

Harrow
Monitoring
Group
paper

New towns, urban regeneration, and the future of social cohesion in Britain

Harrow Monitoring Group's position

new towns must foster integration, diversity, opportunity, and belonging
--- building places of belonging rather than landscapes of displacement ---

Published by

HARROW MONITORING GROUP

June 2026

[email](#)

Introduction

Britain's proposed programme of new towns represents one of the most ambitious exercises in national spatial planning since the post-war era. Framed against a backdrop of chronic housing shortages, rising urban inequality, intergenerational pressures on home ownership, and widening regional disparities, the programme has the potential to reshape not only where people live, but how communities are formed in twenty-first century Britain.

The House of Lords Built Environment Committee has correctly argued that the purpose of new towns must extend beyond the narrow delivery of housing targets. In its inquiry, *New Towns: Creating Communities*, the Committee emphasised that successful settlements must become "sustainable, flourishing communities" built around infrastructure, placemaking, accessibility, inclusion, stewardship, and long-term civic identity. This represents an important shift in policy thinking. Britain's housing crisis is not merely a question of supply and demand; it is also a question of belonging, opportunity, social cohesion, and democratic legitimacy.

The ambition to create a new generation of towns therefore presents both an opportunity and a warning. It offers the chance to address longstanding failures in housing affordability and regional investment while simultaneously rethinking the social, cultural, and economic foundations of community-making. However, this ambition must be grounded in an honest understanding of the successes and failures of previous urban dispersal policies and the long-term consequences of migration patterns associated with suburbanisation, regeneration, and demographic change.

Throughout the latter half of the twentieth century, government policy and market dynamics encouraged outward migration from Britain's inner cities. Post-war overspill policies moved populations from London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, and other urban centres into new towns and peripheral settlements such as Milton Keynes, Basildon, Stevenage, Redditch, Kirkby, and Runcorn. These policies were often presented as progressive and modernising, providing improved housing conditions, green space, and new infrastructure. Yet they also contributed to the depletion of urban economic capacity, fragmented established communities, and accelerated new forms of social and spatial separation.

At the same time, Britain's inner cities underwent profound demographic and cultural transformation. Black British, South Asian, African, Caribbean, and other minority communities established enduring social, economic, and cultural roots in areas that had often experienced decades of underinvestment. Places such as Brixton, Southall, Handsworth, Moss Side, and Toxteth became central not only to multicultural Britain, but also to the economic and cultural regeneration of cities themselves.

The sociological dynamics underpinning these changes have long been recognised. Morton Grodzins' work on demographic transition and Thomas Schelling's "tipping point" model demonstrated how relatively small changes in neighbourhood composition could generate large-scale patterns of residential migration and segregation. Importantly, these movements were rarely reducible to overt racial hostility alone. They reflected wider intersections of class

aspiration, educational opportunity, housing markets, public investment, perceived social stability, and changing cultural identity.

Today, many of the inner-city areas once associated with decline have become centres of economic growth, higher education, culture, and global investment. Yet regeneration has also produced new forms of displacement. Rising housing costs and speculative redevelopment increasingly place pressure on lower-income households, including many Black and Asian communities whose social and cultural labour helped sustain these neighbourhoods through earlier periods of decline.

Against this backdrop, the new towns agenda raises fundamental questions about the future geography of diversity, inclusion, and social cohesion in Britain. If new settlements become mechanisms for economically displacing populations outward from increasingly unaffordable cities, they risk repeating earlier cycles of fragmentation and exclusion. However, if they are consciously designed as inclusive civic environments with integrated housing, strong local economies, participatory governance, social infrastructure, and intercultural placemaking, they could become models of a more cohesive and confident multicultural society.

This paper examines how Britain's new towns agenda intersects with the historical legacies of urban dispersal, suburbanisation, regeneration, and demographic change. It argues that the long-term success of new settlements will depend not simply on housing delivery, but on whether they become socially rooted, economically resilient, and culturally shared communities. The paper explores the lessons of post-war overspill policy; the relationship between regeneration and displacement; the implications for Black and Asian communities; and the governance, economic, architectural, and social principles necessary to ensure that future new towns cultivate belonging rather than fragmentation.

Against this wider historical, demographic, and sociological backdrop, the House of Lords Built Environment Committee's recent reports provide an important contemporary framework for assessing both the opportunities and risks associated with the new towns agenda.

The House of Lords Built Environment Committee's reports, *New Towns: Laying the Foundations* and *New Towns: Creating Communities*, make an important contribution by reframing the debate around long-term community formation rather than short-term housing delivery. The Committee is particularly persuasive in its emphasis on infrastructure-first development, stewardship, environmental quality, health, accessibility, and local identity. Its rejection of speculative, low-quality urban expansion reflects growing public concern that large-scale development too often prioritises numerical targets over social sustainability.

The reports are also correct to stress that successful settlements require a compelling civic vision and durable institutional frameworks capable of sustaining trust over generations. The emphasis on community participation, land value capture, and long-term stewardship addresses many of the weaknesses that undermined aspects of earlier new towns policy.

However, despite these strengths, the Committee's analysis remains comparatively limited in its treatment of demographic change, migration patterns, and the historical sociology of urban dispersal. While the reports discuss inclusion extensively, they do not fully engage with how large-scale population redistribution can reshape the geography of race, class, and political representation over time.

The historical experience of post-war overspill policy demonstrates that population movement is never socially neutral. Decisions concerning where housing is built, who relocates, and how economic opportunity is distributed inevitably affect patterns of segregation, suburbanisation, and community cohesion. The Committee's emphasis on "creating communities" therefore risks underestimating the complexity of integration in practice. Social cohesion cannot simply be masterplanned through architecture or consultation frameworks alone; it emerges through stable institutions, economic inclusion, shared public life, and long-term social trust.

Similarly, although the reports acknowledge affordability pressures, they do not sufficiently confront the possibility that new towns may become destinations for populations economically displaced from regenerated urban centres. In cities such as London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, regeneration has increased prosperity while simultaneously pricing many lower-income residents, including Black and Asian communities, out of historically established neighbourhoods. If future new towns primarily absorb those excluded from increasingly expensive metropolitan economies without creating strong local employment and civic identity, they risk reproducing earlier patterns of peripheral dependency and social fragmentation.

The reports also place considerable faith in participatory governance and mixed-tenure development. While both are necessary, neither automatically guarantees meaningful integration. Participation processes are often dominated by more affluent and politically organised groups, while spatial proximity alone does not necessarily produce social interaction across class, ethnic, or cultural divisions. Genuine integration requires deeper institutional and economic inclusion alongside physical design.

A further unresolved issue concerns the long-term democratic implications of large-scale settlement planning. New towns inevitably influence electoral geography, patterns of representation, and regional political identities. While this should not obstruct ambitious housing development, it does reinforce the need for transparency and accountability in governance arrangements and settlement strategy.

Ultimately, the Committee's work succeeds in elevating the debate beyond housing numbers toward broader questions of human flourishing, civic identity, and sustainable place-making. This is a major contribution. Yet the next stage of policy development must engage more directly with the realities of demographic transition, economic displacement, and social fragmentation that have historically accompanied large-scale urban restructuring in Britain.

Without that deeper sociological understanding, there remains a risk that the new towns programme could unintentionally reproduce the very inequalities and separations it seeks to overcome.

Husain Akhtar

Coordinator

Harrow Monitoring Group

*also, former Councillor and member of the Planning Committee, London Borough of Harrow,
and former Inspector of Schools, Ofsted*

1. Learning from the post-war new towns programme

The post-war New Towns movement emerged from urgent necessity. Britain faced overcrowded cities, severe housing shortages, industrial pollution, and deteriorating inner-city conditions. Settlements such as Milton Keynes, Stevenage, Harlow, Basildon, and Cumbernauld were intended to provide healthier living environments, economic decentralisation, and social renewal.

Many of these towns delivered important gains. Families accessed larger homes, green space, and improved infrastructure. Yet over time it became clear that physical expansion alone could not automatically generate durable civic identity or social cohesion.

Government “overspill” policies from the 1950s through the 1980s accelerated outward migration from major cities including London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool. Londoners relocated to Essex, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Kent. Birmingham expanded outward toward Solihull and Redditch. Liverpool dispersed population into Kirkby, Skelmersdale, and Runcorn. Manchester experienced suburban expansion into Cheshire and peripheral Greater Manchester districts.

While these policies alleviated pressure on urban housing stock, they also weakened many urban cores economically and socially. Population loss frequently coincided with industrial decline, shrinking local tax bases, reduced retail vitality, and diminished public investment. Some receiving towns struggled to establish economic self-sufficiency or coherent civic identities, becoming heavily commuter-dependent settlements vulnerable to stagnation.

The House of Lords Committee has emphasised that future new towns require a compelling national vision and strong local identity from inception. This is a critical lesson from earlier generations of development: communities cannot be sustained solely through housing delivery. They require purpose, participation, and institutions capable of generating long-term attachment to place.

2. White flight, demographic change, and the geography of belonging

Any serious assessment of population redistribution in Britain must engage honestly with the phenomenon commonly described as “white flight.” Although politically sensitive, the concept describes documented patterns of outward migration associated with demographic transition, economic mobility, educational aspirations, and changing perceptions of neighbourhood identity.

The sociologist Morton Grodzins identified in the 1950s how demographic transitions often accelerated once communities perceived social “thresholds” had been crossed. Thomas Schelling’s later “tipping point” model demonstrated how individual residential preferences could collectively produce large-scale segregation even in the absence of overt institutional coordination.

Importantly, these movements were rarely reducible to simple racial hostility. They reflected complex interactions between class mobility, school quality, housing access, public investment, crime perceptions, labour market change, and cultural anxiety. Mortgage finance and planning systems often reinforced these trends.

In Britain, census changes between 2001 and 2021 illustrate substantial demographic transformation. London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Leicester became increasingly diverse, while many surrounding suburban and semi-rural areas saw growth in populations relocating from urban centres.

London offers perhaps the clearest illustration. Boroughs such as Barking and Dagenham, Havering, and parts of outer Essex experienced substantial outward migration of White British households as inner London became more globally diverse and economically polarised. Simultaneously, areas such as Tower Hamlets, Hackney, and Southwark underwent major demographic and cultural transformation driven by immigration, regeneration, and rising housing values.

Birmingham experienced similar dynamics. Areas such as Handsworth and Sparkbrook became centres of Black British and South Asian life while suburban and peripheral movement reshaped the wider West Midlands geography. Manchester saw Moss Side, Rusholme, and Cheetham Hill evolve into highly diverse urban communities while suburbanisation altered surrounding districts. Liverpool's Toxteth similarly became central to Black Liverpoolian identity and multicultural urban life.

These transformations generated both tension and creativity. Inner cities that had once suffered disinvestment became centres of cultural innovation, entrepreneurship, education, food culture, music, and global connectivity. Yet regeneration also introduced new forms of inequality and exclusion.

3. Regeneration and the risk of secondary displacement

The regeneration of Britain's inner cities is one of the defining urban stories of recent decades. Formerly neglected districts in London, Manchester, Birmingham, and Liverpool have attracted major investment, infrastructure renewal, and new economic activity.

Neighbourhoods such as Shoreditch, Brixton, Digbeth, the Northern Quarter, and Liverpool's Baltic Triangle are now associated with creative industries, technology sectors, higher education expansion, and urban consumption economies. However, regeneration has frequently produced contradictory outcomes.

Displacement therefore becomes more than residential relocation. It represents the fragmentation of long-established support networks, religious institutions, local businesses, intergenerational relationships, and forms of cultural belonging built over decades. This is where the debate about new towns intersects directly with questions of diversity and social

justice. If rising urban costs continue to displace lower-income populations outward, poorly planned new towns could become the next stage in a repeating cycle of economic exclusion.

The Lords Committee has warned that new towns must become “places where people will want to live and thrive,” not simply housing allocations attached to commuter infrastructure. Without strong economic foundations, cultural infrastructure, and participatory governance, new settlements risk becoming dormitory zones characterised by weak social attachment and limited upward mobility.

4. Regeneration, gentrification, and the displacement of Black and Asian communities

The regeneration of Britain’s inner cities has produced significant economic and physical transformation, but its social consequences have been unevenly distributed. In many cases, Black and Asian communities who contributed to the survival, cultural vitality, and economic resilience of urban neighbourhoods during periods of decline have experienced increasing displacement pressures as regeneration intensified.

In London, the transformation of areas such as Brixton, Hackney, Peckham, Southall, and parts of Tower Hamlets illustrates this tension clearly. Brixton, historically associated with Black British and Afro-Caribbean culture, became a focal point for regeneration and private investment from the late 1990s onwards. Rising property values, commercial redevelopment, and changing retail patterns altered the social character of the area significantly. Longstanding concerns emerged regarding the displacement of Black-owned businesses, the erosion of cultural identity, and the increasing inability of younger Black Londoners to remain within communities shaped by earlier generations.

Research by Lees, Slater and Wyly on gentrification demonstrates that urban regeneration frequently produces what they describe as “indirect displacement,” whereby communities are not always physically removed immediately, but gradually excluded through escalating rents, changing consumption economies, and the restructuring of local services around more affluent populations. This pattern has been visible across several London boroughs where regeneration has coincided with the reduction of affordable housing stock and rising private rental costs.

The redevelopment of the Heygate Estate in Southwark and the Woodberry Down estate in Hackney generated sustained debate around the social consequences of regeneration for lower-income and ethnically diverse residents. Critics argued that regeneration strategies frequently replaced large quantities of social housing with mixed-tenure developments that were substantially less accessible to original residents. While regeneration improved environmental quality and attracted investment, concerns persisted regarding whether existing communities benefited proportionately from the resulting uplift in land value.

In Birmingham, areas such as Handsworth, Sparkbrook, and Small Heath have historically functioned as centres of Black British and South Asian social and economic life. Regeneration initiatives linked to the city centre expansion, HS2-related redevelopment, and wider

investment corridors have generated opportunities but also intensified affordability pressures and land value inflation. Digbeth's transformation into a creative and technology-oriented district illustrates how former industrial areas adjacent to ethnically diverse neighbourhoods can rapidly transition toward higher-income urban consumption economies.

Manchester presents similar dynamics. Moss Side, Rusholme, Longsight, and Cheetham Hill developed as major centres for Black African, Caribbean, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and later Middle Eastern communities. However, Manchester's extensive city-centre regeneration and expansion of high-density apartment development have increasingly altered the social geography of surrounding districts. Scholars of urban restructuring have noted that while Manchester's regeneration model is often celebrated internationally, it has also intensified socioeconomic polarisation between affluent regenerated zones and peripheral lower-income communities.

Liverpool's experience likewise reflects the complex relationship between regeneration and racialised urban inequality. Toxteth, home to one of the oldest Black communities in Britain, experienced severe disinvestment during the late twentieth century and became nationally associated with the 1981 uprisings following tensions involving policing, unemployment, and structural inequality. Subsequent regeneration improved infrastructure and investment, but longstanding debates remain regarding whether redevelopment strategies adequately protected local community continuity, affordable housing, and Black cultural heritage.

The impact of regeneration on Asian communities has often operated differently but with comparable structural effects. In areas such as Southall in west London, Leicester's Belgrave district, and Birmingham's Sparkhill and Alum Rock, regeneration and rising property markets have interacted with longstanding patterns of ethnic entrepreneurship and family-based property ownership. In some cases, South Asian communities achieved greater economic stability through local business ownership and property accumulation. However, second-generation affordability pressures, overcrowding, and the financialisation of urban land have increasingly challenged the long-term sustainability of these communities within high-demand urban areas.

Importantly, displacement should not be understood solely as physical relocation. Sociologists increasingly emphasise "cultural displacement," where communities experience the erosion of belonging, identity, and social recognition even before residential movement occurs. Changes in retail landscapes, public spaces, nightlife economies, policing patterns, and local governance can all contribute to perceptions that historically rooted communities are becoming socially marginal within neighbourhoods they helped sustain.

These developments are highly relevant to the contemporary new towns debate. If future settlements primarily absorb populations economically displaced from regenerated cities without simultaneously building strong local economies, civic infrastructure, and inclusive cultural identity, Britain risks reproducing a repeating cycle of peripheralisation. Lower-income and minority communities may once again become spatially redistributed away from economically dynamic urban centres while wealth and opportunity concentrate elsewhere.

The key policy lesson is therefore that regeneration and new town development cannot be treated as separate processes. They are interconnected dimensions of a wider spatial restructuring of Britain's cities and regions. Unless managed carefully, regeneration may continue to displace historically rooted communities outward, while new towns become repositories for populations excluded from increasingly unaffordable metropolitan economies.

Avoiding this outcome requires a stronger emphasis on community retention, affordable housing guarantees, local wealth-building, cultural preservation, and democratic participation within both regeneration policy and future settlement planning.

5. Infrastructure first: the social foundations of community

One of the strongest conclusions emerging from the Built Environment Committee's inquiry is the importance of an "infrastructure-first" approach. Schools, healthcare, public transport, utilities, community facilities, and social infrastructure must not arrive years after residents move in; they must form part of the settlement from the outset.

(Read Harrow Monitoring Group's [written evidence](#) for the Committee's inquiry).

This principle is not merely technical but sociological. Communities develop trust through everyday interaction and shared institutions. Early under-provision generates frustration, weakens attachment to place, and creates the perception that residents are inhabiting unfinished or temporary environments.

Recent developments such as Northstowe have demonstrated how delays in schools, GP services, transport links, and communal amenities can undermine confidence and social cohesion during the critical early years of settlement formation.

The implications for diversity are particularly significant. New towns are likely to attract highly mixed populations including younger households priced out of cities, minority communities seeking affordability, migrants, older residents downsizing, and families relocating for employment opportunities. Without deliberate investment in social infrastructure, there is a risk that different groups will coexist physically while remaining socially disconnected.

Integrated infrastructure therefore becomes central to integration itself.

6. Diversity, integration, and shared belonging

The central question is not whether new towns will receive dispersed populations. They almost certainly will. The real question is whether they will successfully integrate those populations into cohesive civic communities.

Britain's future new towns must therefore be multicultural, multi-generational, and economically mixed from inception rather than attempting to retrofit diversity later.

This begins with integrated housing design. Mixed-tenure development, combining social housing, affordable housing, private rental, and owner-occupation within shared neighbourhoods, is essential to avoid reproducing patterns of physical and symbolic segregation.

The Committee's emphasis on community co-design and participatory engagement is equally important. Residents are more likely to develop attachment to place when they shape it directly through local governance, design review, and stewardship structures.

Cultural infrastructure must also be embedded early. Libraries, arts centres, sports facilities, community hubs, and faith-neutral gathering spaces create opportunities for interaction across ethnic, generational, and religious lines. Public spaces matter socially as well as aesthetically.

Intercultural placemaking should therefore become a core principle of settlement design. Public art, multilingual wayfinding, landscape design, naming practices, festivals, and civic programming should reflect Britain's plural identities while fostering shared ownership of space.

This is particularly important given the long historical association between spatial segregation and social distrust. New towns should not become demographic buffers separating communities geographically. They should function instead as bridges between them.

7. Economic opportunity and the danger of dormitory settlements

The Lords Committee has repeatedly stressed that new towns require a purpose beyond housing numbers. Economic viability and opportunity are central to that purpose.

Many earlier new towns struggled because local economies failed to keep pace with residential expansion. Heavy dependence on commuting weakened daytime economies, civic participation, and local identity.

Future settlements must therefore include robust local employment ecosystems from the outset. Business districts, flexible commercial space, co-working hubs, and innovation clusters linked to sectors such as green technology, AI, care economies, education, advanced manufacturing, and cultural industries can help generate long-term resilience.

The risks of failing to do so are substantial. Settlements lacking strong local economic ecosystems often experience declining social mobility, reduced civic confidence, and weakened attachment to place.

Some areas originally viewed as aspirational "escape zones" now face economic stagnation and identity challenges precisely because housing growth was not matched by broader investment.

The original outward movers from cities such as London, Birmingham, and Liverpool cannot easily “return” because affordability, economic geography, and cultural belonging have all changed. The regenerated cities they left have become fundamentally different places.

This demonstrates that population dispersal without enduring economic and social investment creates transient settlement patterns rather than rooted communities.

8. Stewardship, governance, and democratic legitimacy

The Built Environment Committee’s focus on long-term stewardship is especially important. Successful places require institutions capable of maintaining civic assets, managing growth, and sustaining public trust over decades.

Models such as community trusts, stewardship corporations, and long-term land management bodies can help ensure that increases in land value are reinvested into infrastructure, culture, public space, and social services rather than extracted solely through speculative development.

This principle also intersects with democratic legitimacy. Population redistribution inevitably affects electoral geography, local representation, and political power. The concentration or dispersal of demographic groups may unintentionally shape future constituencies and regional political dynamics.

Transparency, participation, and accountability are therefore essential. Development corporations may provide effective delivery mechanisms, but they must remain democratically responsive and locally embedded.

Communities are more likely to support growth when they believe they retain agency over how change occurs.

9. Designing for health, nature, and long-term resilience

The Lords Committee has also placed strong emphasis on health, accessibility, sustainability, and environmental quality as defining features of successful new towns.

This reflects a broader shift in urban thinking. Housing policy can no longer be separated from public health, biodiversity, climate adaptation, and mental wellbeing.

Walkable neighbourhoods, integrated cycle infrastructure, green-blue networks, biodiversity corridors, and community-managed green spaces should become foundational elements rather than aesthetic afterthoughts. Environmental design directly shapes physical activity, social interaction, and psychological wellbeing.

New towns should also function as laboratories for socially intelligent and climate-responsive design. International examples such as Almere in the Netherlands and Hammarby Sjöstad in

Sweden demonstrate how ecological sustainability, mixed-use development, and community participation can be integrated successfully.

Flexible zoning, adaptive housing, renewable energy systems, digital infrastructure, and community energy models will be essential to future-proofing settlements against technological and economic change.

Equally important is accessibility. Universal design principles, step-free infrastructure, adaptable housing, and inclusive recreational spaces ensure that settlements remain genuinely shared environments across age, disability, and income differences.

Conclusion

The lessons emerging from both post-war planning and contemporary regeneration are therefore clear.

Britain's spatial inequalities are not merely geographic. They are historical, economic, and sociocultural. The legacies of white flight, uneven regeneration, economic centralisation, racial inequality, and housing scarcity continue to shape where people live, how communities form, and who feels they belong.

The new towns programme therefore represents far more than a construction agenda. It is a test of whether Britain can build places capable of sustaining social trust within an increasingly diverse society.

The House of Lords Built Environment Committee is correct to argue that these settlements require a compelling vision rooted in community, stewardship, inclusion, and long-term civic identity.

If new towns are conceived primarily as mechanisms to redistribute housing pressure away from prosperous urban centres, they risk repeating the failures of earlier eras: fragmentation, dormitory urbanism, displacement, and weakened belonging.

But if they are designed as shared projects of integration and participation, places where infrastructure, opportunity, diversity, and democratic agency are embedded from the beginning, they could become one of the most important civic achievements of modern Britain.

The challenge is not simply to build homes. It is to cultivate belonging.

References

- Beatley, T. (2012). *Green Cities of Europe: Global Lessons on Green Urbanism*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Bourne, L. S. (1993). “The Myth and Reality of Gentrification: A Commentary on Emerging Urban Forms.” *Urban Studies*, 30(1), pp. 183–189.
- Built Environment Committee, House of Lords. (2025). *New Towns: Laying the Foundations*. HL Paper 183. London: UK Parliament.
- Built Environment Committee, House of Lords. (2026). *New Towns: Creating Communities*. HL Paper 278. London: UK Parliament.
- Butler, T. and Robson, G. (2003). *London Calling: The Middle Classes and the Re-making of Inner London*. Oxford: Berg.
- Davidson, M. and Lees, L. (2010). “New-build Gentrification: Its Histories, Trajectories, and Critical Geographies.” *Population, Space and Place*, 16(5), pp. 395–411.
- Florida, R. (2017). *The New Urban Crisis*. London: Oneworld.
- Glaeser, E. (2011). *Triumph of the City*. London: Pan Macmillan.
- Grodzins, M. (1958). *The Metropolitan Area as a Racial Problem*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Hall, P. and Ward, C. (1998). *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Hubbard, P. (2016). *The Battle for the High Street: Retail Gentrification, Class and Disgust*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, E. and Benson, M. (2014). “Neither ‘Deepest, Darkest Peckham’ nor ‘Run-of-the-Mill’ East Dulwich: The Middle Classes and Their ‘Others’ in an Inner-London Neighbourhood.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), pp. 1195–1210.
- Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. New York: Routledge.
- Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minton, A. (2017). *Big Capital: Who Is London For?* London: Penguin.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS). (2001–2021). *Census Data for England and Wales*.
- Phillips, D. (2006). “Parallel Lives? Challenging Discourses of British Muslim Self-Segregation.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24(1), pp. 25–40.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century.” *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), pp. 137–174.
- Sampson, R. J. (2012). *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sassen, S. (2001). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schelling, T. C. (1969). “Models of Segregation.” *American Economic Review*, 59(2), pp. 488–493.
- Tonkiss, F. (2013). *Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tyler, I. (2013). *Revolt Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed Books.
- UN-Habitat. (2020). *World Cities Report 2020: The Value of Sustainable Urbanization*. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
- Urban Task Force. (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Watt, P. (2009). “Living in an Oasis: Middle-class Disaffiliation and Selective Belonging in an English Suburb.” *Environment and Planning A*, 41(12), pp. 2874–2892.
- Watt, P. (2021). *Estate Regeneration and Its Discontents: Public Housing, Place and Inequality in London*. Bristol: Policy Press.