward move within that sector. But in many cases this would be beyond the means of out-movers who would secondly turn their attention toward the public sector. This seems particularly to be the case for the one in ten moves into New Town accommodation, especially Cumbernauld (from which, interestingly, a number of families subsequently returned.) It is likely that the majority of those moving out of the private rented sector, finding even the cheaper end of owner occupation too costly, also move into the public sector. This raises the question of whether the private rented sector should be viewed as one in which people live temporarily awaiting a move into owner occupation or a move into the 'better' parts of the local authority stock. There do however seem to be two distinct groups of outmovers. While both aspire to owner occupation, a number are eventually deflected into the public sector.

The mean size of out-mover households is 2.62 which is larger than that of in-movers.
The dominance amongst outmovers of what are apparently young couples at the early stages of family formation is evident. Not surprisingly these figures are borne out by changes in the size of accommodation associated with the move.

Almost 70% of out-movers end up in at least 3-apartment accommodation, whereas at origin 80% were in units below this size. Again this reflects the existing size distribution of units in the area and the need for more space in the early stages of family formation. Unlike the in-mover data, the dominant change associated with a move out is to larger accommodation rather than a change of tenure in favour of owner occupation. Again, this would suggest that changes in the distribution of unit size following rehabilitation will affect the level of out-movement.

The production of two computer grid maps (Figures 26, 27) provided an indication of the spatial distribution of both in- and out-movers. In both cases, the strongly eastward sectoral pattern of moves is evident. However, care must be exercised in interpreting the maps especially relating to out-movers. As the data only covered the City of Glasgow itself, the map does not show the distribution of owner occupied accommodation in suburbs immediately adjacent to but outwith the city boundary. Moves into owner occupation in these areas will not be recorded on the map.
### Figure 26: Distribution of In-movers
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The table represents the distribution of in-movers across different categories, with each row and column indicating the count or frequency of in-movers in each category.
Figure 27    Distribution of Out-movers
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The in-mover map reveals a strong concentration around the study area itself, especially from Bridgeton, Camlachie, Calton, Tollcross, Riddrie and Carnyine. Ruchazie, Garthamlock and Easterhouse also stand out. Since none of these is noted for its high proportion of private stock, it can be assumed that these moves largely originate in the public sector. A move to Dennistoun would therefore be to the nearest area of cheaper private stock composed both of younger folk looking for a first owner occupied house and others returning to an area of former residence, especially those previously decanted to Easterhouse, Ruchazie and Garthamlock. The focus of Dennistoun as an island of owner occupation in the east end is again evident.

The out-mover map is more elongated in an easterly direction, stretching out to inner east end suburbs in Baillieston, Moodiesburn and Stepps. These represent proximate areas of owner occupation one step up the housing ladder from Dennistoun and the strong sectoral orientation of moves highlights the way in which people's spatial search patterns for housing are determined by their current location and the distribution of tenures throughout the city.

The migration study also provided a number of more general points of interest. The summary report identified Dennistoun as one of three strongly developed areas of population inflow:

"Dennistoun is a bit of a surprise. It was formerly a well thought of area, with many families resident there for generations. Latterly it was thought that Dennistoun was sharing the decline of the East End and was probably exporting population. However for whatever reason, Dennistoun is holding its own and may even be revitalising itself."

(Scottish Development Department, Central Research Unit 1980: p13)

The Report explained the results in terms of the operation of a brisk market in flats for young couples and the hypothesis is tentatively upheld by results elsewhere in this study. Figure 28 shows clearly how Dennistoun acts as a focus for moves from local authority to owner occupied housing from the northeast quadrant of the city, especially Easterhouse and Garthamlock. Only Shawlands on the south side of the city comes even close to reproducing such a marked pattern. Again, for movements into and within the owner occupied sector, Dennistoun is second only to Shawlands in the amount of internal movement. The flow from local authority to owner occupied housing breaks most of the traditional urban migration rules: it is a radially inward move and is from newer to older housing. In addition
Figure 28 Moves from Local Authority Houses to Owner-Occupation, 1974

(SDO, CRU 1980:33)
"Some in-movement of white-collar employees to the inner city is evident. Areas such as Crosshill, Dennistoun and Partick/Kelvingrove function in large measure as temporary residential locations for young, upwardly mobile sections of the community." (SDD, CRU 1980: 20)

Discussion with institutions active in Dennistoun suggest that this is indeed the case.

The Report also points out that when houses 'buy' out of the public into the private sector, their search patterns tend to focus on their 'local' private housing area:

"This suggests that a strong attachment exists to the older areas from which the council house family came originally. It also underlines the geographic lack of choice inside the city for someone seeking a house to buy".

A greater understanding of the function of areas like Dennistoun has important planning implications. If Dennistoun is successfully attracting buyers,

"... then positive policies to enhance other areas of similar types by rehabilitation and/or financial support would very probably be rewarding in attracting and keeping more mobile owner occupiers within the city." (SDD, CRU 1980: 6)

This would be consistent with both District and Regional Council policies for inner city development and might have positive implications for inner city housing in neighbouring areas such as GEAR.

It is therefore important to examine how these changes are related to improvement activity.

6.4 Cheaper End Study

In addition to improvement grant data, the Cheaper End Study (SEPF 1979) also provided useful information on changes in house price, the number of house transactions and the sources of house finance in the study area. These are presented in Figures 29-35.

From 1972-80 there were over 5,000 individual private house transactions although several of these related to the same property. There was a 20% increase in the number of transactions during the period for which data was available. A random sample also revealed a 400% increase in the mean price of transactions and it is not surprising that Maclellan (Planning Exchange 1980) has characterised the tenemental flat sector as undergoing the most rapid recent price appreciation. Substantial and increasing demand for the type of accommodation provided in Dennistoun is evident.
Figure 30  Dennistoun: Number of House Transactions, 1972
This demand in part explains the changing distribution of sources of house finance in the study area. Comparison of the maps clearly reveals the changing emphasis between local authority mortgages in 1972 and building society mortgages in 1980. The rise of the latter is the result of two changes: the decline of local authority lending in the city as a whole and a new appreciation of demand for the type of accommodation provided in areas such as Dennistoun. Of course building societies have been quick to recognise that recent developments in bank mortgage services threaten their operations, necessitating a search for new market opportunities. Despite this, there seems little doubt that the growth of building society activity in the study area is a response to perceived demand and greater feelings of security about the future of the area as far as lending institutions are concerned.

Table of Sources of House Finance by 100 Metre Grid-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Society</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Company</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining maps (Fig. 37-39) indicate the distribution and value of improvement grants approved in the study area. As previously noted, the value of grant-aid reflects the nature of the private improvement work which characterises Dennistoun, minor rather than full-scale rehabilitation. The spatial distribution of grants is concentrated between the two major east-west thoroughfares of Duke Street and Alexandra Parade and, to a certain extent, along their facades. The property between Duke Street and Alexandra Parade is of higher structural quality than that immediately adjacent to both north and south. Thus the latter was included in action areas for improvement under the auspices of the two community based housing associations, Milnbank and Reidvale respectively. Private rehabilitation is therefore concentrated between these two areas. The emphasis on the two street frontages is a direct result of District Council policy.
Figure 39 Distribution of Improvement Grants, 1975–80
6.5 Summary

The results so far may be summarised as follows:

(a) Gentrification does not appear to be occurring in the study area and there is little difference in the socio-economic character of in- and out-movers. Grant-aided improvement is not resulting in the displacement of lower by upper income groups.

(b) Improvement activity has resulted in enhanced levels of population movement in the study area and has affected the operation of its housing market. However, the available data suggests only minor social disruption as a result of improvement. Indeed the area is experiencing a degree of self-revitalisation and a reconstitution of former community links.

(c) Improvement is, by and large, benefiting existing residents rather than newcomers.

(d) Areas of cheaper-end private accommodation like Dennistoun play an important part in the functioning of the city-wide housing markets. Improvement may have both a positive and a negative impact on the performance of that role.

(e) Movers are, on average, younger than the resident population and their housing search patterns are oriented towards the eastern half of the city. Movement out is associated with the need for more space following family formation, while movement in is associated with first-time buyers especially young married couples. Many of the latter have some kind of link with Dennistoun (former residence, family) and move from east and local authority estates into owner occupation.

(f) A happy combination of market demand and public intervention through improvement has resulted in a degree of revitalisation. House allocation policies of both District Council and Housing Associations have contributed to the continuity of community ties.
Chapter 7

LOCAL DISCUSSIONS

While there can be no substitute for factual data, it was felt that discussions with persons and groups having experience of the Dennistoun situation would be useful. The information gathered from such discussions is, of course, not always subject to verification and individual biases are always a problem. Individual opinions do not always concur with the official views of organisations or departments consulted. However, the contribution of local field workers can often provide flesh for the factual bones.

7.1 Planning Department: As noted earlier, the study area is covered by two Local Plans. Both present a statistical description of the volume of improvement work undertaken and planned but say little about the thinking behind the policy of rehabilitation. Indeed the Planning Department itself was not in a position to provide any data at all on such matters as grant-aided improvement and its effect on housing market characteristics and population movements. In general, the planners left the collection and analysis of such data to the Housing Department, Housing Corporation and Housing Associations. While this partly reflects the distribution of responsibilities between District Council departments, it must be a cause for concern as planning is inextricably linked to the movement of people.

Members of both local plan teams rejected the suggestion of gentrification although concern was expressed over the degree of subdivision believed to be occurring in the larger villas and terraced properties of the Conservation Area. Neither considered the population implications of improvement activity to be significant problems.

7.2 Housing Department: The Private Sector of the Housing Department is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of private improvement grant policy. In their opinion Dennistoun has always been different from its surrounding area due to the peculiar history of its development. Private sector interest in Dennistoun began as a result of the widespread damage caused by the storm of 1968 and a deliberate policy of pump-priming was followed in order to stimulate private interest in investment and rehabilitation. This pump-priming originally focussed on the stonecleaning of major thoroughfare facades.
With the exception of the two action areas, it was felt that most units had already been provided with the standard amenities and that conversion activity was not widespread apart from the larger villas. The rateable value limit of eligibility for grant-aid had originally been deliberately set to include large parts of the study area. Many of the villas were now above the £335 limit and thus ineligible for improvements grants. The current problem was mainly one of repair, reflecting the 1978 designation of part of Dennistoun as a 'Repairs Area'.

It was not felt that the impact of grant-aided improvement on the tenure structure had been a problem. Rather than being associated with availability of improvement grants, increased owner occupation was due mainly to the death of long-term tenants and factors, on the basis of purely economic considerations, instructing that properties be sold rather than relet on falling empty. The gentrification hypothesis was rejected and in-movers were characterised as mainly young couples, not necessarily moving into improved property, progressing outwards and upwards after a fairly short period of residence. In view of the difficulties of eviction, the Department was not aware of displacement as a problem. While the legislation specifically expresses the desire to avoid municipalisation of the stock, it was admitted that this was exactly what was happening as a result of Housing Association activity.

In general, the impression was given that the Dennistoun pump-priming exercise had been a success, although success was measured in physical more than social terms. An area of decline had successfully been 'turned around' and public involvement was now being run down in favour of private improvement. It was felt that the pump-priming of private investment was a perfectly legitimate and effective way of achieving inner city regeneration: "If Dennistoun turns into a Woodlands then that's great." Private Sector attention was now switching to areas like Govanhill, Ibrox, Shawlands and Pollokshields where it was felt that the 'Dennistoun Experiment' could be successfully repeated.

7.3 Reidvale Housing Association: Although much of the Reidvale data has already been examined, a number of other points of interest were raised in discussions with Housing Association staff. The Association currently possess 450 unimproved units, half of which are vacant and this point has given rise to
some concern amongst local residents. It is expected that, after rehabilitation, only 300 improved units will remain, a decline of over 30%. In addition, the associated population decline will be more than 30% as it is proposed that a number of improved units be left vacant for subsequent allocation.

While the Association were, not surprisingly, reticent to discuss the degree of out-movement, it was not felt that displacement had been a problem although difficulties had been experienced with existing owner occupiers and factors regarding the acquisition of property for rehabilitation. The District Council had rehoused a number of people displaced as a result of Housing Association improvement and it was obvious that the Association knew more about their subsequent whereabouts and conditions than those moving into the private sector. It was however felt that the majority of households intending to move out as a result of Housing Association activity had already done so, although the area was not yet stabilised compared to, say, Woodlands.

7.4 Theo Crombie, formerly House Improvement and Clearance Section, Glasgow Corporation:

The role of local authority pump-priming was especially important in Dennistoun. It became obvious that the local authority alone could not be expected to tackle the scale of improvement work required and that private investment would have to be stimulated. To this end, the Corporation decided to concentrate on those areas of activity where it alone had statutory responsibility and where no other group could carry out the work necessary. Where other bodies were more suited to other tasks, the role of the local authority was to interest and influence them to get on with the job. This co-operative approach now characterises the District Council's thinking on such matters as economic regeneration and the creation of new employment.

From the outset public investment was used in such a way as to provide a framework for subsequent private investment and the whole strategy rested on a number of assumptions. Firstly, any public investment would be viewed as a commitment to the future stability of the area, providing a degree of security of return on private investment. It had long been argued that the lack of such security in the face of uncertainty about future clearance and planning policies had exacerbated the cycle of inner city neighbourhood decline. A tangible sign of local authority commitment to the well-being of the area might
reverse the trend of negative investment psychology.

Two types of local authority action were most visible. A programme of general environmental improvement such as backcourt improvement schemes and the tidying up of vacant or open space and improved local authority service provision produced rapid and marked results. In addition, a vigorous programme of external structural work, especially stone-cleaning, would reinforce the overall perception of neighbourhood improvement. Where this work was concentrated along major street frontages and visible to those passing through the area, it might be expected to revive general interest in the area's residential potential. Again it was felt that, in terms of safeguarding part of the existing stock, the experiment had been a success and attention could now switch to the identification of repeat areas.

Little was known about how socially disruptive the process had been. A previous study of the Old Swan project had revealed that the benefits of rehabilitation had not in fact accrued to existing residents; most had been rehoused over two miles away. Nor was there a particular pattern amongst in-movers, whose origins were liberally spread throughout the city.

The role of local authority mortgages in neighbourhood regeneration is somewhat ambiguous. It had been hypothesised that the availability of such finance would have been viewed as a positive expression of local authority commitment to the future stability of the area. However, it was suggested in discussion that the result might be exactly the opposite and that public home loans might stimulate private disinvestment. Thus while home loans could support other improvement policies, they could not alone fulfil the catalytic role required by local authority pump-priming. Indeed as a result of the general city-wide reduction in local authority mortgages, the Home Loans Department had already begun to withdraw from the study area to be replaced by bank and building society finance. Even while being phased out, however, local authority loans played a crucial part in the holding operation while the improvement programme gathered momentum.

The general impression given was that the role of the local authority should be as 'enabler' rather than 'doer', even where this involved the use of loss-leader public investment. In terms of social impact, it was felt that while rehabilitation might involve some displacement it was far more desirable than the widespread disruption associated with comprehensive redevelopment: "Rehabilitation is so bloody difficult to do that you can never do enough of it to create a major problem."
ASSIST: ASSIST became involved in the Reidvale Housing Association improvement programme in 1974 after a request from the Association's Development Officer for assistance in the identification of blocks for rehabilitation and possible future tenants. Following the original project assessment prior to Housing Action Area designation, a public meeting of all existing residents was called at which each resident was individually interviewed by a member of ASSIST about their personal rehabilitation needs and desires. Since the finance available from the Housing Corporation depends in part on the size of rehabilitated units, some manipulation of the planned distribution of unit sizes was undertaken to maximise central government's contribution. The Development Officer was then responsible for matching up households with accommodation units of the correct size.

In general, the physical effect of tenement rehabilitation was to reduce the number of accommodation units from 11 to 9 due to amalgamation and the loss of top floor flats. It was not felt that disruption of the community had been excessive since the benefits of rehabilitation were flowing to existing residents although not necessarily in their original unit. For those moving as a result of rehabilitation, the following choices were open:

(i) moving back into the rehabilitated unit
(ii) moving into a different rehabilitated unit of the right size
(iii) decant into an unrehabilitated vacant unit made liveable by minor repair
(iv) rehousing by the District Council
(v) moving independently within the private sector

The architects felt that two major problems faced future rehabilitation in Dennistoun. Firstly, rehabilitation of the Duke Street facade had been delayed because shopowners, especially chains, were unwilling or unable to meet their responsibility for a substantial share of rehabilitation costs. Only single-shop shopowners are eligible for assistance under the District's Shop Repairs Scheme. Secondly, in terms of community links, the degree of public participation had declined as the programme progressed. Initially residents had greater choice about the location and design of improvements but such flexibility was impossible during periods of financial restraint. Increased standardisation of rehabilitation resulted in fewer opportunities for participation.
Building Societies, Estate Agents, Banks: The level of building society activity in the study area has increased through the 1970's and they now dominate in the provision of finance for house purchase. Only two major societies have branches in Dennistoun (Leeds Permanent, Abbey National) both established within the last three years. Another society (Woolwich) operates through a local solicitor's office while the Trustee Savings Bank has always been involved in house lending from their Duke Street branch.

The area is served by a single estate agent (Skinner McArthur) established in Dennistoun for over ten years. There was no estate agent in the area at that time and Skinner McArthur located in Dennistoun in response to perceived demand for property there, although the office also serves a much wider area in the east of the city. The growth of demand was due to three factors. For those seeking tenement flats, the 'west end' of the city is still the first choice. However, excess demand there had resulted in higher prices and first-time buyers, reforming their original aspirations, looked to areas such as Dennistoun as a cheaper alternative. Shawlands fulfilled a similar role on the south side of the city. Secondly, it was felt that the provision of amenities in Dennistoun was a positive attraction for buyers especially shopping, transport, access and the existence of an established community. Finally, the demonstration effect of improvement and the ready availability of improvement grants acted as a further stimulus: "Dennistoun is now a very popular area for purchase."

Until 1980, in-movers were dominated by first-time buyers, young married couples with no family moving into smaller units and intending subsequently to move out and up the housing ladder. Under current conditions of economic recession and high unemployment, this group had been joined by people moving from larger units into smaller ones. While these were not characterised by any particular age or socio-economic bias, many did have former residence or family links with Dennistoun. A number of those returning came from east end local authority estates and Cumbernauld.

It was also claimed that a number of professional people were moving into the area, especially doctors employed in the newly completed Royal Infirmary addition immediately to the west of the study area. Many of these were moving into Glasgow for the first time rather than constituting some kind of 'back to the city' movement. Having firstly...
sought accommodation in the west end, their field of search switched to Dennistoun where the desired type of accommodation was available at the right price and they were moving not only into terrace and villa properties but also renovated tenement flats.

The characteristics of out-movers had not been subject to such change. Most were not first-time buyers but had previously bought smaller units in Dennistoun as a starter home after marriage. Having reached the stage of family formation, more space was required and there was a desire for property with a garden and back and front door. Out-movers tended to concentrate on the outer zone of owner occupation beyond the eastern edge of the city: Moodiesburn, Bishopbriggs, Lenzie, Kirkintilloch, Cumbernauld.

At one time very few building societies would lend in Dennistoun. A marked change in lending policy had occurred in response to perceived demand and confidence in the future stability of the area as reflected in public commitment to improvement. The area had always been a 'cut above' its surroundings: "When I was young and you lived in Dennistoun everyone thought you were a bit of a snob." While Dennistoun had been going downhill, it had now been successfully turned around and was attracting a 'better' type of in-mover. It was expected that this process would continue, reflecting the extremely buoyant and vibrant character of the local housing sub-market.

Increased demand also attracted both of the building societies although their original priority was for local investment and savings rather than house lending. Abbey National were increasing the share of their business devoted to lending and felt that their competitors were merely waiting to assess the initiative before following suit. Indeed the Duke Street branch recently won an award as the fastest growing office in the West of Scotland (Evening Times 11/2/82). The Duke Street location proved especially attractive with local shops generating considerable passing trade and adequate off-street parking.

Both characterised the Dennistoun housing market as buoyant, pointing out that, while recent house prices had been fairly static, tenement flat prices continued to appreciate. Lending activity had also been stimulated by the programme of council house sales but increased demand at the cheaper end of the owner occupied market had proven the major attraction. There was some disagreement on the nature of in- and out-movers although neither were aware of in-coming professionals to any great extent. The Leeds Permanent felt that most of those looking for house finance were young married couples and first-time
buyers, many of whom were moving from local parental homes. At the time of child rearing, these families moved eastwards and upwards seeking larger and more suitable owner occupied accommodation. Abbey National did not feel that any particular kind of person was moving in or out. Although the west end remained for many people their first choice, the lower prices in Dennistoun were proving a major attraction as was the price differential between inner-city and suburban accommodation.

Both societies claimed they were quite willing to lend in Dennistoun as long as the property involved was up to standard. However they did admit that housing and environmental improvement work made lending more likely and recognised the stabilising effect that rehabilitation was having on the area. Emphasising the location, shopping provision and amenities of the area, it was felt that Dennistoun was now much more attractive for private investment than formerly: "It no longer has an east end image." Neither was actively involved in rehabilitation themselves, unlike Abbey National in Govanhill (Skinner 1980), but welcomed its positive contribution in the study area.

The Trustee Savings Bank have also been active in lending in the area for some years. Their activity had increased recently but it was claimed that this was part of an overall plan to broaden the services of the bank to its customers rather than direct competition with the Building Societies. It was felt that the societies were not keen to lend on tenement property and the bank underwrote District Council loans referred to them up to the value of £10,000. Buoyant demand, especially for rehabilitated property, resulted in young owner occupiers replacing older renters. A number of in-movers were from peripheral local authority housing schemes and emphasised Dennistoun's convenient location, ease of access, facilities and the reasonable cost of accommodation. Finance would be made available for any property up to standard and it was not felt that completed rehabilitation work influenced the availability of loans. The activities of the Housing Associations, especially local decanting, had succeeded in keeping the community together although most of the longer-term residents tended to concentrate in the area between Duke Street and Alexandra Parade untouched by Association rehabilitation.

7.7 Community Councils: The study area is covered by two community councils, the much larger area north of Duke Street falling within the Dennistoun Community Council and the smaller area to the
south covered by North Camlachie Community Council. Unfortunately, discussions could only be arranged with the latter although this did include residents affected by the improvement programme undertaken by Reidvale Housing Association.

While residents expressed general satisfaction with the rehabilitation programme, a number of common problems existed. Concern was raised at the time rehabilitation was taking place: one family had been decanted for over 19 months. The quality of work left something to be desired and fair rents were considerably higher than before rehabilitation. No attempt had been made to make use of local unemployed skilled construction workers. With increased standardisation of rehabilitation, tenants had less choice in what they wanted done and the Housing Association had not adequately taken residents' views into account. Standardisation had also resulted in the repetition of mistakes from which the Association had failed to learn. It was also felt that the Association's allocation policy was subject to unwelcome interference from 'empire builders' in the various organisations involved.

The major complaint related to vacant property held by the Housing Association. Of 173 vacant units, 142 were on-site or pending development leaving only 31 available for decanting. However it cost on average £3,000 per unit to bring these up to a standard suitable for short-term decant and the finance was simply not available. Residents felt that it was a waste to have such units lying empty and would have preferred letting them to younger folk, on a short-term basis at reduced rents, even if no work had been undertaken on them.

Most of those who had moved out as a result of rehabilitation were young couples who had only recently bought. Sale to the Housing Association provided the prospect of a good price and a chance to move out and up the housing ladder. It was made clear that the first choice of a rehabilitated unit went to the former resident. Where this was not desired, the emphasis was firstly on providing accommodation for other existing residents and secondly on those with former links to the area. There was no feeling of either gentrification or displacement. A number of people who had moved out to peripheral estates when their families were young now wished to move back into the area as their families had grown up. In this way it was felt that the community was being retained and rejuvenated and attempts to mix old
and new tenants were welcomed. It was finally noted that the environment and amenities of Dennistoun acted as a positive attraction to in-movers and that a strong community spirit still existed in the area.
Chapter 8

A MODEL OF NEIGHBOURHOOD CHANGE

"An understanding of the process of population redistribution in cities is essential to the planning of a better urban environment" (SDD, CRU 1980:3)

8.1 Hitherto attention has focussed on the particular characteristics of the Dennistoun example. This chapter seeks to extend the analysis into a broader consideration of inner city population movement and its relationship to house improvement programmes. By developing a general model of neighbourhood change, it is hoped to identify policy implications for future programmes of inner city regeneration.

Throughout the dissertation an attempt has been made to consider the movement of households in terms of the operation of the housing market. Such an approach is hardly new and there is a long history of research developing models of residential location. Underlying many of these are the notions of invasion, succession and filtering whereby upper income groups continually seek new residential areas, leaving behind their former accommodation for groups lower down the income scale. It is through this process of downward filtering, according to theory, that housing conditions are in general improved. While filtering has received considerable criticism as only a partial explanation of the operation of the housing market, it continues to underpin much of the debate about the purpose and effect of house improvement policy. For example, in the argument about the physical versus the social purpose of rehabilitation, it is often stated that, as a result of the operation of filtering, those in greatest need will eventually benefit even from a physical emphasis as better quality housing filters down to them. But empirical research has shown that filtering tends to work only very imperfectly. In addition, despite Lowry’s seminal work (Lowry 1960), it has always been assumed that filtering operates down the housing market and the possibility of upward filtering has largely been ignored.

As a theory of housing change, filtering relates largely to the private sector, taking little account of the impact of public intervention. Thus, under filtering, household relocation would be characterised by movement outwards from the city into areas of newer and better quality housing. In the case of Dennistoun, however, it has been shown that exactly the opposite occurs: a movement inward from
the periphery of the city into an area of older housing. Why should
this have been the case? Does it represent an example of reverse
filtering?

To answer these questions it is necessary to ask why areas decline
and why some of them recover. From a purely economic viewpoint an
area's housing conditions deteriorate when it can no longer attract
or retain property owners who are wealthy or interested enough to
adequately maintain the housing:

"...one or two owners selling up and moving away is bound
to make other owners question the value of staying and
improving..." (Mason 1976)

There are any number of reasons why such a situation might develop
but all of them result in a reduction of investment or indeed active
disinvestment. For Ahlbrandt and Brophy (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975)
this is only one stage of a general neighbourhood life-cycle:

```
Figure 40 Neighbourhood Life-cycle
(after Ahlbrandt/Brophy 1975)

healthy viable neighbourhood
incipient decline (deference of maintenance,
repairs)
visible decline
accelerated decline (public/private
disinvestment, psychology of pessimism)
abandonment
```

Thus disinvestment, a negative image, general socio-economic instability
and insecurity about the future all contribute to the general downward
trend.

Three points emerge from such a model. Firstly the whole process
presupposes the operation of downward filtering with the movement out
of the better off and their replacement by successively lower income
groups. Secondly, the model fails to take account of the prospects
for recovery and in effect begs the whole question of the potentially
cyclical nature of neighbourhood changes. This is a fundamental point
which is worthy of further consideration. And finally there is no
place in the model for considering the impact of housing rehabilitation
and improvement policy.

Housing, like many other goods, deteriorates over time. If this
were not the case, then, all other things being equal, only increased
demand would result in new building. Of course the time-scale for
housing deterioration is much longer than for some other goods with the
result that the housing stock 20 years hence will be largely as it is
to-day. Since new building will only form a small part of that stock,
most household movement will be associated with second-hand housing.
This is a major assumption on which the concept of filtering is based.
The important point is that deterioration is an inevitable process
which improvement can only delay, not postpone indefinitely.
Improvement can, however, interrupt the process of neighbourhood
decline.

There are two broad schools of thought regarding what happens to
an area after it has reached the final stage of abandonment outlined
above. The neighbourhood, having outlived whatever reasons gave rise
to its original development, should be allowed to die. On the other
hand, if an area declines far enough, it can be assumed that the
negative investment psychology generated results in reduced demand for
land and property and thus lower prices for both. A stage may be
reached where prices decline so far that it again becomes profitable
for investors to look to the area in preference to other possible
investment locations. But is it really necessary for such wide swings
in the fortunes of inner city areas to occur? To answer this question
it is necessary to consider why some neighbourhoods succeed in recovery.

8.2 While there is unlikely to be a single answer, the following
factors all seem to play a prominent role:

(i) It has been hypothesised that neighbourhood recovery may be
stimulated by a fall in house prices to such a low level that
demand once again begins to pick up. However, the Dennistoun
house market has been characterised as one of traditionally
buoyant demand with a corollary increase in the price of local
accommodation. Obviously other factors have been responsible
for halting and, to a degree, reversing the downward trend.

(ii) In the case of Dennistoun part of the demand for housing arises
from households who would prefer to live in the west end but
find the price of accommodation there excessively high.
Dennistoun provides similar type of accommodation but at a
lower cost. A spill-over of demand from other areas can there­
fore stimulate neighbourhood recovery. While this may describe
what is actually occurring in the study area, it does not
entirely explain why Dennistoun has become a focus for some
of this 'second choice' demand.
(iii) As census indicators of housing conditions, with the exception of housing in major need of repair, have continued to improve attention has turned to other aspects of the complex good known as housing. Increasingly, the 'housing problem' is viewed in terms of three factors: tenure, location and access. Different tenures carry with them different advantages and disadvantages. The current balance is tipped in favour of owner occupation, reflecting both active government policy to expand this form of tenure and the assumption that it is the type aspired to by most households. Dennistoun stands out in the east end as an island of owner occupation and, although much of this can be characterised as being at the cheaper end of the market, it is not surprising that it has become something of a magnet for movers. Thus the existing tenure distribution of Dennistoun, which reflects a long history of development, is currently standing it in good stead in the attraction of demand for housing. This is particularly the case for first-time buyers since less than $\frac{1}{4}$ of them buy new-build housing while substantially more than $\frac{1}{4}$ buy pre-1919 units. Location and access are also currently working in Dennistoun's favour especially when compared to the peripheral estates. If private builders are indeed correct and there is a general move back in favour of inner city rather than suburban living (Evening Times 28/1/82), then the location of Dennistoun is likely to become even more advantageous. The provision of amenities and the safeguarding of Duke Street as a major shopping centre act as further incentives.

(iv) It is entirely possible that the above factors alone might be sufficient to stimulate recovery of an inner city area like Dennistoun. In-movers might well be attracted, especially to the larger villa and terraced properties of the conservation area, with the possibility of grant-aided improvement. But at what social cost?

At the onset of this dissertation it was hypothesised that gentrification and displacement might be occurring in Dennistoun. For a number of reasons the evidence indicates that this is not the case. Most studies of gentrification suggest that it occurs only in the largest cities with a significant proportion of
white-collar employment and the typical American stereotype of a move back into the city in response to the high cost of suburban commuting does not sit particularly comfortably on a city as compact as Glasgow. While abuses of grant-aid certainly occurred under the 1969 Housing Act, the more obvious loopholes were closed by subsequent legislation. It has also been noted that publicly-funded improvement, carried out under the auspices of community based housing associations tends to favour existing or former residents. Dennistoun has not completely lost its somewhat negative image especially compared to the west end which has also undergone considerable improvement. While the latter has traditionally been viewed as the cultural centre of the city, Dennistoun has had no similar advantage.

The presence of the University in particular has given the west end a socio-economic character which is hardly typical of inner city areas. Both staff and students have naturally gravitated to the area and many graduates, having stayed in the area while attending University, continue to live there after taking up professional careers. Dennistoun is not all that distant from the city's second university, Strathclyde, although most of the expansion there has been northeast into the former Townhead Comprehensive Development Area. Indeed the area around Strathclyde is something of an 'educational pole' with the university, College of Technology and College of Building and Printing. This complex may have the same effect on Dennistoun as did the University in the west end although it would have to overcome two barriers not encountered by the latter: the physical and cultural barriers of the High Street and the M8 motorway. The recent eastward expansion of the Royal Infirmary certainly brings an outlier of the 'education pole' to the very doorstep of Dennistoun. It will be fascinating to see whether any future expansion of this sort replicates events in the west end. While there is no evidence so far of gentrification, it does seem that the continuation of the trends outlined above can only increase the possibility of its occurrence in Dennistoun. Should this occur the need for public intervention to ameliorate social disruption will become evident.

(v) Until now, however, public intervention in Dennistoun has had exactly the opposite purpose, to stimulate private interest and
investment. This is of course easier when market forces and public policy are working in the same direction and it is extremely difficult to separate out those elements of Dennistoun's recovery due to each set of factors. However everyone interviewed in the course of this study admitted that Dennistoun had been in decline prior to improvement activity. Public involvement only became established in the early 1970's before the market trends outlined above gained momentum. Indeed the earliest intervention of the House Improvement and Clearance Section occurred when Dennistoun was characterised by active disinvestment. Thus while improvement policy and market forces may now be acting in unison, they were formerly pulling against each other. The crucial role of pump-priming in reversing neighbourhood decline is evident.

Neighbourhood improvement does not take place overnight. It is the result of a process of change generated by a wide variety of factors. Regardless of subsequent developments, the critical first step is to reverse the negative investment psychology which has become identified with the area. Neighbourhood decline is associated with insecurity and uncertainty regarding the future investment stability of the area. In Glasgow much of this uncertainty was a result of the massive programme of clearance undertaken during the 1950's and 1960's. Comprehensive Development Area designation effectively heralded impending destruction and the threat of compulsory purchase and the prospect of physical upheaval were unlikely to prove attractive to potential investors. Had redevelopment proceeded as planned, this phase would eventually have passed. But the slowness of wholesale clearance expanded the period of uncertainty interminably: Would there be new houses up there? Were they really going to knock down that tenement? When was anything going to get started let alone finished?

There are numerous examples of the destructive effect of planning blight. Yet even in the absence of a specific planning proposal, the mere suspicion of impending action can be enough to generate confusion and uncertainty (Mason 1976), colouring the whole perception of the area involved. Thus a major result of Comprehensive Development Area designation was to create uncertainty about the future, an inhospitable environment
for investment and stimulate movement in traditionally stable areas.

The main objective of public pump-priming is to reverse that negative psychology and this can be achieved by reducing the destructive influence of insecurity and instability. Rehabilitation, by its very nature, represents a commitment to the area and to the existing structure of the area:

"To a large extent the mere act of declaration of an improvement area is an act of faith in the future of older housing areas." (Anson and Shelton 1971:229)

As there will be no major changes, only efforts to safeguard and improve that which already exists, there is less uncertainty about the future. It is however impossible to remove all uncertainty. Firstly, Housing Action Area designation is associated, especially in the early stages, with enhanced population movement. Secondly, improvement in general affects the supply of cheaper private accommodation, and the impact of this change on other parts of the city housing market are as yet little researched. If Dennistoun has always acted as a launching pad for upward movement in the private sector then a reduction in the supply of cheaper private accommodation will influence patterns of household movement. Similarly if improvement leads to increased community stability, the possibilities for household movement are again curtailed. Recent research (Murie and Forrest 1980) has focussed on the segmented rather than unitary nature of housing markets with different areas playing different functional roles. While the links between these are little understood, it may well be that improvement results in the diminution of part of the linkage system between different segments of the housing market.

While the above will partly help overcome the negative image associated with uncertainty and instability, the final test of pump-priming is of course its ability to generate subsequent private investment. This is a familiar dilemma for planners who, while responsible for plan-making, inevitably depend on the private sector for plan implementation. They can help create a suitable environment for investment but the actual injection of capital finally rests with the private sector either as
individuals or institutions. Private investment rests on security of future return on that investment and if uncertainty about the future results in active disinvestment then the creation of a feeling of security and commitment should result in a reawakening of investment interest. This is the goal which local authority pump-priming must achieve before regeneration can succeed.

8.3 Throughout this dissertation emphasis has been placed on the pivotal role of local authority pump-priming in creating the conditions for the revitalisation of inner city areas. But there are any number of ways in which public spending can be used to stimulate private investment. In regional economic planning, for example, public spending on the provision of infrastructure has often been proposed as one way of generating economic activity and employment. The Dennistoun case study indicates that, to stimulate neighbourhood recovery, three types of pump-priming are of particular value.

There are certain things which only a local authority, using its statutory powers, can undertake. General environmental improvement and improved service provision fall into such a category and both are required to stimulate the necessary turn-around of investment psychology:

"The property owner who reinvests could not expect the market to value his investment as long as neighbourhood conditions do not improve." (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975:154)

Back-court improvement schemes, the landscaping of vacant and derelict sites and stonecleaning are not particularly attractive for private sector investment. Through the provision of a variety of public services (transport, refuse collection, street cleaning and lighting, community facilities) a local authority can raise the attractiveness of a given area to inmovers and investors alike. This is not a job that can be undertaken by the private sector. While improved service provision may be more costly to a local authority, it is the programme of general environmental improvement which results in the essential visible expression of change for the better and public commitment to the future of the area. The influence of such a boost in confidence is perhaps impossible to quantify but the perception of conditions improving in Dennistoun was mentioned by movers, building societies, banks and estate agent alike. The importance of the demonstration effect on owners is evident:
"...the decision of one owner to stay and improve can encourage other owners to act likewise." (Mason 1976)

As the environment surrounding a house becomes increasingly important in residential relocation decisions, the influence of public pump-priming directed towards visible, not necessarily large-scale, projects of general environmental improvement should not be underestimated.

Local authority loans for house purchase also appear to be a potentially useful tool in neighbourhood regeneration. However, there is conflicting evidence on this point. In the case of Govanhill it appeared that the designation of Housing Treatment Areas made it more rather than less difficult to obtain a District Council home loan:

"...perhaps they (the local authority) saw this as a method of acquiring and securing the improvement of property which was much easier than using compulsory purchase powers or waiting for an owner occupier to carry out the improvements himself" (Mason 1976)

It has also been suggested that local authority home loans actually function as a leader-out rather than a leader-in of investment. In the Dennistoun example, however, it appeared that home loans served a useful bridging role between private disinvestment and reinvestment, providing temporary relief from the downward cycle before regeneration could begin. With reductions in the programme of local authority lending this role is increasingly under stress but it does seem that it can serve as a useful adjunct to other policy measures even if alone it cannot achieve the desired results. It is on these three areas, general environmental improvement, improved service provision and home loans, that local authority pump-priming for neighbourhood recovery should focus.

The creation of a positive investment psychology is the most critical role of all for the local authority because the private sector is unable to do it. Ironically, this may also be relatively inexpensive in terms of public resources. While any amount of public money may be spent on improvement, the ultimate power of the local authority in creating a positive investment psychology rests purely on decisions which either grant or withhold the prospect of future stability to a given area (This may involve costs other than financial ones.) This is not of course to say that the role of the local authority is to create the conditions in which private enterprise can let rip. On the contrary, just as there is a local authority role in stimulating
private investment, there is an equally crucial local authority role in ensuring that the impact of that investment is not unacceptably damaging:

"There is a thin line between removing conditions to stimulate improvement and stimulating property speculation." (Scottish Housing Advisory Committee 1981:21)

This highlights the need for continuing public intervention throughout the whole process of improvement and a much clearer understanding amongst planners of how their actions affect the operation of the private sector and the housing market.

8.4 As noted previously improvement does not occur overnight and pump-priming is only one part of a process involving a variety of inputs. Is there a particular phasing of changes associated with this process? Particularly in the American context, studies of neighbourhood decline have often been linked to the idea of 'tipping points', critical, threshold phases in the progression of decline. Little thought has been given to whether tipping points occur in the upward cycle, rather as in critical mass theory. It has been suggested that the changing racial character of an area reaches such visible proportions that white residents begin to move out in increasing numbers. The racial aspect is not relevant to Dennistoun and the evidence available does not suggest that any other changes provoke such marked results. With the exception of the turn-around of investment psychology through public intervention, both downward and upward transitions are much more continuous processes, slow and cumulative.

This does however raise the whole question of indicators of neighbourhood change and their policy implications. Ahlbrandt and Brophy (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975) identify the following as key indicators:

(i) physical: degree of overcrowding, proportion of housing that is substandard or lacking basic amenities

(ii) economic: property values, lending by financial institutions, household income, rent levels, vacancy rates

(iii) social/attitudinal: health measures, crime rate, quality of schools

(iv) demographic: size and structure of population, age, home ownership

These measures are equally appropriate for the identification of both upward and downward transition and their continuous monitoring would
provide local authorities with an early-warning system to identify and hopefully ameliorate the more damaging aspects of either change. They would also identify particular stages where intervention would be most effective. The timing of public intervention is especially important in view of the complexity of factors involved in neighbourhood change. Unfortunately, as noted in the methodological chapter, the type of data required for such a monitoring exercise is often not available or, if it is, lacks the necessary time sequence.

Figure 4 highlights the central role of public sector inputs in terms of their impact on the quality of life and the degree of private sector investment:

"The public sector plays a pivotal role in determining the future of a neighbourhood through its service delivery and investment decisions." (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975:24)

The model is more realistic than one which simply depicts eventual neighbourhood abandonment for it recognises how the various factors involved are linked in a circular process of mutual cause and effect. Thus the model clearly allows for the possibility of neighbourhood recovery as a result of inputs elsewhere in the system. An integral part of recovery is demand for housing resulting in investment and reinvestment in housing. If neighbourhood revitalisation depends upon the existence of a viable housing market then the implications for public policy are clear. Demand for housing must be stimulated. And the three forms of pump-priming identified above would all contribute greatly to that recovery of demand.

It is all very well to discuss such processes in theoretical terms but they must also be operationalised in practice to identify other areas of the city where a Dennistoun-type experiment could be repeated. The choice of Dennistoun as a focus for public activity owed very little to rational decision-making and there is no set of agreed indicators upon which such intervention would be founded. As a first contribution, then, what are the major characteristics of Dennistoun which have contributed to the recovery process and are they replicated elsewhere in the city?

Four factors seem to be of greatest importance. Firstly, the quality of housing must not be so bad that rehabilitation is physically impractical nor must it be so good that rehabilitation would be likely to occur even in the absence of public intervention. Target areas would be part of the cheaper end of the house market but with
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(Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975:25)
potentially buoyant demand especially from first-type buyers. If such demand had collapsed, then it would have to be stimulated through public intervention. They would also have a distinctive tenure pattern with a predominance of private housing, especially owner occupation, and would be centrally located with good access and local facilities.

Discussions with various groups active in Dennistoun revealed a fair consensus of 'Dennistoun-type' areas throughout the rest of the city and, not surprisingly, a number of them exhibit the same kind of migration pattern as the study area: Shawlands, Ibrox, Govanhill, Pollokshields, Partick. These are all areas identified by the private sector of the Housing Department for future improvement effort and each exhibits the characteristics outlined above as being important in the Dennistoun recovery. They share two further characteristics. Most have strong representations of Housing Association improvement work and, with the exception of Partick, they are all located on the south side. Partick represents an obvious spill-over of demand from the west end. However, the greatest potential and choice of areas is south of the river and it is on these areas that future public policy will probably concentrate. Consideration now of the kinds of indicators outlined above would be of great future benefit in ensuring constructive and socially beneficial public intervention.

8.5 On the basis of the analysis undertaken in this dissertation, it is possible to outline a model of population movement for Dennistoun indicating the impact of improvement activity. Only further research will confirm whether the elements of this model are equally applicable to other inner city areas but should this prove to be the case a number of policy implications become evident.

The pattern of population movement associated with Dennistoun can be summarised as follows:

(a) Incomers tend to be from east end local authority estates (and Cumbernauld New Town) and have some kind of prior link with the study area. Movement is a response to new household formation, the desire for owner occupation or dissatisfaction with existing local authority accommodation. In some cases it also reflects a spill-over of demand from the west end. In-mover households tend to be young and small and, while not all move into improved property, general environmental improvement in Dennistoun
acts as a positive incentive. Intended residence is not always of long duration and is viewed, especially by first-time buyers, as the first step in outward and upward movement within the owner occupied sector. A second and smaller group of in-movers consist of older households, formerly resident in Dennistoun, returning to the area after their families have grown up.

(b) Out-movers tend to move in an easterly direction and while the majority aspire to owner occupation a number eventually settle for local authority housing. Movement is a response to the need for more space in the early stages of family formation and residential search patterns focus on east end suburbs. It is not generally long-distance. Very few households move as a direct result of improvement and the vast majority feel that their housing conditions are better as a result of their move.

(c) There is a good deal of internal movement within Dennistoun as a result of two sets of forces. Firstly, some of the internal movement is from smaller to larger units and from a declining private rented sector to a growing owner occupied sector. In addition, local decanting by Housing Associations during rehabilitation results in movement within the study area. As an island of cheaper-end private accommodation within the east end, Dennistoun retains a number of movers who cannot afford the more expensive eastern suburbs. The restricted opportunity space and the desire to continue in private accommodation result in internal movement. Secondly, many internal movers have strong family ties in Dennistoun. Where the move is a result of new household formation, the desire for proximity to the parental homes is not surprising. Through the various community organisations and their own knowledge of the area, young couples brought up in Dennistoun are part of a word-of-mouth network of communication by which they learn of local housing vacancies. In addition, where movers are longer-term residents, it is not unexpected that their search patterns are dominated by the local area. Both these expressions of strong and continuing community ties result in considerable internal movement within the study area.

(d) The evidence available suggests that improvement activity has three main effects on population movement. Firstly, particularly in the early stages, the designation of areas for improvement results in enhanced levels of population movement. Whether
out-movement is the result of rational decision-making or confusion about how improvement operates, a stage is eventually reached where all those wishing to move out in response to improvement have done so and a more stable situation emerges. Improvement also stimulates demand from in-movers. Secondly tenement rehabilitation, by its very nature, results in a reduction in the number of accommodation units and, where carried out by Housing Associations, a municipalisation of the stock. These will affect both the supply of and the demand for housing in the improvement area. Finally if improvement eventually results in enhanced population stability and the replacement of smaller by larger units, the traditional role of areas like Dennistoun is threatened.

The spatial pattern of movement associated with Dennistoun is reproduced graphically in Figure 42. The diagram indicates how Dennistoun plays a pivotal role in a complicated system of flows and counterflows within the east end of the city and to the eastern suburbs. Three aspects of the system are of particular interest. Movement is almost exclusively characterised by an eastward sectoral bias, a spatial representation of the segmented nature of housing markets. Secondly, the return flows break the traditional migration rules of outward movement to newer housing. They are also associated with a shift of tenure from local authority to owner occupation. Thirdly, the results of the system have serious implications for the existing problems of the peripheral estates and especially for those residents of the peripheral estates who, for one reason or another, will be excluded from the potential benefits of movement. The creation of stability and rigidity in individual parts of the system as a result of, say, improvement must be weighed against the benefits of improvement in stabilising communities like Dennistoun. Inner city neighbourhoods can be successfully retained and local authorities have a crucial role to play in that process but there is now a need for public policy to consider much more carefully the ramifications of improvement for city-wide processes of population movement and redistribution.

8.6 What, then, does the future hold for areas like Dennistoun?
While public policy is now much more sensitive to the possible occurrence of displacement, it is likely that continuation of the housing market trends noted earlier (greater emphasis on tenure,
location and access) can only result in increased pressure for private rehabilitation. This is particularly so when considered against the background of the general revival of interest in the provision of private housing in inner city areas although the two processes, new-build and rehabilitation, are not of course directly comparable. While many would suggest that renewed interest in the inner city merely reflects the inability of developers to secure peripheral green-field sites for housing, private builders themselves believe there to be a genuine and large demand for inner city housing in preference to suburban housing, especially for small starter homes. There does seem to be an authentic desire to move back into town, especially for those with local roots or connections.

There are of course alternative explanations for the renewed interest in inner city areas. Laska and Spain (Laska and Spain 1980) have suggested that recent developments are less due to local conditions than broad shifts in the structure and functioning of the national housing market, especially changes in supply and demand. Reductions in the level of new building and enhanced competition for the existing stock result in changing patterns of population movement of which displacement is only a small part. Supply and demand are also affected by the availability of finance for house purchase:

"The lending criteria adopted by .... institutions affect the housing opportunities offered to certain households, the housing constraints imposed on others and the basic character of housing sub-markets within the city." (Bassett and Short 1980:279)

In addition, Housing Association allocation policy will affect the supply of improved housing:

"...the allocation policy adopted by an Association is of critical importance, not only in influencing the housing function and population mix of the area but also in determining access for individual households." (Brailey 1980:21)

Regardless of the reasons for future change, certain points become evident. Rehabilitation requires careful monitoring to ensure that its results are not as harmful as those of redevelopment and clearance:

"Neighbourhood revitalisation can aim at either the structures or the people....it is necessary to clearly identify the desired results of a revitalisation strategy prior to formulating a programme of public sector involvement." (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975:151)
In terms of Housing Association improvement, there may be a conflict between the role of the Associations as an agent of urban renewal and their role in providing accommodation for those in greatest need. It is time that the possible contradictions of improvement policy are acknowledged especially if, as recommended in this dissertation, public funds should concentrate on priming the improvement process, providing a secure framework for the investment of private funds in tenement rehabilitation. The need for continued public vigilance is evident.

8.7 Summary

The results of this dissertation do not suggest that Dennistoun is subject to either gentrification or displacement and, as a result, it proved impossible to test the hypothesis of a relationship between gentrification and the distribution of private improvement grants. It has however been shown that rehabilitation need not be as socially neutral as hitherto believed.

By virtue of the nature of the Glasgow tenemental stock, rehabilitation inevitably involves the amalgamation of smaller flats into larger units. Rehabilitation undertaken by Reidvale Housing Association will result in a 25% decline in the number of units of accommodation and a population decline at least as great. Housing Association activity has also resulted in a major shift in the tenure pattern of Dennistoun and a reduction in the stock of cheaper end owner occupied and private rented accommodation.

Improvement has stimulated the housing market in Dennistoun resulting in enhanced levels of population movement although there is little socio-economic difference between in- and out-movers. Very few people moved out as a direct result of improvement, rating other reasons more highly in explaining their decision to leave. Demand for housing is buoyant and the area plays an important part in a complicated system of flows and counterflows of households within the east of the city. Much of that demand is from people with former connections to the area. While improvement has been a positive attraction for in-movers, of equal importance have been Dennistoun's tenure, location and access. If the trend in the housing market is indeed towards a preference for inner city rather than suburban living, then these three factors will ensure continued demand for housing in areas like Dennistoun.
A major shortfall of the dissertation has been to disregard the question of improvement carried out without grant-aid. There is very little data available on this aspect of improvement and it is by no means clear whether non-grant-aided work is more or less important than grant-aided. Little attempt has been made to assess the extent of non-grant-aided work, largely because it would be so difficult to measure. While the distribution of improvement grants is at least recorded, there is no similar requirement for work carried out privately without recourse to public assistance. Perhaps the only way to discover the extent of non-grant-aided work would be through a specific question in the census or a generalised survey of changes in rateable values, assuming these increase as a result of improvement. Both of these would require considerable man-hour effort. Non-grant-aided work is one of the great unknowns of improvement studies. It is an area ripe for future research, not only to identify the extent of its occurrence but also to develop a suitable methodology for its measurement.

Care is required to ensure that the effects of rehabilitation are not as socially disruptive as those of clearance. In Dennistoun improvement has benefited local residents. In addition, the allocation policies of both District Council and Housing Associations have favoured those with former links to the area and have played a major role in safeguarding community ties. On the negative side, improvement reduces the stock of cheaper-end private accommodation and may introduce an unwelcome degree of rigidity within the wider system of household movement in the east of the city. Inner city areas can be successfully retained and there is a major role for local authorities in such a process. Yet pressures for inner city living and the regeneration of areas like Dennistoun may only serve to exacerbate the existing problems of local authority housing schemes, especially on the periphery. While inner city regeneration may be welcome, it would be tragic if it were achieved merely at the expense of accelerated decline of the peripheral estates. There is a need for continued local authority vigilance in both types of area and a realisation that the futures of both are linked rather than independent.

8.8 Recommendations

(1) acceptance that improvement can aim at either structures or people and that clear identification of which of these is paramount is
long overdue.

(2) systematic collation and monitoring of indicators of
neighbourhood change

(3) closer scrutiny of those moving out of Housing Action Areas
for improvement, especially into or within the private sector

(4) repetition of the loss-leader experiment in other suitable
areas of the city.

(Approx. 28,000 words)
APPENDIX 1

Dennistoun Questionnaire: ON-SITE / OFF-SITE

Address:

How long have you lived at this address?

Are you:  Owner-occupier
        Tenant:
            Private (name of factor)

CURRENT ADDRESS
    District Council
    Housing Association (which one?)

How many people live here?
Age of head of household
Occupation of head of household?
How many rooms do you have?

ONLY FOR ON-SITE
(Do you know the name of the former resident of your house?)
(Do you know where they moved to? (address if possible or general area)

Address:

Were you:  Owner occupier
        Tenant:
FORMER ADDRESS
            Private (name of factor)
            District Council
            Housing Association (which one?)

How many rooms did you have there?
Why did you move from that address? Why did you come to Dennistoun?
Do you feel your housing conditions are better as a result of your move?
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