

## **CHAPTER 13**

### **HOUSING CONDITIONS OF CYPRIOTS IN LONDON**

#### **Cyprus & Inner London: the Contrast**

For most of the immigrants to Britain from the less developed countries of the Commonwealth, even the poorest housing conditions in Britain's towns are liable to constitute an improvement in terms of space and amenities on what has been known before. In the case of the Cypriots, the contrast between conditions in Britain and in their home country is less marked than among settlers from Asia and the Caribbean. During the prosperous post-war period there has been much improvement throughout the island in standards of construction and of amenities.

Although in the smaller villages and in the poorer rural areas most housing is still of the traditional type, built of home-made mud brick or stone, and with a flat mud roof, dwellings of modern construction are now common in many parts. Building materials are relatively cheap, and residential property the most popular form of investment - as well as providing the owner-occupier with considerable prestige. The wealthier villages, therefore, with their shining white houses, often two-storied and with low red-tiled roofs, present the appearance of almost another world by contrast with their poorer counterparts. Moreover, just as construction techniques have been modernised, so has the standard of household amenities. Piped water begins to replace the women's journey to the well, though flush-type toilets and baths are found only rarely in private homes. Electricity has now become available to villagers in most parts of the island, providing lighting, and often power as well. Electrical goods such as refrigerators and washing machines are only beginning to be found outside the towns; in 1960 these items were installed in only 4 per cent and 1 per cent respectively of rural dwellings.<sup>1</sup>

In the towns, as one would expect, such modern techniques and amenities are relatively common. However, statistics for housing conditions in the towns conceal a range of standards from the post-war quality units (built for the British troops - now mostly departed - and for the new middle-class) to pre-war slum properties and the ramshackle but recent erections that characterise some sectors of the expanding suburbs. Town-bred migrants, or those with experience of urban residence, may come more from the latter kind of background than from the former. Even so, one can safely say that, of all post-war Cypriot migrants, the vast majority had already experienced something of the conditions and amenities of modern urban life - if not in their own homes, at least in the homes of friends or relatives, and in public places.

The housing environment in the areas of London within which most Cypriot immigrants first settle is nonetheless in many ways sharply contrasted with that of Cyprus. The major 'reception area' for Cypriot immigrants has undoubtedly been the borough of Islington. Islington, a once fashionable middle-class outgrowth of Victorian London, had by the 1950s become one of the 'twilight zones' characteristic of the inner city area of almost all major cities of the industrial West. Its Victorian terraces, tall, decayed, fronting almost direct onto the road, and devoid of any kind of greenery, could hardly in appearance be more different from their residential counterparts in Cyprus. Indeed, housing conditions in Islington were among the poorest in London, and similar to those in (old) St. Pancras borough, these being the two boroughs most populous with Cypriots in 1961.

An indication of the housing conditions encountered by Cypriot immigrants on their arrival is provided by details from those Census Enumeration Districts in London within which in 1961 Cypriot immigrants constituted more than 10 per cent of the total population.<sup>2</sup> Of 51 such Enumeration Districts, 29 were within the borough of Islington; these 29 are taken as typical of the 'reception areas' within which the immigrants first settled. Selected housing characteristics of these areas are shown in Table 13.1.

The main features of these 'reception' areas, as revealed by the Census, are poor amenities, a high proportion of households sharing dwellings, and a high density of occupancy of housing. For example, five out of six households in these 29 E.D.s were sharing their dwelling (i.e. without self-

Table 13.1

HOUSING CONDITIONS OF CENSUS ENUMERATION DISTRICTS  
WITH HIGH CYPRIOT POPULATION: ISLINGTON, 1961

<u>All Households</u>	<u>Mean for</u> <u>29 E.D.'s in</u> <u>Islington (a)</u>	<u>Mean for</u> <u>all E.D.'s</u> <u>in London A.C.</u>
% sharing dwelling	83.1	29.1
% sharing, and without exclusive use of stove or sink.	17.7	6.9
% without exclusive use of w.c.	73.2	30.4
No. rooms per dwelling	6.7	4.7
No. persons per room	0.98	0.78
% room density over 1½	18.2	6.9

Notes: (a) ~~New~~ E.D.'s with more than 10 per cent of enumerated population born in Cyprus.

Source: data made available by the Centre for Urban Studies, University College, London: derived from 1961 Census returns.

contained accommodation) with other households, as compared with well under a third of all those in the inner London area (the erstwhile 'Administrative County' of London). Three-quarters, moreover, were without exclusive use of a w.c., compared again with less than a third in inner London generally. Eighteen per cent, moreover, did not even have exclusive use of stove and sink. Davison's survey of housing conditions in seven inner London boroughs (though not including Islington)<sup>3</sup> found that almost half (47 per cent) of the Cypriot households in those areas had no hot water tap, and more than a third (36 per cent) had no fixed bath.<sup>4</sup>

Although tending to lack these basic amenities, the houses in the Islington E.D.s were large and rarely converted structurally to facilitate multi-occupation. The average number of rooms per dwelling was 6.7, as compared with 4.7 in inner London generally; and the number of persons per room was 0.98 as compared with 0.78. Associated with this was a relatively high proportion of households occupying rooms at a density of over 1½ persons per room: 18 per cent, or towards three times that among Londoners generally. This high occupancy was especially marked among larger households, with three-fifths of those of five persons or more living at more than 1½ persons per room.

Davison's evidence for the situation of Cypriots in his selected boroughs provides evidence of the use made by Cypriot immigrants in particular of this kind of housing stock: this may in turn be compared with circumstances in Cyprus. Household size, for instance, at 4.2 persons per Cypriot household in the seven boroughs,<sup>5</sup> was significantly higher than in Cyprus as a whole in 1960, when it was on average 3.6 persons per household. If urban areas only are compared, a different picture emerges, for in the towns alone in Cyprus the average size was also 4.2 persons: in the rural areas, on the other hand, it was 3.4 persons.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps similar factors, such as limited access to housing, kinship structure and the stage of the family cycle, may account for the similar and greater size of urban households in both situations.

Cypriot households appear to be considerably better off for space on settlement in Britain by comparison with Cyprus. Table 13.2 shows the proportion of households occupying one, two, three, or more rooms in London centre as compared with the home island. Whereas half of the households in Cyprus were in housing units of two rooms or less, only a quarter had so little space in Britain. With

**Table 13.2**  
**ROOMS OCCUPIED BY CYPRIOT HOUSEHOLDS IN LONDON CENTRE**  
**1961 & IN CYPRUS 1960**

<u>% occupying</u>	<u>London</u> <u>Centre</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Cyprus</u>	<u>Cyprus</u> <u>Towns</u>	<u>Cyprus</u> <u>Villages</u>
1 room	7	24	18	27
2 rooms	17	27	22	30
3 rooms	29	22	21	22
4 or more rooms	47	27	39	21
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	100	100	100	100
N	1,891	145,709	51,343	94,366

**Notes:** (a) 'Cypriot Household' = household with head born in Cyprus  
(b) 'London Centre' = boroughs of Lambeth, Stoke Newington, Hackney, Paddington, Deptford, Battersea and Camberwell.

**Sources:** Davison R.B., Black British, O.U.P. 1967, Tables 13, 18 (derived from 1961 Census returns); C.P.A. 1960

units of more than three rooms the picture was almost reversed, nearly half of Cypriot households in Britain having this amount of space, but little more than a quarter in Cyprus. The contrast between the immigrants and their home background appears the more marked if one takes only the statistics for village households, whereas in the towns the distribution is more similar to that in Britain.

It must be pointed out, however, that in Table 13.2 neither the size of rooms is taken into account, nor, more importantly, is the number of persons per household. No data on room-size are available, but there can be no doubt that the main rooms in the Victorian and Edwardian houses so commonly inhabited by Cypriots in London are much larger than their counterparts in Cyprus. However, although the number of rooms, and their size, is larger for Cypriot households in Britain, it is also true that there are more persons per household. Measuring housing space in terms of room density, therefore, we find that the density of occupation is in fact only marginally lower among Cypriot households in the seven central London boroughs than in Cyprus. In Britain the room density was a little less than 1.2 persons per room, while in Cyprus it was in the region of 1.3, with little difference between rural and urban areas.<sup>7</sup> In this respect, therefore, the improvement in housing conditions is much less than in respect of the space available for households as wholes. The average number of rooms per household in Britain was 3.6, whereas in Cyprus it was 2.8 (3.4 in the towns, and 2.5 in the rural areas).<sup>8</sup>

If the evidence from the seven inner London boroughs can be taken as indicative of the housing conditions experienced by Cypriot migrants in the early years of their settlement in Britain, it seems likely that many Cypriot immigrants have encountered certain improvements as regards the conventional indices of housing conditions. These may not, however, have been particularly great. In overall character, though the London housing of the immigrants was very different from that in Cyprus. This contrasting quality of the urban environment, and the necessarily indoor life (as opposed to the largely outdoor life in Cyprus), are perhaps the two differences in this area that the Cypriot immigrants find most striking.



## Housing Tenure

Generally speaking, in housing, as in other aspects of social and economic life, Cypriot families desire to be independent, and therefore to possess homes of their own. A house of one's own is an ideal that is expected to be realised, and in recent times in Cyprus it has become increasingly common for this to be provided for a couple by the bride's parents as part of the marriage dowry. Traditionally, in the villages, to have one's own house was the only way to be able to run one's domestic affairs separately from relatives, whereas in modern times the practice of renting housing in the towns has provided an alternative solution for this problem. However, even in the towns almost half of the households in 1960 were owner-occupiers,<sup>9</sup> a surprisingly high proportion considering the mobile and uncertain labour situation on the island.

It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the chief aims of almost every Cypriot immigrant family in Britain is to save up enough for the down-payment on a mortgage, and thus to obtain a house of their own. Moreover, Cypriots have been particularly successful in this respect since in both 1961 and 1966, according to the Census returns for Greater London, more Cypriot householders were owner-occupiers than any other Commonwealth group.<sup>10</sup>

The types of tenure of Cypriot households in Greater London, as enumerated by the 10 per cent Sample Surveys of the Censuses in 1961 and 1966, are set out in Table 13.3. In 1966, 44 per cent of Cypriot households were owner-occupied, 50 per cent were rented privately, and 6 per cent were rented from a Local Authority.

**Table 13.3**

**HOUSING TENURE OF CYPRIOT HOUSEHOLDS IN GREATER LONDON**

**1961 & 1966**

	<u>Cypriot Households</u>		<u>All Households</u> <u>in London</u>
	<u>1961</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1966</u>
Owner-occupied	38.2	43.8	38.5
Rented:			
Local Authority	4.6	6.3	21.6
Private Unfurnished	28.3	24.3	28.5
Private Furnished	24.9	25.6	8.6
Other/not stated	4.0	-	2.8
All Tenures	100.0	100.0	100.0
N (10% Sample)	944	1,739	262,425

**Notes:** (a) 'Cypriot households' = households with head or spouse born in Cyprus.  
(b) 'Other' tenures of Cypriot households in 1961 were either "held by virtue of employment" or "rented together with ... business premises" (none 'not stated').

**Sources:** G.R.O. 1961; C.I.T. 1966; General Register Office, Sample Census, England & Wales, County Report: Greater London, H.M.S.O. 1967.

Not only is the proportion of owner-occupiers higher than among other ethnic minorities in London, as mentioned earlier, but it is also significantly higher than that for householders in Greater London as a whole, at 38 per cent of the total. The proportion in Local Authority housing, on the other hand, was very small by comparison with the overall London population: more than one in five London households rented their homes from a Local Authority, as compared with one in sixteen among the Cypriot minority. As regards private renting of housing, this involved rather more households among

Cypriots than among Londoners generally, owing to the high proportion of Cypriot households occupying furnished accommodation rented privately.

Since 1961, the trend among Cypriots in London appears to have been mainly towards owner-occupation of housing, and away from private renting. In view of the substantial increase in the number of households due to immigration during the intervening five years, the rise in the proportion of owner-occupiers is especially striking, and suggests that the proportion may increase more sharply subsequently. The proportion of Cypriots in Local Authority housing has also increased, but its scale continues to be relatively rather small.

The situation of Cypriots in relation to the purchase of private housing is dependent upon three factors: their motivation to become owner-occupiers, their possession or access to the necessary finance, and their freedom of access to the market for this kind of property. The presence of motivation among Cypriots to become house-owners has already been remarked upon, and it therefore remains to consider the other two factors.

On the financial side, the success in business of so many Cypriots in Britain has obviously been of major importance in enabling purchase of private housing. The majority of Cypriots work very hard, particularly when they first arrive in Britain and while they are young, and they save much of what they earn with a view to purchasing a house. Since in their view the purchase of residential property is also about the best form of investment they can make (since it is secure from inflation, free of ordinary business risks, and potentially productive of income free from physical work) they can in this way achieve two purposes simultaneously. However, few purchase housing without borrowing money in the form of a mortgage. A survey carried out for P.E.P. indicated that almost all Cypriot owner-occupiers had mortgages: of a sample in the London borough of Islington, 47 per cent were owner-occupiers and 44 per cent had mortgages on their property.<sup>11</sup> To judge from advertisements (private and agency) in the Greek-Cypriot press during 1965 and 1966, the houses bought by Cypriots lay mostly in the £5,000 to £6,000 price range: in size they varied between five and eight rooms depending on their age and location, the latter spreading chiefly out northwards from the Kentish Town and Finsbury Park areas.

So far as access to mortgages and to the housing market is concerned, the P.E.P. Report on 'Racial Discrimination' showed that the experience of discrimination by Cypriots was generally low in relation to 'coloured' minorities in Britain.<sup>12</sup> The existence in 1966 of at least nine Cypriot property agents dealing wholly or substantially in housing in the north London area is of particular importance in facilitating Cypriot access to the housing market and to mortgages. Loans and mortgages can be obtained from or through these agencies or from other Greek Cypriot businesses that advertise in the press, and language problems and other difficulties are thereby eliminated. In this way the Cypriot community in itself provides means of access to housing and finance for those who prefer not to go, or are unsuccessful in going elsewhere to obtain these services.

More Cypriots living out of the centre of London are owner-occupiers than in the middle. The movement of Cypriots northwards from the early centres of residence<sup>13</sup> is for most a move away from their work-place and towards higher quality housing. According to Davison, 34 per cent of Cypriot households in seven central London boroughs in 1961 were owner-occupiers, whereas in Greater London as a whole 38 per cent were owner-occupiers.<sup>14</sup> A survey of immigrant families in the Haringey area of the borough of Haringey with children entering primary school in autumn 1965 showed that 30 out of 45 Cypriot parents were house owners.<sup>15</sup> All of these householders, incidentally, said that they were intending to stay in Haringey. Unfortunately no Census data for individual boroughs is available, but there is no doubt about the trend in home-ownership being associated with the movement of Cypriots northwards. Both rents and house prices are appreciably lower in the Outer boroughs to the north, and it is this together with character of housing available there that are the two main determinants of the moved outwards.

As was shown in Table 13.3, half of all Cypriot households in London rented their accommodation from private landlords. As with other groups in the population, Cypriots often do this because they cannot afford housing of their own or because they have not yet qualified for public housing. Many Cypriots rent from other Cypriots, but by no means exclusively. Again, many take

rooms in houses occupied by other Cypriot families, but then others are alone amongst non-Cypriots in their accommodation. Quite often, a property-owner will let to relatives at a moderate rent, and to others at a more competitive price. Exactly how common or unusual these various arrangements are amongst Cypriots in Britain is not known, since no relevant statistics are available. There is the same lack of information about rents paid for furnished and unfurnished accommodation. In Cyprus, in the towns, rented accommodation is generally quite cheap. In London the informal information network of the Cypriot community is probably efficient in spreading the news of opportunities and in keeping prices competitive, and in this way (and with the help of house-owning relatives) many Cypriots can get housing at a reasonable price. Also, they often prefer to tolerate cheaper and less convenient housing in order to be able to save. But on the whole, the rents paid by Cypriot families appear quite as variable as does the size and condition of their accommodation.

Since Cypriots think so highly of owning their own family house, it is to be expected that the number renting housing from a Local Authority would be small. However, Table 13.3 indicates that about one in sixteen Cypriot households in Greater London held this type of tenure, a higher proportion than among 'coloured' immigrant households in London in 1966 (among whom 4.2 per cent were housed in Local Authority Accommodation)<sup>16</sup>. What is not known is the quality of the Local Authority housing that Cypriots occupy: whether it be patched-up slum property, modern or modernised flats, or houses with gardens on Council Estates. There is little evidence of any major increase in the proportion in Local Authority housing as Cypriot settlement in Britain becomes longer established. With relatively few immigrants arriving after 1962, the majority of households could potentially have satisfied residence requirements by 1966. Yet the proportion renting their homes from the Local Authority rose only slightly during the five years preceding the 1966 Census.

The survey on 'Racial Discrimination' carried out for P.E.P. in 1966/7 helps to explain the situation of Cypriot immigrants in relation to Local Authority housing. Just short of a hundred Cypriots were interviewed in 'Area II' of the survey, subsequently revealed in the press as the London borough of Islington,<sup>17</sup> and interviews were also carried out with officials of the Local Authority Housing Department. The latter interviews, however, were not successful in producing any detailed information about the housing of immigrants. The authors of the Report wrote that they 'had very great difficulty in gaining access and persuading officers to talk to (them).' They were assured, though, by one officer in the borough 'that until very recently the borough had refused to house any immigrants at all.'<sup>18</sup> According to the survey, only 1 per cent of Cypriots were occupying accommodation rented from the Council.<sup>19</sup> This proportion is low by comparison with Cypriots in Greater London as a whole, and is not incompatible with the officer's assurance cited above. It is perhaps surprising though, in view of the length of residence of many Cypriots in Islington, and the amount of slum clearance and redevelopment in land there.

However, according to the P.E.P. survey, only 9 per cent of Cypriots in Islington had even considered applying for Council accommodation.<sup>20</sup> While this figure was much the same as for Asians in all areas sampled, it was lower than that for West Indians, 23 per cent of whom had considered applying. This set of similarities and differences in part reflects income differentials and in part different attitudes towards home ownership. Of those Cypriots who said they had considered applying, two-thirds had actually made an application: thus approximately six per cent had their names down for Council accommodation. No attempt was made to gauge the prospects of success in this respect, for the difficulties of measurement and of evaluation would be very great, and anyway in the case of Cypriots the numbers involved were very small. Of the reasons given by those who had not considered applying for Council accommodation, by far the most popular was that they preferred to buy, or already had, their own house. Others stated that they already had satisfactory accommodation, or that the waiting period was too long, while one in nine said that the possibility had never occurred to them.<sup>21</sup> On the whole, then, it appears that Cypriots (or at least, the first generation of settlers) are not greatly interested in obtaining Local Authority housing, preferring to rent privately as a preliminary to purchasing their own home.

Among Cypriots living outside London in 1966, a higher proportion of householders were owner-occupiers: 57 per cent as opposed to 44 per cent within London. A further difference was that

11 per cent of Cypriot households occupied accommodation rented from a Local Authority (as compared with 6 per cent in London). The proportion in privately rented accommodation was therefore correspondingly smaller, and only 12 per cent occupied furnished lettings as compared with 25 per cent in Greater London. Although the number of households enumerated by the Sample Survey was small (378), the differences in the pattern of housing tenure between Cypriots within and outside London were clearly substantial. The higher proportion of owner-occupiers accords with the higher proportion of single-family households found outside London, and the higher proportion of Cypriots engaged in running their own businesses found also.

### Household Amenities

More than half of all Cypriot households in Greater London in 1966 were sharing dwellings with other households, in that their accommodation was not a self-contained unit (see Table 13.4). The proportion sharing dwellings in this way was not quite as high as 'coloured' immigrant households in London, but was more than twice the proportion among London households generally. Since 44 per cent of Cypriot households were owner-occupied, it is likely that a fair proportion of Cypriot owner-occupiers were letting part of their houses to other Cypriot families on such a 'sharing' basis.

Table 13.4.  
ACCESS TO AMENITIES OF CYPRIOT HOUSEHOLDS IN GREATER  
LONDON 1966

<u>% of Households</u>	<u>Cypriot Households</u>	<u>All Coloured Immigrant Households</u>	<u>All London Households</u>
Sharing dwellings	55.0	70.1	24.2
Without exclusive use of sink or stove	5.2	24.7	3.1
1-2 persons only	3.4	..	..
3 or more persons	1.8	..	..
Sharing fixed bath	36.1	50.9	13.3
No fixed bath	19.2	14.1	14.8
No exclusive use of w.c.	36.9	53.2	16.7
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	100.0	100.0	100.0
N (10 % Sample)	1,506	n.a.	262,425

Note: 'Cypriot' and 'Coloured Immigrant Households' = where head of household born in Cyprus, or in 'Coloured Commonwealth' country.

Sources: G.R.O. 1966; Rose E.J.B. and associates, Colour and Citizenship, O.U.P. 1969, Tables 12.6, 12.7; General Register Office, Sample Census 1966, England and Wales, County Report: Greater London, H.M.S.O. 1967.

Even among such 'sharing' households, few were without exclusive use of sink or stove: some 5 per cent of Cypriot households in London overall. In this respect Cypriot households were close to the figure for London households generally (3 per cent), and very differently situated from 'coloured' immigrant households, one quarter of whom were without exclusive use of these kitchen facilities. Moreover, only a third of those Cypriot households lacking such facilities were units of three persons or more. Thus although Cypriots in London were inclined to be sharing dwellings with other families, it was rare that they did not have their own facilities for preparing meals and washing.

Other amenities, however, were less accessible to Cypriot households. This was not so much due to their absence, although a slightly higher proportion of Cypriot households had no fixed bath, for instance, than among 'coloured' immigrants or Londoners generally. It was more due to a higher propensity to be sharing access to such amenities. Over a third of Cypriot households were sharing



access both to a fixed bath and to a w.c. This propensity to share amenities was not as great as among 'coloured' immigrants, but was two to three times as common as among the London population as a whole.

These figures for the Greater London area as a whole undoubtedly conceal variations between more localised areas, and especially between Cypriot housing in the inner and outer boroughs. For example, 62 per cent of Cypriot households in the seven inner boroughs studied by Davison were sharing their dwellings, as compared with 55 per cent in London overall. Moreover, 10 per cent of Cypriot households in these areas were without exclusive use of stove or sink: twice the proportion among Cypriots in Greater London generally.

But in spite of the limited access to amenities of Cypriot households in London, visitors to Cypriot homes will have been struck by the neat and tidy condition in which they are kept. Families also take pride in their possession of modern household gadgets such as refrigerators and cookers; and in most households a television set can be found, and often a record-player too (to play Cypriot 'pop-songs'). On the whole there is a high standard of house-keeping, regardless of the housing circumstances of the family.

### Housing Density

Although a majority of Cypriot households in Greater London were sharing dwellings in 1966, and household size was large relative to the overall population, these do not necessarily entail that the density of occupation of housing by Cypriots should be particularly high. However, as may be seen from Table 13.5, the room density of Cypriot households in London in 1966 was on average 0.94, which was substantially greater than that for Greater London as a whole, in which it was 0.60 persons per room.

<p align="center"><u>Table 13.5</u></p> <p align="center"><u>ROOM DENSITY OF CYPRIOT HOUSEHOLDS IN GREATER LONDON</u></p> <p align="center"><u>1961 and 1966</u></p>			
	<u>Cypriot Households</u>		<u>All Households</u> <u>in London</u>
<u>%</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1966</u>
Average No. Persons per Room	n.a.	0.94	0.60
Room Density:			
% over $1\frac{1}{2}$	26.6	13.2	2.4
% over 1, up to $1\frac{1}{2}$	25.9	20.8	4.7
% $\frac{1}{2}$ - 1	44.9	61.0	62.3
% less than $\frac{1}{2}$	2.6	5.0	30.6
ALL DENSITIES	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean Household Size	4.1	3.9	2.8
No. Households	944	1,506	262,425
No. Persons (10% Sample)	3,891	5,854	742,065
<p><u>Notes:</u> (a) 'Cypriot household' = household with head or spouse born in Cyprus.</p> <p>(b) 'Room' in 1961 included kitchens only if regularly used for meals: in 1966, all kitchens included.</p>			
<p><u>Sources:</u> G.R.O. 1961; C.I.T. 1966; General Register Office, Sample Census 1966, England and Wales, County Report: Greater London, H.M.S.O. 1967; Deakin N., <u>Colour Citizenship and British Society</u>, Panther Books, 1970, p.68.</p>			



According to the Census, one-third of all Cypriot households in London in 1961 were living at a density of more than one person per room: five times the proportion for London generally. Moreover, more than one in either Cypriot households were at a density of occupancy of over one and a half persons per room. However, this proportioning was appreciably less than that for 'coloured' immigrant households in London, among whom 28 per cent were living at such a high density.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, only one in twenty Cypriot households occupied housing with more than two rooms per member of the household, although towards one-third of the overall population of London were so situated.

Between 1961 and 1966, the density of occupation of housing among Cypriot households in London declined, but the extent of this reduction is exaggerated by the figures given in Table 13.5 due to a difference in the definition of the term 'room' in the respective Censuses. In 1961, kitchens were only included as rooms if they were regularly used for one or more meal a day, whereas in 1966 all kitchens were recorded as rooms regardless. It is probably the proportion of households living at the higher density that has changed most among the four categories of room density given in Table 13.5. It is notable however, that average household size among Cypriot settlers declined only slightly during the five-year period. Although the proportion of single-family households among Cypriots rose, the increasing numbers of children born to immigrant parents has maintained the average household size at near its previous level, and has thus maintained the pressure of numbers of housing resources within the Cypriot settlement. Thus the relatively high housing density and household size among Cypriot immigrants is now more due to larger families than to the inclusion of wider kin within the household.

The overall figures no doubt conceal certain variations between settlement in different geographical areas of London, but no details of this kind are available. However, the Census provides evidence of variations in room density between households with different types of tenure. As may be seen from Table 13.6, in 1966 only 5 per cent of owner-occupied households were living at a room density of over 1½ persons per room, as compared with 21 per cent in privately-rented

<p align="center"><u>Table 13.6</u></p> <p align="center"><u>ROOM DENSITY OF CYPRIOT HOUSEHOLDS IN GREATER LONDON</u></p> <p align="center"><u>BY TENURE 1966</u></p>		
<u>%</u>	<u>Owner-Occupied</u>	<u>Privately Rented</u>
<u>Persons per room:</u>		
Over 1½	4.6	21.3
Over 1, up to 1½	17.2	24.4
up to 1	76.2	54.3
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	100.0	100.0
N (10% Sample)	761	868
<u>Note: 'Cypriot Household' = household with head or spouse born in Cyprus</u>		
<u>Source: C.I.T. 1966</u>		

accommodation. Still, more than one in five owner-occupiers were at a density of more than one person per room, although among those renting privately the proportion at this level of occupancy was toward one half. As the proportion of owner-occupiers increases, so the mean density of occupation of housing on the part of Cypriots in London will decrease further. Many Cypriots in privately-rented accommodation live in fewer rooms than they need, in order to save money to purchase their own home. Owner-occupiers, though, often limit themselves too in order to be able to rent out accommodation. The greater room density of Cypriot households is thus in part (though not entirely) due to Cypriot

preferences, for housing space does not come so high on their scale of values as perhaps most British families. As in Cyprus, Cypriot immigrant families are close-knit groups in a spatial as well as social sense, and even within larger houses seem to use a relatively small amount of housing space intensively.

Among Cypriots outside London room densities were on average rather lower than within the Metropolis. Only 7 per cent of households were living at a density of over 1½ persons per room, as compared with 13 per cent within London. Households at more than unit room density were only half as frequent, at 18 per cent of the total, in 'provincial' areas of Britain. Thus 82 per cent of all households in Cypriot settlement outside London in 1966 were at a room density of less than one person per room, as compared with 66 percent in London itself. These differences relate to the greater extent of owner-occupation among Cypriots outside London, and the higher proportion of single-family households enumerated there.

### **Footnotes**

- <sup>1</sup> C.P.A. 1960.
- <sup>2</sup> Data made available by the Centre for Urban Studies, University College, London.
- <sup>3</sup> Lambeth, Stoke Newington, Hackney, Paddington, Deptford, Battersea, Camberwell.
- <sup>4</sup> Davison, R.B., Black British, O.U.P. 1967, Tables 24, 25.
- <sup>5</sup> Davison, op.cit., Table 18.
- <sup>6</sup> C.P.A. 1960.
- <sup>7</sup> Calculated from Davison, op.cit.; C.P.A. 1960.
- <sup>8</sup> Calculated from Davison, op.cit.; C.P.A. 1960.
- <sup>9</sup> C.P.A. 1960.
- <sup>10</sup> See Table 13.3 below, and Rose, E.J.B. & Associates, Colour & Citizenship, O.U.P. 1969, Figure 12.3.
- <sup>11</sup> Racial Discrimination, Political and Economic Planning, 1967, p. 79.
- <sup>12</sup> Racial Discrimination, p. 74.
- <sup>13</sup> See Chapter 10.
- <sup>14</sup> Davison, op.cit., Table 27.
- <sup>15</sup> Data made available by Mrs. Mary Dines (Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants).
- <sup>16</sup> Rose, op.cit., Table 12.8.
- <sup>17</sup> The Observer, 23 April 1967.
- <sup>18</sup> Racial Discrimination, p. 86.
- <sup>19</sup> Information made available by Political and Economic Planning.
- <sup>20</sup> Racial Discrimination, p. 98.
- <sup>21</sup> Racial Discrimination, p. 98a.
- <sup>22</sup> Rose, op.cit., Table 12.5.