# Tackling Difficult Estates

**CASE/Social Exclusion Unit Seminar held at the National Tenants Resource Centre, Trafford Hall**

March 1998

Liz Richardson

January 1999

## Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion

# Background

There are up to 2,000 difficult social housing estates across the UK. Residents, landlords, local authorities, government and other agencies face a challenging set of problems in trying to make these 'difficult to live in' areas work.

In some of these estates there are individuals and organisations who **are** successfully rebuilding communities - tackling unemployment, crime, health, family and youth problems and co-ordinating service delivery.

This report summarises the presentations and discussion at a seminar on 'Tackling Difficult Estates' organised by CASE on behalf of the Social Exclusion Unit. It took place at the National Tenants Resource Centre, at Trafford Hall near Chester, on 30th-31st March 1998.

The seminar brought together front line practitioners, civil servants, policy makers and community representatives – all interested in looking at positive ways to make deprived neighbourhoods better. We heard presentations from practitioners who live and work on difficult estates about their experiences.

Cutting across the different case study examples were several common themes about the types of approaches that have been shown to work, together with questions about how to replicate and implement these approaches in other estates. Those themes and outstanding questions are summarised here.

The case studies are given in full in the second section.

As well as the recommendations from the frontline project examples, we heard about two sets of stimulating proposals: for neighbourhood management; and rebuilding communities. These are outlined in the third section of the document.

The organisers are very grateful to Trafford Hall for its help in making this event happen, and to all the participants for their contributions.

**CONTENTS**          **PAGE**

# *Key Themes and Questions*

Based on practitioners' experience of making things work on the ground, several common themes emerged.  These themes prompted questions about how success can be replicated, how to overcome obstacles, and what role government can play.

The themes were:
- scaling down and linking up;
- cutting across boundaries and an area focus;
- performance incentives;
- the role of charisma, innovation, leadership and flexibility;
- community capacity and involvement;
- starting points;
- organisation and bureaucracy.


- **Scaling Down and Linking Up**

    - *Scaling down to the neighbourhood level*
    Because of the problems that difficult estates face, control and delivery of services should happen at the most local level.  Some local flexibility, within a clear framework, can also help local services to respond more effectively.

    In the success stories we saw, a local neighbourhood focus enabled a more tailored and hands-on style of management.  This additional input and close attention helped to reduce problems.

    The devolution of services in some cases happened in spite of short term financial pressures to re-centralise services.  Shifting power to the local level can be difficult, and needs support from the top.

    The size of a neighbourhood varies, but 1,000 units (3,000 residents) would be a viable size.  This is far smaller than the level at which local government and other services, e.g. primary health care groups, usually operate at, but it is larger than a primary school area or a health visitor's patch.

    - *Linking up*
    The links between neighbourhoods and wider areas are key - both to their decline and rescue.  Local neighbourhood management has to tie in to regeneration work at a wider area and strategic level, e.g. 3-4 neighbourhoods.

    These wider links are particularly important for infrastructure, economic activity and to attract private investment.

    The large gap between central government and the neighbourhood level means that the local authority is essential as an intermediary, and strategist.  Therefore, local authorities, and local democracy, have to be made to work.  Alongside community

leadership, there should be good quality local political leadership.  Otherwise, given the lack of direct links, how can central government help initiate and implement action at the neighbourhood level?

- *Capturing money flows*
Local control and delivery of services requires local and devolved budgets. Approximately £10 million of public money per annum flows into an average estate of 1,000 units, how do we make sure that this money reaches the bottom, i.e. delivers actual ground level services?

- **Cutting Across Boundaries and an Area Focus**

   - *Multi-agency working*
   Low income neighbourhoods need strong co-ordination of services to ensure that the large volume of underpinning already in place works well, that residents get maximum access, and to ensure investment reaches its targets.  A locally based 'neighbourhood manager' can do this.  Service partnerships and inter-agency work fit well with a neighbourhood focus, as services are delivered to areas, and areas cut across departmental lines.

   - *Re-inventing lateral connections*
   Multi-agency work is already happening on some estates, and the Government is developing area based tools e.g. New Deal for Communities.  However, there are several obstacles to successful multi-agency working: if it is an 'add-on', rather than integral to peoples' work it can get pushed out in favour of other demands; it requires strong co-ordination; professionalism can create resistance.  How can we mandate inter-agency working, while keeping an emphasis on efficiency?

   - *How to be exemplary?*
   The government has traditionally worked on segregated departmental lines - 'vertical silos' of policy and accountability.  How can the centre reflect an area focus and holistic working?

- **Incentives for Performance**

   - *Indicators and making communities work*
   National performance indicators should help people make estates work.  Best value is an opportunity to look at this, e.g. making people managerially accountable for multi-agency working, allowing estate managers to prioritise to rescue an area, giving people an incentive to do preventative work.

   We need an idea of what counts as success in tackling difficult estates.

   - *Making local authorities work*
   Given the vital role of local authorities, how do we improve their performance?

- **The Role Of Innovation, Leadership and Flexibility**

  - *'Zingy' frontline personnel*
  The success stories we heard all involved a visionary, innovative, hands-on approach. The role of charismatic leadership and risk taking was key to their success. This means having 'zingy' frontline staff and volunteers to develop and implement ideas.

  But, how can we have a system that depends on charisma and creativity? How can we spread this success and develop a 'new breed' of estate based innovators and problem solvers? How do we support risk takers, particularly in risk averse environments?

  - *Balancing flexibility and accountability*
  How can we have both innovation and accountability to regulators and funders? What is the balance between processes and results? Can we have 'rules' for local flexibility?

- **Community Capacity, Community Building And Involvement**

  - *Organic communities*
  Neighbourhoods need a thriving community - this should develop organically. We can nurture this through encouraging family and social support networks to grow on estates.

  - *Social capital*
  The human and social capital of an area is just as important as financial capital to its viability. In the success stories, where extra investment was needed it only worked where it was linked with consistent management and investment in human resources.

  We should look at the assets as well as the needs of an area - asset mapping rather than needs assessment.

  Community involvement and self help are vital in getting areas back on their feet. In difficult areas where extra effort is needed, support for the development of capacity is central, e.g. through training and paid community development workers. Only a very few communities can be re-built or kick-started without outside help. There has been little government support for this basic community development work.

  The community includes its workers too – the future of areas depends on people staying in jobs that serve neighbourhoods.

  - *Community involvement*
  Community participation can be fragile and must be sensitively nurtured. It only works if there is some sense of local control. There are many threats to the development of community involvement, such as the fear of intimidation. Community action can take a heavy toll on those involved, and there is little recognition for people's unpaid input.

Community involvement is often fragmentary and ad hoc. It depends on the willingness of individuals, and is difficult to organise more systematically.

- *Community standards and 'zero tolerance'*

Several of the case study examples demonstrated a robust 'zero tolerance' approach to re-establishing acceptable standards of behaviour in the community and in education. Other communities had used a 'no-exclusion' strategy, trying to integrate those whose behaviour was difficult. In what circumstances are more extreme measures justified? How do we balance tackling social exclusion with excluding certain people?

Anti discriminatory practice is crucial in disadvantaged areas, as these are often the places where people are the most vitriolic against other disadvantaged groups.

- *How can the centre encourage community building and ownership?*

## • Starting Points

- *Should we focus on the worst?*

Even the worst cities are closer to the national average than those cities are to their worst estates. A focus on the most disadvantaged and struggling estates would help close these gaps. But those at highest risk do not make up the majority. Would a focus on the worst compound problems by exacerbating stigma? If we do not have enough resources for all, should we concentrate on improving a few fully, or distributing partial help to many estates?

- *Does it matter which service?*

Local neighbourhood management can potentially be led or initiated by any of the services provided in an area - there are successful examples from health and housing.

Can we have a 'million flowers bloom' model, or do we need one starting point if we are to make a national impact?

Some services carry poor reputations, both with other professionals and with residents, and have an ambiguous policing versus helping role.

Housing is most often at the helm of local initiatives because of landlords' responsibilities. How do we establish a focus of operation in other kinds of deprived neighbourhoods which are not solely owned by social landlords? How can mixed tenure or multi-landlord areas be co-ordinated?

## • Organisation And Bureaucracy

- *Smaller organisational units*

The size and complexity of larger bureaucracies creates problems trying to deliver services on the ground. Organisational rigidities can hinder progress in developing local and creative solutions, particularly for local authorities. A structural break and

smaller organisational units may be needed to tackle this. Is an 'all or nothing' approach necessary to break out of local authority structures?

- *Single purpose organisations*

Local authorities have a pivotal strategic, enabling and co-ordinating role. Arguably, single purpose landlord organisations can provide a more effective service for difficult estates, once removed from direct political control.

## Postscript

Some outstanding wider questions arise about the future of social housing:

- As conditions and prosperity improve, does social housing become an inferior good?
- Why do we want to retain the social rented sector?
- How can we entice people with choices into areas at the bottom? How can landlords hold on to existing residents?
- Are there barriers to making estates work in the benefits and subsidy system and how do we overcome them?
- We have a primarily urban focus, what about problems of rural deprivation?

# 1. PC Adrian Stobbart - Home Housing Association and Northumbria Police, Elswick, Newcastle

## Tackling Crime - Landlords and Police Together

**SUMMARY**
- Decline in Elswick had happened despite investment by the landlord in refurbishment and community work, against a wider city background of falling housing demand/over supply of housing, increasing crime rates and continuing stigma.
- Concentrated and focused police action against known offenders, coupled with the landlord using existing remedies, helped re-establish law and order.
- Tough measures in allocations and tenancy enforcement were necessary to stem the decline of the area, although void rates are still high.
- Key to the turn round in crime rates was a transformation of the attitude of local residents towards the police and landlord, and an agreement by the whole community that it would stop tolerating poor standards of behaviour.
- This project cost £150K over 2 years for around 300 homes. Northumbria police suggest comparable levels of crime reduction can be achieved using existing resources if the decision is made to focus energy on particular areas with a similar strategy. But, the wider gains for the area, such as increased demand, may not be achieved without this special dedicated effort and landlord involvement, and no-one knows whether they would survive the withdrawal of special policing.

Elswick is a troubled area in the West End of Newcastle, near to Benwell. In 1983 Home Housing Association bought 350 properties in Elswick that had been allowed to fall into serious disrepair by their owners, local business people. Before this, the area had been considered for demolition by the city council. The area went further into decline following a local murder and serious violent disturbances, with many people leaving the area. In 1984 there were around 170 empty properties out of 350.

The landlord refurbished the properties (now 288 units), opened a local office and employed a community worker. The homes were filled, and stayed full for 4-5 years until 1988. From 1988, people started to leave the area again. By October 1996 there were around 130 empty properties out of 288.

As a result of this background, Home HA decided to take action. In October 1996 they invested £150K over two years to pay for two full time Northumbria Police officers specially dedicated to three streets in Elswick.

The aims of the project are to cut crime and increase demand for the area, reducing the number of empty houses. One of the first things the police officers did was to win over the support of the housing staff. Home housing officers were embittered because they felt they had received inadequate support from the association to deal with the intimidation they faced – there had been threats made against staff, their cars had been damaged. They also felt that they had been given little backup from the police.

So, the Home sponsored police officers joined forces with the housing staff to persuade the association to put in CCTV, panic alarms and unbreakable glass in the housing office. Housing staff were given personal alarms and mobile phones. Also key in winning over staff was the fact that the police officers worked out of the same local housing office.

The police officers started to tackle the serious crime problems on the estate. There were particular families 'running' the estate, so police officers ran operations targeting these offenders, and the families left the estate as a result.

There was a sense of relief on the estate that law and order had been re-established. Previously residents had thought those families couldn't be touched: "for the first time there were two police walking, not running, through the estate."

Housing and police staff negotiated with the association to spend £10K clearing graffiti, and the police officers initiated a zero tolerance campaign to maintain this and crack down on minor criminal damage. The landlord took preventative measures against vandalism and theft, such as removing obvious targets, like boilers, from void properties.

Residents can give the police information anywhere and anytime, for example they can go to the housing office on pretence of paying the rent and talk to the police. The officers also gave out leaflets with their photos on and contact numbers.

It was important to get the residents on side. Residents invited the officers to a community Forum, and the police were keen to attend. They now play an active role in the group. The residents were concerned about allocations and lettings, and told police they were unhappy that "anyone could get keys to the houses". As a result, the landlord and police instituted an indemnity form with a police check. If the applicant has a conviction or history of anti social behaviour etc in a previous tenancy, then they are not allocated a home in Elswick. Applicants who are closely associated with known criminals are also turned down for housing in Elswick by Home HA.

The project has been up and running for a year, the officers have a good relationship with the young people on the estate. They get the kids to remove their own graffiti, and talk to the parents to emphasise that they are responsible for their children's actions and could be in breach of their tenancy if they don't act. This is coupled with an active tenancy enforcement strategy by the landlord.

| *Success* | April 1996-97 | April 1997 – 98 |
|---|---|---|
| | 81 crimes | 45 crimes |
| | 847 incidents | 111 incidents (drop of 78%) |
| | 154 voids (peak) | 126 voids |
| | 0 people refused housing | 57 (to March) people refused |

The association are hopeful that they will be able to reduce the number of empty properties further, and there are now 30 people on the waiting list.

**Why did it work?**
- got rid of a small, problematic minority
- high profile and dedicated police presence
- police officers work flexible shifts, quick response, care about problems, accessible

There have been complaints from other estates that they cannot afford to do the same. The costs have been £75K a year for 2 years for only 288 properties on 3 streets. However, the association feels it has been value for money - it was ready to bulldoze the estate before it tried this.

Not only this, Northumbria Police say that they have been successful in reducing crime in other areas as a result of using a similar strategy using only existing resources i.e. concentrated police presence, targeting known offenders and target hardening, e.g. crime in Scotswood, an area adjacent to Elswick, has halved from June 1997.


## DISCUSSION

➢ If privately sponsored policing is going to happen then we need guidance from central government.
➢ Where do those people evicted or refused housing go? The evidence from Elswick is that people get housed in the private sector, or by other housing associations, particularly because there is an excess of housing in the area.
➢ What would the 2 officers have been doing otherwise that's more important? The key thing was that Elswick was a 'lost area' where crime had been allowed to continue.
➢ Similar results have been achieved in Stockwell Park estate in an area of 1700 homes with just 1 community policeman, where they have the lowest crime rate in Brixton using a different strategy of lots of tolerance, not zero tolerance. There is also a race issue in Brixton, not black and white, but the new Europeans.
➢ Could the association have done it without the police? the majority of the remedies used were civil not criminal. The issue is getting on top of the problem, not necessarily who does this. You don't have to buy police officers; the landlord has remedies available but just may not be using them. On the other hand, action by landlords is difficult, courts often give people another chance, and the police have experience of information gathering and dealing with criminal behaviour.

## 2.    Jill Baker – Co-ordinator, Family Health and Community Project, Cowgate, Newcastle

### Working with Families

**SUMMARY**
- Government investment has improved the quality of the housing stock, but the area still faces multiple social problems.
- Save the Children rescued an underused local authority run neighbourhood centre as a community based health project.
- The Project is now well used, providing support to local families and children.
- It provides: community research; direct services e.g. toy library; outreach; Children's Express (a news agency for children); and a multi-agency support team.
- Its multi-agency work is crucial in giving residents access to existing services through 'signposting' and simplified access routes.
- The project costs £80,000 a year to run, employs 5 full time staff and other workers.
- The Project uses local women to do local surveys, focusing on mapping the assets of the area not just its needs.
- Health can be a good starting point for multi-agency work, particularly with families and children.
- The community includes its workers too – the future of areas depends on people staying in jobs.

Cowgate is a deprived area in the West End of Newcastle.  It often misses out on special government help because the surrounding area contains a well off ward.  There are no primary health care services and there is no supermarket nearby.   The local authority owned area got some Estate Action money in 1991, and a third of the social housing stock went to North British HA.  The housing stock is now in good condition, but the area still faces multiple problems: stigma; unemployment; crime culture; high child densities and large numbers of over 60s.

This multi-agency health project, developed and funded by the Save the Children Fund, focuses on young people and children, as well as families.  The Project was developed with the local authority, the health authority and local residents to rescue an underused Social Services run Neighbourhood Centre.  It was set up in its current form 1992.  Its work includes:
- **Community research** - the project trained up 6 local women as researchers looking at play provision.  It has also been useful as the women have been able to uncover smaller area statistics than ward level to overcome distortions.
- **Direct services** – for example, group work with parents, crèche provision, toy library, trips out, advice.  Local residents and project users sit on the Executive Committee.
- **Outreach** family work.
- **Children's Express** -  a news agency led by children.

- **Family Support Team** – this is a multi-agency team co-ordinated by the Project which involves social services, health, housing, victim support, the schools, NCH Action for Children and other services.

There are 25 agencies working on this small estate so residents 'get lost' with the organisations.  The Project helps signpost services, and gives a way in to support for residents.  Anti discriminatory practice is crucial in disadvantaged areas, as these are often the places where people are the most vitriolic against other disadvantaged groups.

The Project aims to be community based, and they feel strongly that 'the community' includes local workers as well as residents.  There is currently no community representative on the main management group, and the Project is working on this, at the same time as avoiding having just one person representing the residents of an area.

The Project has had problems engaging with some agencies, for example, probation, children and young people section, and education and welfare service.  Some services only use the co-ordinating role of the Project as and when necessary e.g. the police, GP, Catholic Church.

The experience of the project is that multi-agency working needs to be integral to people's work.  If it is an add-on, it gets pushed out in favour of other demands.

It is also involved with the FreshStart Initiative at Blakelaw School – the 1st one in the UK.  FreshStart puts emphasis on vocational qualifications, and includes improved pupil/staff ratios and links to child protection.

*Issues* – asset mapping not needs assessment
- need to hook people into new ways of thinking e.g. time dollars for community work or other services in exchange for rent arrears
- role of voluntary sector – need support from the centre.  If you can get people round a table, you can  work on winning their hearts later on
- community is workers too – future of areas depends on people staying in jobs
- removing stigma – assets not needs, inclusion not exclusion, developing estates not worst estates

The Project employs 5 full time staff, as well as sessional workers for the crèche and youth sessions.  It costs around £80,000 a year, plus a seconded social services worker.

## 3.    Dr. Richard Neal – GP, Honor Oak Estate, London

## Early Intervention – Work with Parents

**SUMMARY**
- Poor parenting can lead to negative outcomes throughout a person's life, particularly in areas of socio-economic stress.  Care must be taken not to present this in a pathologising and deterministic way.
- On the Honor Oak Estate, health visitors identify and treat postnatal depression.  This type of early intervention can help prevent poor parenting.
- National research and anecdotal evidence from the estate has shown that a closer attachment between parent and child can prevent behavioural problems in children.

Richard Neal has worked on this deprived estate in South East London for 20 years.  He has been chair of the community liaison group for 7 years, which includes GPs, social workers, and community representatives.

For the last 6 months he has been undertaking a research project asking why some families in deprived areas suffer from many problems, but other families facing the same social and economic stresses, in the same environment do not suffer.

The work has looked for explanations based on attachment theory and models of parenting that pass on patterns of behaviour down generations.

Research evidence they have looked at has shown that the development of secure attachments in early life affects outcomes later on.  Problems can develop if infants have insecure attachments, particularly where there are multiple stresses on families.  For example, insecure attachments are linked to signs of behavioural problems and learning disabilities in pre-school children, violent behaviour and lying in children, and bullying, mugging, cruelty in teenagers, and family break-up, alcoholism, child neglect and early pregnancy in adults.

**What works to tackle these problems?**
1. Health visitor based identification and treatment of postnatal depression and early intervention.  This started on the Honor Oak Estate 7 years ago.

   After 5 years of the project, teachers in the local school saw a positive difference in the new intake of children.

2. Encouragement of close physical contact between mother and infant.  Research has shown that when new parents were given baby slings as free gift the number of children with secure attachments was 83%, compared to a national average of 60% of 13 month old children and a rate of 34% for the control group in lower socio-economic classes.

## 4. Pat Carney – Head, St. Thomas Aquinas RC High School, Moss Side and Hulme, Manchester

## Ethnic Minority Achievement in Schools

**SUMMARY**
- The school faced problems of disruptive young black pupils, racial tension and low achievement among ethnic minority pupils.
- Targeted work on personal identity, black history and role models with underachieving black pupils has improved motivation, self esteem and educational attainment.
- Exclusions have been reduced from 23 a year to 2 a year.
- This work has also meant challenging racial stereotypes amongst some of the teachers.
- It has attracted criticism and resentment from some sections of the white population, which the school has fought to tackle.  It has worked hard to win support from parents and governors.
- OFSTED has praised the school's work.

St. Thomas Aquinas serves the community of South Manchester, including Moss Side and the recently regenerated area of Hulme.  Around 30% of the pupils are of African-Caribbean descent.

The school faced problems both inside and outside.  Outside the school there were the problems of a deprived inner city area.  Inside the school, some of the teachers saw the black kids as drug dealers, expected they would fail and wanted to get them out of the school.  The black pupils also felt that teachers had low opinions of them, and were beginning to act out this stereotype.

To counter this, in 1988 the school started work with disruptive young black pupils on African history e.g. visit to the slavery exhibition at Liverpool.  This led to criticism of the Head for giving black pupils 'treats' , but the improvement in the pupils behaviour and motivation meant that she decided to kept going despite this.

This work led to the introduction of Afrikan studies as an extra curricular class open to all pupils.   Demand from other older pupils led to the school introducing Afrikan studies into the curriculum through PSE classes in 1994.

The school makes sure that pupils who are achieving are moved quickly into the right stream.  Contact with parents is important, and reports are sent home 7 times a year.

The school still faces criticisms about helping black pupils achieve, but the programme now has support from parents and governors.  The school now has black governors from Moss Side and Hulme on the board.

The pupils have pushed the programme further. They wanted to go beyond looking at past achievements and history, to future possible gains. The school set up a mentoring scheme, making sure not to focus only on 'traditional' black role models such as sports people or entertainers, but also on other professions such as doctors and lawyers.

Now they use the young people themselves, such as ex-pupils who have gone to university. They teach pupils to see the differences between a strict teacher and a racist teacher, and the school has an open door policy for pupils on complaints about teachers. St. Thomas emphasises to pupils that if they misbehave it reinforces negative stereotypes and this undermines their work to tackle racism.

This work goes on alongside other changes the school are trying to make, for instance on links with the community and local businesses. The school faces a problem getting support from local businesses which encourage pupils to stay off school eg. one local cafe locked the door to stop teachers getting in to retrieve pupils. Also the bus companies let pupils on in school time.

*Success*

Results for black pupils reflect the improvements. For example, in 1997, half of the girls achieving 5 GCSEs at grades A-C were black girls.

OFSTED monitoring has also praised the level of racial harmony at the school.

Exclusions have been reduced from 23 a year to 2 a year, and the reasons for exclusions have changed too. Pupils were previously excluded for alleged one off incidents that were not investigated. Now, incidents are investigated, and there must be a series of incidents to trigger an exclusion.

There are still some criticisms of the programme, particularly things like images of Christ as a black man in a Roman Catholic school. But, the school believe that its success means they are right to keep going.

## 5.     Jean Else – Head, Whalley Range High School, Moss Side, Manchester

### Turning Round a Failing School

**SUMMARY**
- In 1994, the school had the worst truancy in the country, poor standards of behaviour, falling rolls and a poor image in the media.
- It is now the best attended in Manchester, and intake has increased from 92 to 300 new pupils a year.
- OFSTED has praised the 'rapidly improving' school, and it has a positive media profile.
- The head and staff turned the school around through strong leadership, an improved and attractive physical environment, consistent and enforced discipline, and the provision of extra curricula activities.
- The school has achieved this success with most of the same staff, and without extra resources, by having a dynamic vision.

Whalley Range High School is a girls school in the well known Moss Side area of Manchester. 72% of the pupils are from ethnic minority backgrounds and there are 12 different cultures within the school, mostly Asian.

Jean Else was appointed Head in September 1994, and two months later the school had hit the headlines as having the worst truancy in the country!  The school was in decline, with falling rolls and poor standards of behaviour.  By November 1995, the school had been turned around.  It is now the best attended in Manchester with 94% attendance.

The school has achieved this success through their dynamic vision of what kind of school they wanted, and strong and enthusiastic leadership.

Jean started by making a good physical environment.  In her first few weeks as Head she cleaned and painted, and put pictures in toilets.  She put up displays of this work in progress with titles such as '*Flushed with success*'.  Display has been key.  Pupils and staff did not want the school to have a traditional 'school' atmosphere.  The building now has a CD player in the entrance hall, lots of well-designed displays showing images of the pupils and their achievements, and carpeted corridors.  Although previous displays were vandalised, these improvements have lasted partly due to a zero tolerance policy, and partly because they are considered to be worth saving.

Whalley Range aims to provide a second home – some girls are there from 7am to 9pm. It runs a peer counselling scheme, a house system, and the girls are not allowed out at lunch but there are many different activities to do instead e.g. step aerobics and self defence classes.   There are lots of social activities in the evenings too, which is particularly important for some of the Asian girls who do not have the opportunities for evening activities from home.

Although staff thought it couldn't be done, pupils voted for full uniform, with blazers like the independent school over the road. There are clear and consistent rules and a reward system. There are strong community and parental links.

Parents like the improvements – 80% of them returned feedback forms and most were positive. The intake has now increased because of the improvements. The school learnt the hard way that it cannot rely on Asian parents sending their children to Whalley Range just because it is single sex if standards are not good.

The school has welcomed the increased accountability of schools and teachers, but has found that OFSTED inspections, sometimes 15 inspectors for a week, are too much, and not effective enough. Jean feels that schools instead need more self evaluation and monitoring, and more vision-management techniques to increase effectiveness.

Whalley Range has previously had bad press, but the school has now got the media on side and has invited the cameras in to have a look at the improvements. The school has since been on GMTV to talk about its achievements.

*Success*

Whalley Range now has an attendance rate of 94%, and intake has increased from 92 to 300 new pupils a year. There has been positive parental feedback on the improvements.

The school had a very poor reputation before the changes eg. it was known locally as 'Mothercare'. They did consider changing the name of the school, but feel glad now that they didn't because the improvements can be seen in sharper contrast.

The school's OFSTED report of April 1997 praised the 'rapidly improving' school for its leadership, high expectations, teaching, pupils' good attitudes, behaviour and attendance, relationships with community and parents and the fast rise in educational attainment.

**DISCUSSION**

➢ Can we organise the involvement of community and parents in schools more systematically e.g. mentoring, voluntary literacy helpers, extra curricular activities? Do we have to depend on the willingness and ability of individual teachers and/or parents and communities?

➢ How do we spread success without relying on charismatic personalities turning up?

➢ The first people who know kids are truanting are housing officers, because vandalism goes up. There needs to be a better line of contact between housing staff and schools.

➢ It may be difficult to get parents involved in schools in some areas because of open enrolment - children from Brixton go to schools in Croydon.

➢ Some schools have a policy of no exclusions, so have to tackle problems head on. Is this preferable? How do we establish what is unacceptable otherwise?

➢ Cuts in the education budget, eg. in Oxfordshire, mean that special needs education and classroom assistants have been cut.  These are the people who work with the vulnerable kids we are talking about and are in danger of being excluded.

## 6.    Steve Mycio – Head of  Housing, Manchester City Council

### Making Social Housing Work

---

**SUMMARY**
- The housing department in Manchester works in a context of severe deprivation e.g. in a quarter of its neighbourhoods, over half of the residents receive benefits.
- 38% of Manchester's housing stock is local authority housing, but deprived areas also include mixed tenure areas and estates with multiple social landlords.
- Manchester's housing management model for its difficult estates is based on resident participation, locally focused services, and innovative risk taking e.g. anti social behaviour team.
- Even where housing management works well, the viability of areas depends on other basic services.
- Manchester has set up multi-agency Neighbourhood Strategy Forums in 3 of its most difficult areas to look at general service delivery for areas of around 2,000 units.  This is similar to the PEP local service partnership model, and the neighbourhood management model.
- Local neighbourhood management has to tie in to regeneration work at a wider area level, e.g. 3-4 neighbourhoods.

---

Difficult estates are "not difficult to manage but difficult to live on."

1. **Context.**
- Housing stock - 45% social housing (38% council stock, 7% housing association)
- 71% of households are in council tax band A, 94% are in bands A-C
- 76% of the local authority tenants are on HB.  £200m H.B. a year
- 25% of neighbourhoods have over 50% of residents on Income Support
- unemployment is twice the national average

2. **Deprived areas** aren't just council owned, also includes mixed tenure areas and multi- landlord estates.  Neighbourhood management is just as relevant in mixed areas, but more complex and difficult.

3. There is **no 1 model** of management but there are key features:
- start with community/resident participation – find 'champions'.  The content of involvement and consultation is more important than the form.
- need extra resources, especially short term revenue support.  This can stop the need for capital investment in the longer term and stop wasted investment.
- genuinely listen to residents - if tenants talk tough it's because of their experiences - why should they tolerate the unacceptable?  We don't.

4. **Local services** tailored to local people and problems:
- need locally focused services, but these don't necessarily have to be locally based
- the viability of services is more important than where the office is
- local authorities don't have to deliver services as long as they are effective

- don't necessarily need same services across the city, and need to review

5. **Joined up thinking in local services.**
   In some areas people are more satisfied with their homes than the areas the housing is in. Housing and housing management may be OK, but the area may still be unpopular - therefore there is a need to go beyond housing and look at basic services.

   Manchester has the Neighbourhood Strategies Approach. The City Council has identified the 3 most difficult estates, each of around 2,000 units, and formed multi agency forums for each area. The forums have two groups – an area strategy group with a focus on anti-social behaviour and a service delivery group for the estate (not city wide). This is similar to the PEP local service partnership model. The service delivery group aims to decide what is needed across services eg. change caretaking for a special needs teacher. Different departments lead, but housing is very active. Attitudes are more important than structures in making this work.

   You need a vision of your aims eg. to create and maintain sustainable communities, and have an agreed definition of what that is eg. reduced turnover or reduced dependency, or both. Plus you need to set objectives to achieve these aims.

6. **Neighbourhood management can't solve the problem of cities by itself.**
   Manchester has so many deprived neighbourhoods, they need to tie into regeneration at a wider area level. For example, SRB, which has to operate at bigger scale, around 3-4 neighbourhoods, to attract private investment and be viable. Work in Hulme originally covered 3 different neighbourhoods with just under 6,000 population, and work on the new local housing company in East Withenshawe covers 4.

   Each neighbourhood isn't a self contained village, we need to tie in neighbourhoods to city wide jobs, sports facilities, libraries, infrastructure that isn't provided for each individual neighbourhood.

7. **Issues/Barriers to Nirvana**
- Need benchmarks and the right indicators to make estates work– e.g. allow people to let arrears wobble to get turnover down.
- Statutory duties eg. right to repair costs £5m/year in compensation. Should you let tenants vote to waive their rights to solve this?
- Difficulties in attracting quality local Cllrs because of poor status and rewards.
- Reducing resources year on year so pressure to re-centralise, set up call centres etc because it seems cheaper (isn't), and move from generic to specialist working.
- Need to look at data protection.
- Conflicts between statutory duties.
- Vertical silos nationally (regionally silos not even there!).
- Professionalism – each profession knows best.
- Pressures for process e.g. Ombudsmen focus on procedure rather than service quality.
- Risk aversion e.g. Manchester was criticised for its ground breaking anti-social behaviour work. It is difficult to put your head above the parapet- so how do we support risk takers?
- Need access to investment - public and private.

## 7.    Bob Brett – Head of Housing, L.B. Tower Hamlets

## A Welfare Bureaucracy and Change - Housing Transfers

**SUMMARY**
- Tower Hamlets is one of the most deprived areas of the country.
- The Borough owns and manages 40,000 social housing properties and has 12,000 employees.  The size and complexity of the organisation creates problems trying to solve problems on the ground.
- It faces other problems of a lack of resources, and weak local democracy.
- Because of these issues, Tower Hamlets is making a structural break by transferring housing stock to local housing companies.
- The new organisations will have access to new investment, independence from political structures, smaller organisation units, a single purpose focus and direct accountability to residents.
- The new landlords will also have a focus on community building and regeneration, and there is scope for new local frontline jobs.

Tower Hamlets faces an inner city problem, rather than having individual intensely deprived estates.  No one area is worse than the others, they are all bad.  The relationship between supply and demand in the area means that there is no demand problem.  LBTH has 12,000 people on the housing waiting list, so there are no problems filling the stock.

But the Borough does face other problems, it is one of most deprived areas in the country whatever indicators are used e.g. racial violence, education, health, ethnic minority population, non- English speakers.

You need to get housing management right before you try and tackle other problems.  If housing management is not right then it compounds the problem, and negates the ability of other agencies to solve other problems.

*The problem of trying to get housing management right:*

- the service operates as part of a large welfare bureaucracy, serving 40,000 units, with 12,000 employees, and 70% of tenants on HB - so it is difficult to solve the housing management problem on the ground.  The size and complexity of the organisation causes problems;
- the diffusion of power in the organisation – the way power is decentralised and managed means that different parts of the organisation are trying to achieve different objectives, which slows effectiveness.  There is also active resistance to change from a dynamic bureaucracy!
- the problem of local democracy, especially poor members (like Manchester);
- lack of resources.

We can solve all these things, but put together they make the task more difficult.

Councillors have a different set of imperatives, which are not necessarily making management happen. Instead, they concentrate more on political problems in relation to their constituents, for example, we developed tenants' Forums, but they have become a pretence for members to meet with community and be seen to listen. The Forums take lots of energy to organise but don't deliver real community participation.

There is a fundamental problem of a lack of resources. Tower Hamlets estimates that it needs £400m to bring its stock up to scratch, but it only had a £12m HIP allocation this year. This puts intense pressure on housing management.

There is also a revenue problem. LBTH has lost £12m over the last 5 years in revenue subsidy. These losses may mean having to close local offices.

The Borough is not a bad manager – it is 3$^{rd}$ in the Citizens Charter indicators, just under Corporation of London and Westminster, and both those boroughs spend more on housing management than Tower Hamlets and face very different sets of needs.

So things have improved over the last 4 years. There are 29 local offices – this is a good start, but to really crack the problem we need structural change. That is why LBTH is now trying to transfer stock to local housing companies.

1$^{st}$ transfer of 1,700 dwellings took place last week to Poplar HARCA. There is another company being developed on the City side of the Borough. The aim is to eventually transfer 13,000 homes in total, 6,500 units to each company.

We have had 3 successful ERCF bids so far, a total of £90m public subsidy for 4,000 units (the rest of council owned stock only got £34m for 38,000 units).

But, it is crucial that the new organisations aren't just landlords, but look at social and economic regeneration as well. The budget for the companies includes £2 per household per week for community development. We are finding ways of making the community work – developing a virtuous spiral. So, as part of the business plan each area is getting a Community Enterprise Centre with a Community Enterprise Director who will be in charge of not just running the building, but also building up networks and links with agencies locally, and finding pathways into work. In Tower Hamlets most employment opportunities are outside of estates in the wider economy, so residents need routes in.

With 6,500 dwellings there will be lots of scope to create new frontline jobs locally. The Board of the new company is made up of one third tenants, and this may create spin offs in community control and job opportunities.

**DISCUSSION**

➢ The model of smaller units also works for Manchester which is going the same route in East Withenshawe. Local authorities get embroiled in too many priorities, LHCs are good because they leave the authority to concentrate on one area - not housing management or being a landlord, but jobs.

➢ There has to be an all or nothing approach, and a structural break from the bureaucracy to make the new housing service work. Not all local authorities agree – some are waiting for PSBR changes.

➢ One fear that people have about LHCs is rent control and rent levels – if rents can be maintained. LHCs are positive because they give more accountability to residents, while keeping links to the wider context. Some recidivists in the authority and trade unions want to wish it away.

➢ What about LGA quasi-corporation proposal where the housing service is ringfenced internally within the bureaucracy?

➢ Both Manchester and LBTH feel that the quasi-corporation concept is a backward step. You need to take housing management out of the political arena, so that the local authority make strategic decisions, but not day to day decisions on repairs etc. It is a device to take back control of housing to councils, and it wouldn't give residents the same level of involvement as the LHC route.

➢ Both councils have suffered from revenue losses due to changes in the way subsidy is calculated. Both are considering taking services away from the frontline in some areas because of lack of revenue. Manchester is looking at setting up call centres; they have grave reservations about doing this, but are considering the option in order to keep staff at the frontline.

➢ The benefits to residents of LHCs are clear, but there is damage to the authority as it loses subsidy. This is why the bureaucracy mobilises against it.

➢ The LHC model depends on separating the housing management function from the rest of the authority – is this creating another silo and another separate set of structures that need co-ordination?

➢ But, the question is what makes sense to locate in the neighbourhood? The LHC could run other services e.g. youth, social services, and can link horizontally at the local level - Tower Hamlets has already tried this with decentralisation. The local authority should be more about strategic planning not day to day control.

➢ National performance indicators need to include what makes communities work – shouldn't have to do this work as an add on or despite the indicators.

➢ What about 12,000 people on LBTH's transfer and waiting list? Tower Hamlets has the worst overcrowding in UK – 3K households – LHCs won't tackle this problem.

## 8. Julie Fawcett - Resident, Stockwell Park Estate, Brixton, London

## Community Action

**SUMMARY**
- Stockwell Park Estate in Brixton was a very difficult estate.
- A combination of resident activity and government investment for refurbishment has helped improve conditions.
- The residents have taken over management of the estate to protect the improvements.
- Creative, 'Octavia Hill' style hands on housing management is key. The EMB is entrepreneurial and has brought in extra investment as well as managing services.
- Children and young people are a priority for community self help work. The volunteer-run Youth and Community Centre works with over 400 young people.
- The resident group emphasises responsibility and tries to integrate the young people into the wider community.
- The community group's work supplements that of the schools and families - the community takes on joint responsibility for failing children.
- Training and non-directive professional help have been important.
- The group takes a problem solving approach, even where this goes against the rules.
- The local authority has been an obstacle to re-establishing community life on the estate, particularly in relation to race and drug issues.

Julie Fawcett is a resident on what was a difficult estate in Brixton. She chairs the community and tenants group on the estate and is a leading volunteer in developing the community run youth work at the Youth and Community Centre.

*Housing management*
In 1989 Stockwell Park Estate won Estate Action funding, and started setting up a tenant management organisation, partly because of the criteria for EA funding. In 1992 residents voted for the Estate Management Board to take over running the housing service. Turnout was 95% (local election only got 16% turnout) and a 97% yes vote.

Initially the EMB covered 996 units, and its success persuaded a previously hostile section of the estate to join as well. The EMB now manages 1,700 units.

One problem the EMB faces is that they pay a large proportion of their income back to the centre (Lambeth council) for central services which do not provide good value for money and are poor quality.

The EMB wants more freedom to operate an Octavia Hill style of management – with more staff walking the streets and in direct face to face contact with residents. They would prefer to employ the workers directly, but are 'stuck' with local authority staff.
Good frontline housing officers are key. The EMB wants them to be creative and innovative and bring extra resources in to the estate. The EMB has brought in an extra

£35,000 this year – although this is probably against treasury rules!  They are currently trying to set up a LHC to bring in extra investment to the estate.

*Race, drugs, children and young people*
The group also focuses on work with children, young people and families.  In the 1980s, Lambeth youth workers politicised the young black men on the estate, and put emphasis on their rights rather than their responsibilities.  Poor behaviour was tolerated and the youth encouraged to see themselves as victims of racism.

The Community Centre on the middle of the estate was being run by a sham community organisation, and was used as a crack house.  Lambeth turned a blind eye, because it was reluctant to criticise black community groups.  £2m of residents' money was going into the Centre.

However, when the Centre was named in the Yardie (a newspaper) as the place to get cocaine in South London, Lambeth closed it down.  The building was left empty for 3 years.  The housing manager on the estate became so frustrated that he gave the group the keys, probably illegally!

*Youth*
The group put the building to use as a Youth and Community Centre, with an emphasis on trying to integrate the often very difficult young people on the estate back into the community and mainstream institutions.  The Centre now has over 400 young people on its books, some of whom have been to Trafford Hall together with the workers.

The Youth Club is open 6-9pm every Friday, and is run voluntarily by residents and parents.  The residents also have a lot of contact with the young people day to day, and provide a strong support service and even a substitute family.  It deals with kids that sometimes have no contact with any other statutory service.

The Youth Centre has 12 computers, and encourages the kids to do activities like creating animation – and to think about using their skills in future careers.  It is currently developing a  Cyber café.

*Drugs*
They have reached a compromise with the drug dealers, and there is no open dealing now on the estate eg. on the walkways.  There is some cannabis use which is tolerable, but the estate does have a heroin problem.  There were 3 methadone clinics nearby which attracted addicts into the area.  The group campaigned for them to be moved, and made contact with the health authority via City Challenge.  2 have now been closed.  The estate also faces a big problem with alcoholism.

Local businesses have aggravated the problem eg. William Hill used to provide a waiting room for addicts.  Residents feel angry that addiction is being state funded - people don't think it is acceptable to supply free non-alcoholic drinks to alcoholics.

*Children*

The group also run a pre-school playgroup in a smaller building near to the Centre. This has been threatened by changes in the rules for operating play provision, eg. currently staff are paid £10/day to work 9-3.

4 year olds are 'creamed off' early into overcrowded reception classes, whereas children on the estate need a longer time to socialise and learn skills. The skill level of some of the children on the estate is very low - the play workers teach some children how to use a knife and fork, and have to potty train some.

Social services are not effective - some children who are technically in their care are instead ricocheting around estate.

*Education*
The group has a strong link to the schools through the playgroup, helping get the children to the right level before they go to school. It also supports the older children eg. help to get to university through using the software facilities at club to do animation.

However, as a school governor, Julie found it difficult to get teachers to focus on things like getting more resources and books - they were more interested in claiming allowances and wages. The school also inadvertently created obstacles to parental involvement e.g. there was a parent group but the school made the meetings non-smoking so it collapsed. They also sent letters home telling parents not to send their children with fizzy drinks to school – and instead to give them pressed juice only ("we wish!").

The estate wants to sell off 25% of stock to bring in wealth, but it can't attract better off residents partly because the schools aren't up to standard. The schools are dealing with pressures and crisis too ie. a new influx of kids getting to secondary school with literacy problems. This means that the problem is in primary schools – they try and put responsibility back onto parents, but if the household is not stable this doesn't work. The community in Stockwell Park tries to help take on joint responsibility for children alongside pressured families - communities which do this need support.

*Race*
Where there is poverty, you get resentment - we need one nation services for all races and not quotas. Positive discrimination means someone else is negatively discriminated against. There is a new problem being brought in from the new Europeans – they want to get an education and then leave - they do not have a long term commitment.

*Work and money*
On the estate, people are claiming Income Support who are not living on it. The alternative economy is strong, residents on the estate are scared of government because it is attacking that. All the blame is going to the bottom, rather than to the service deliverers and those at the top. "We want to run our own lives – our bad behaviour pays your mortgages, we want it to pay ours".

*Community involvement*
Professionals can dis-empower, we want decision making power and real control. The group wants to allow people to drop in and out with professionals hired to keep it going. The role of training has been crucial – the group feels it wouldn't be there without s16.

Middle class residents maybe don't need to have a community, but estates need support.


**DISCUSSION**

➢ Families need access points for help before their children get to school. Parental involvement in schools has to be meaningful, not just dragging them in to clean up.

➢ In Cowgate, the primary school still is not perfect, but it is better than it would have been because it has made links to the community. It is hard to be a parent governor because of possible conflicts of interest if your children attend the school.

➢ Open enrolment in secondary school means they are not necessarily locally based. A lot of the developments of the last 20 years on neighbourhood and parent links have ceased because of this.

➢ There isn't any government help for community work except s16. Whatever problems there are with s16, it has been £5m into tenant training which is positive. The amount of s16 money has not been cut, but not increased either, so it has decreased in real terms. The fund is a very small amount in government terms, but has been very significant in terms of ground level work. Where is other support for this community self help work?

➢ There should be a Ministry for Urban Regeneration and Community Development. Training is important – it's a way of working with residents to maximise their input into regeneration, and it also contributes to their job skills.

➢ We want policy makers to go to Stockwell Park to keep in touch. We need informally delivered services and lateral performance indicators.

➢ Community representatives are angry at facing so many obstacles. Is government part of the problem or the solution?

## 9. Tricia Zipfel - Senior Director, Priority Estates Project and Cynthia Bower, Chief Executive, Birmingham Health Authority

## Reforming Local Services and Supporting Families

**SUMMARY**

The Family Support Strategy is a new experiment initiated by the Health Authority. It is running in 8 pilot areas in Birmingham to try and improve the health and quality of life of families in low income neighbourhoods.

- The Strategy is headed by a city wide steering group which includes all the key local authority services and the voluntary sector. Each pilot area also has a multi-agency steering group and a part time co-ordinator. PEP is helping develop the pilots.
- No new money has been put into the Strategy. Instead, the aim is to change the way mainstream services are provided, in response to local needs and priorities, to get better value from investment through joint working and prevention.
- Local consultation and stronger community capacity are key to maximising the value of mainstream services.
- The projects are expected to deliver hard outcomes, such as a reduced number of teenage pregnancies, reduced housing turnover and increased educational attainment.
- Each area is developing an action plan. The plans include proposals like a 'Community Mothers' scheme, and more support for new tenants.
- It will be another 1-2 years before the pilots deliver tangible results.

The Birmingham Family Support Strategy recognises the relationship between poverty and poor health, between welfare and educational outcomes for children and the fact that problems are concentrated in particular neighbourhoods.

In 1994 the Audit Commission highlighted the failure of health and social services to develop joint strategies for working with children and families. They advocated a 'problem solving approach'. Following these reports, Birmingham Health Authority and the City Council endorsed the Family Support Strategy as a way to:

- promote and encourage good parenting across the city
- improve co-operation between professionals in the statutory and voluntary sectors
- develop new and more positive relationships between agencies and the local communities they serve, and
- act as a voice for each area and a vehicle through which needs and problems could be channelled.

Another aim was to focus resources on locally defined needs and to democratise mainstream services through a commissioning and re-commissioning model. The strategy was based on the hypothesis that indices of health and social morbidity in mothers and children will improve if their social isolation is reduced, communities are strengthened and families can provide more support for themselves.

No new money was provided for the Family Support Strategy. The challenge was to devise innovative solutions by changing the way mainstream resources are used and by developing the potential within local communities.

A city wide steering group, chaired by the Director of Education, brought together key services - housing, education, social services, leisure, health and the voluntary sector. The group selected eight pilot areas, including inner city and peripheral estates and a mixed tenure neighbourhood.

Each area has its own multi-agency steering group, the support of a part-time co-ordinator, and access to small sums of money for local initiatives.

Since April 1997, PEP has been helping the pilots to undertake detailed local needs analyses, consult and involve their local communities, develop action plans and put in place mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. Joint training, shared experience and the dissemination of good practice inform the approach. Issues and lessons from the pilots are taken up by 'service champions' who sit on the Steering group and provide a link with mainstream departments and agencies.

The Family Support Strategy aims to :
- create more stable neighbourhoods
- strengthen the social and communal infrastructure
- encourage self-reliance
- develop positive attitudes to learning and improve children's basic skills
- extend and change the way services are provided, in response to local priorities
- get better value from public sector investment

The projects are expected to deliver hard outcomes such as: reduced teenage pregnancies; reduced low birth weight babies; reduced housing turnover; increased school attendance and educational attainment; a decrease in child protection referrals.

So far consultation has engaged people successfully on health issues, partly because it keys in to parents' aspirations for their children.

Developing local capacity within communities is central to the Strategy. Employing local people to deliver services for children is attractive to local people and funders, so a focus on health allows you to hit targets for jobs and training, as well as health (e.g. people want to be nurses). Birmingham Centre for Voluntary Services is helping set up community businesses to do this.

The eight pilots are at different stages of development. The most advanced have produced and shared information - they have identifies local priorities and are developing action plans in response. Specific proposals in the action plans include an initiative to recruit and train 'Community Mothers' who could support young parents and vulnerable families. There are plans to train local residents as peer educators to prevent smoking. Schools and health visitors are collaborating to help parents of children with serious behavioural problems. Lettings policies have been changed to reduce turnover and there is more support for new tenants. It will probably take a further 12-24 months before the impact of this new approach begins to deliver tangible results.

The project has raised several issues about joint working and devolution:
- Performance indicators do not provide incentives to work more effectively, as they as based on numbers, not outcomes.
-  There are problems responding to local consultation.  Local priorities sometimes clash with departmental agendas.
- The scale for consultation, such as 100,000 people in primary care groups, is too big.
- There are limits to interagency working based on good will – people do what they are managerially accountable for.  We need performance management systems to push people.
- Visionary leadership and community development support for residents is crucial to making this model work.
- Local control and delegation is difficult where there is a strong corporate culture.
- There are pressures preventing community involvement e.g. fear or disillusion.
- There is a lack of local information on service levels and budgets - housing has already been forced to get this information in some areas.  If this information could be accessed it could help radically reshape services.


## DISCUSSION

➢ Why was health chosen?  Can you have any starting point?

➢ The choice of health was a coincidence, but health is good starting point – popular, important, and has local purchasing, but doesn't have to be health.

➢ In Scotland it has been difficult to engage health services in urban partnerships because it is a fractious service – split with different interests.  Also, the management ethos of 1980s left health professionals with a tendency to want to control and they won't interact with other services unless it is on their own terms.  Their professional ethos gets in the way of talking to community health people.

➢ It is important to be able to change things if you consult people.  In Cowgate the Community health Project was set up with funding from the health authority to look at why the area had 47 GPs for 3,000 people – when we told them they said they already knew but couldn't do anything about it.

➢ Issue of professionalism (not too bad for housing management cos not a profession!).  The barriers are worse for social workers who have years of training.  When listening to people training gets in way – the 'they don't know what is good for them' attitude.

➢ But, social work is not a graduate profession, most only have 2 years training, the barrier is that people aren't sure about what they're doing and social workers are overloaded.  this still means that in Birmingham social services hasn't been a suitable start point, they use education as a better vehicle.

➢ Perhaps it is not the attitude of the professionals, but departmental priorities that is the obstacle.  Each profession needs a service champion and culture carrier – the professional equivalent to community activists.

➢ A common theme is how to shift power i.e. resources "grab them by the wallet and their hearts and minds will follow".  There is a need to shift power from the top levels of the bureaucracy to the bottom.  There is a consensus to shift things to the lowest level and the local level.  This idea could be piloted to see what happens

➢ Another issue is the importance of hierarchies and buck passing e.g. between education and social work.  Real structural alterations and changes may be an illusion, and they take time.  To achieve devolution of power central government could allow local authority level organisations to organise themselves as they see fit, or we could force certain arrangements/hierarchies onto them.

➢ There seems to be a common feeling that local authorities are the problem not the solution, but central government finds it very difficult to work without going through local government e.g. we are scared of giving cash direct to local groups.  We need an intervening structure between central government and local structures, therefore, local authorities have to be made to work.

➢ Multi-agency service partnerships are not trying to bypass the local authority.  They should facilitate and backup its work.  But, it is an issue that budgets get tied up at local authority level and there is leakage.  If we put cash at the front end, there is less leakage and more scope for risk taking.  Need to give people their head – workers and communities.

## 10.    Evans - Co-ordinator, Bootstrap Enterprises, Hackney, London

## Getting Residents into Jobs

**SUMMARY**
- Bootstrap Enterprises is a voluntary organisation based in Hackney, working on estates where unemployment is as high as 66% for some groups of residents, such as ethnic minority residents and lone parents.
- It provides a flexible pathway back to employment in the mainstream labour market such as employment and job search advice, customised vocational training, pre-vocational training and employer links.
- Bootstrap has also created 30 new jobs and over 150 training and work experience places through setting up new businesses and projects e.g. Cybercycle - a computer recycling firm and a café.
- There are many additional benefits - projects such as community enterprise training and credit union development, self-build, community capacity building, recycling businesses and the interactive environmental education centre all provide services.
- It links disadvantaged unemployed residents into the newest forms of work e.g. IT.
- Success rates getting people into work or further training are between 40-80%, this compares favourable with success rates of around 25% for government schemes.
- The average cost per person for the different schemes ranges from £380 to £3,000.
- A local base, good employer links and a sensitive approach have helped their success.

Helen was one of two people who set up Bootstrap Enterprises 21 years ago in Hackney. Bootstrap is a voluntary organisation which works in areas of acute poverty with unemployed residents to improve their job prospects.

Hackney as a whole has one of the highest claimant rates in the country (18% in June 1997).  On the Hackney estates where Bootstrap Enterprises works, the rate is more than double this (46% in one ward), and for particular groups e.g. young black men, it is over three times this level (66%).

Bootstrap Enterprises worked with over 1,500 Hackney residents last year.  Up to 85% of the participants have been unemployed for over 1 year, and around a third of this group have been unemployed for over three years.  It covers three broad areas of work:

**1.  Pathway to employment.**
The five steps in the pathway cater for the needs of unemployed people at different levels e.g. not job ready, job ready but lacking qualifications, job ready with skills but lacking experience.  People can plug in at any point, or go from one step to the next:
- Estate based outreach and drop in employment advice on 6 estates;
- Prevocational training e.g. basic skills/literacy and numeracy, self confidence for young people, single parents and others, and long term unemployed residents;
- Customised vocational training geared to employers' needs e.g. coach driving, childcare, health care, mentoring and literacy teaching;

- Work placements, for people with skills and qualifications who need experience;
- Employer link scheme, linking people who are job ready to vacancies.

## 2. **Business set up and managed businesses.**
The pathways model is limited because it depends on jobs being available. In Hackney, competition for work is acute – there are 4 people for every job. So, the second area of Bootstrap's work is to try to create jobs and work placement opportunities. Although this has been a huge struggle, Bootstrap has created businesses such as Green Door (vegetarian café), the Rubbish Dump (interactive education centre), Cybercycle (computer recycling), the Print House (managed workspace), Hackney Building Partnership (local labour in construction), and an estate recycling scheme.

All the projects and businesses are still going 7 years on, and also provide services to the area, but it has been very difficult to do this.

## 3. **Capacity building in the community.**
Bootstrap also works on estate based projects that link employment and training to the development of capacity in the community, such as community enterprise training, a credit union development agency, community nursery and childcare training, and training residents to do jobs on estate e.g. mentoring, caretaking.

*Funding*
Funding comes through: central and local government and TECs; ESF and ERDF; charities and trusts; and additional money from trading surpluses and consultancy income.

*Success*

| Method | Outcomes | Cost per person/job |
|---|---|---|
| ▪ Employer link scheme | 80% into jobs | £1,457 |
| ▪ Work experience project | 58% into jobs, 30% into training | £1,892 |
| ▪ Customised training | 50-60% into jobs, 23% work experience/training | £2,647 |
| ▪ Pre-vocational training | 75-85% into jobs/training/self employment | £2,748 |
| ▪ Employment advice | 40-50% into jobs/training/self employment | £382 |
| ▪ Businesses | 25 jobs, 90 work placements | set up costs £5-10,000 |
| ▪ Capacity building work | 50 training places | £1,400 |

These outcomes compare well to other back to work schemes, for example government schemes have a success rate of around 25%. Depending on the project, between 50-80% of those going into work get permanent employment, mostly in administrative and manual occupations.

Bootstrap also has projects in development, such as Cyberbus (mobile computer training and employment advice) which could provide up to 370 jobs and over 60 training places.

**WHAT APPROACH WORKS?**
- independent advice and a voluntary programme
- personal support, specially tailored
- holistic, long term thinking and upskilling as a priority
- a local base and strong local employer/labour market links
- real work experience places and provision for childcare and travel

## 11. Bob Marshall - Programme Manager, Glasgow Works

## Getting the Long Term Unemployed into Work

**SUMMARY**
- Glasgow Works gives long term unemployed people a real job in new local projects, plus training and development.  The jobs are a stepping stone to re-entering the mainstream labour market for people who have been out of work for over 12 months.
- Participants receive a wage which relates to the work they do, people also come off benefits from day one, so are free to earn extra income.
- The cost is £10,154 per participant.
- Inward investment for new jobs for the long term unemployed is crucial, but projects like this are necessary to get the supply side right too.
- Success rates  are high eg. 72% into jobs or education, 80% of the jobs are permanent and full time, 70% are still in work 6 months after leaving the programme.
- It is cost effective, the net cost per job outcome is 58% of other programmes, and it is almost 3 times as effective at getting people back to work than TfW.
- Glasgow Works' model uses existing social security and training budgets in a more effective and productive  way.
- The projects also have additional social and economic benefits e.g. they provide services such as childcare places, which have added £400,000/year to local incomes.
- This is a voluntary programme which is attractive to the unemployed because it provides real work, status, quality, a wage and dignity.
- It is attractive to employers because it reduces the perceived risks of poor discipline, motivation and social skills.

Glasgow Works was set up in 1994 as a partnership project between Glasgow Development Agency (a LEC), Glasgow City Council, Scottish Enterprise, the Employment Service and the Scottish TUC.  It is an intermediate labour market project that provides a stepping stone for the long term unemployed  back to work.  There are estimated to be over 30,000 long term unemployed people in Glasgow, (unemployed for over 12 months), concentrated in the peripheral housing estates, such as Easterhouse, and some inner city areas.

There are many barriers to employment e.g. travel, lack of confidence to re-enter the labour market, and lack of jobs.  As well as encouraging inward investment, you need to look at labour supply too to tackle long term unemployment: lack of job skills; return to work is high risk compared to benefits; poor employability and employer perceptions.

*The Project*
To overcome these barriers, Glasgow Works provides a package of waged work experience, in a real job with an employment contract, as well as vocational training and non-vocational personal development, for up to a year.

Participants receive a proper wage of around £135-140/week and full childcare if needed. While people are on the scheme, they are off benefits from day one, so they can do as much work as possible, and do not have to face coming off benefits to go into work after.

The jobs come through new projects which are managed locally by different voluntary and private organisations, and which also provide useful services for deprived estates like the Gorbals. The projects and businesses include things like after school clubs, environmental wardens, a youth work project for excluded pupils.

The jobs are advertised in Job Centres and newspapers, and applicants are interviewed before the successful candidate is chosen. As part of the scheme, all Glasgow Workers have a personal development programme – anything from driving lessons to learning sign language. Everyone gets training in core skills like customer care and gets support while on scheme e.g. advice on in-work benefits. There is aftercare to ensure a successful transition to the mainstream labour market.

*Costs and funding*
The average cost per participant is £10,154. Of this, £7,077 is funded by money which would have been paid out anyway as benefits or for training programmes e.g. TfW. Glasgow Works negotiated with Scottish Enterprise to use these existing budgets.

The additional £3,077 is raised from agencies which pay for the service provided eg. the City Council helps fund health promotion work as part of its remit.

The project is cost effective - the net cost per job outcome is 58% of other programmes, and it is almost three times as effective. 50% goes back into the local economy in wages.

***Success***
- 65% straight into employment after the scheme
- 72% of all leavers into work or education
- 53% of the very long term unemployed (over 3 years) into work
- 80% of the jobs leavers get are full time and permanent
- and wages rate are 145% of the job centre's vacancies average
- at 6 months after leaving, 69% are still in work

The project also compares favourably with other training initiatives eg. TfW on drop out rates, numbers into work and numbers gaining qualifications.

There are additional social and economic benefits, such as:
- Glasgow Works has created over 200 childcare places for low income families on estates like Easterhouse. This has added £400,000/year to residents' incomes;
- better integration of young people in to the community and reduced vandalism;
- 7,000 refurbished white goods are sold a year to families at low prices

*Why does Glasgow Works work?*
- it is voluntary programme, - people compete to get in to the programme. Residents now approach the project to join because it is attractive and provides real work, status, quality, a wage and dignity.

- it is attractive to employers because it reduces the perceived risks of poor discipline, motivation and social skills

**DISCUSSION**

➢ Is there a role for the Employment Service? Glasgow Works does work with it, but only as a second choice.

➢ Glasgow Works is successful but it has motivated, self selected people coming onto the scheme – what about the rest of the long term unemployed?

➢ The project does monitor creaming at the point of selection and has found that the profile of the people who get on the scheme and those who don't is the same – but what about those who don't apply?

➢ Regeneration cash is a good base for tackling unemployment, but doesn't necessarily create jobs for local residents as employers bring people with them or recruit from outside.

➢ Evidence from Bootstrap Enterprises and Glasgow Works is that levels of basic skills e.g. literacy and social skills, are very low amongst the unemployed people they work with.

➢ Does this mean that we are dealing with the failures of the educational system? What is the scope for intervention e.g. teaching time keeping/work ethic at school?

➢ How much of the problem is unemployment and how much is unemployability? For example, most of the available jobs in Brixton are service jobs, but the young people don't want to serve.

➢ Transport issues in employment are very important eg. Plymouth do subsidised travel, Glasgow Works do car pooling.

## 12.    Jackie Haq - Community Worker, Scotswood, Newcastle

## Community Involvement in Regeneration

**SUMMARY**
- Scotswood is a mixed tenure area containing 3 estates that has suffered serious problems of deprivation and decline, particularly from the mid 1980s.  The break-up of the area was symbolised by riots in the early 1990s.
- Residents of the area are working to try and stop the decline, hold conditions and provide for the basic needs of this low income area, for example, the Scotswood Community Project which runs a credit union, a crèche and a childcare network.
- As well as this ground level community run activity, the community was pivotal in levering in large scale government investment to regenerate the area.  A network of community activists developed the Scotswood Area Strategy which formed the basis of the City Challenge work, and significantly helped Newcastle win their bid.
- Community representatives were involved in delivering the regeneration work through the City Challenge board.  Their experience of this involvement was both positive and negative.
- The lessons about community involvement in regeneration are:

*For community representatives* - they should be properly accountable back to their constituencies, and should try to keep hold of their grass roots connections.  Involvement is time consuming and demanding.

*For regeneration organisations* - they should recognise and support community representatives voluntary input on a more day to day basis, and provide good training and community development help.

Scotswood is made up of three social housing estates which form half of the stock, and the rest are privately owned homes.  The area has high child densities and unemployment rates.  Over 60% of the children in the area receive free school meals, and it has the highest proportion of lone parent household in the city.  The area went into serious decline in the late 1980s, with a dramatic increase in turnover of population and the number of empty homes.  It suffered from riots in the early 1990s.

Jackie Haq is a resident in the area, and has been a community worker for 16 years, both voluntarily and paid.  She was instrumental in setting up the Scotswood Community Project.  The Project runs a credit union, the first to be set up in the North East, which has now lent £207,000 and is so successful that the loan sharks have asked to join!  It runs a crèche and has a child care network which also helps residents qualify as crèche workers.  The network of activists involved have a strong local neighbourhood focus, but try not to allow themselves to become too inward looking and competitive with other neighbourhoods.

To complement this community run activity, local women wanted to make something much bigger happen to tackle the wider problems of the area.  In the late 1980s, a network of local activists, with the support of the City Council, tried an experiment in re-

shaping regeneration from the bottom up.  The group developed a plan for renewal called the Scotswood Area Strategy, which was very significant in  helping Newcastle win City Challenge funding.  The Area Strategy group also presented a challenge to traditional top down ways of working for many officers.   Jackie was one of the community representatives on the City Challenge board who helped to keep the large scale investment on track, for example when £6 million went missing!

Jackie's experience over the last 16 years and involvement in City Challenge have raised several problems that need to be overcome when getting the community to participate.  Sometimes community activists are 'plucked' out of the community (rather than elected) and don't have structures to feed back to the rest of the community.  There is a danger that those people who do get involved are 'sucked in' to the world of board meetings, and start talking the language, and so become isolated from grass roots action on their estates.  Community representatives face conflicts of interest when given information that is supposed to be confidential.

Community involvement is time consuming and means residents giving a lot of free input, often despite extremely stressful personal circumstances.  This input often isn't fully recognised or supported in the right ways - day to day support for all involved would be more helpful than high profile awards for one person.  Training and community development support for community representatives is vital if they are to have a meaningful input.

Stigma has been very damaging for Scotswood, we shouldn't contribute to that with terms like social 'exclusion', instead the focus should be on social inclusion.

## 13.   Wendy Spray - Tenant Participation Worker, Blackbird Leys Estate,  Oxford

## Community Development Building Communities

---
**SUMMARY**
- Examples from difficult estates in Islington and Oxford show there are many potential community projects that can be set up, and that resident led organisations can help turn round 'no go' areas.
- Community development and tenant participation workers' role is vital to community building – only a very few communities can do it totally by themselves.
- Support staff bring crucial skills and confidence building to communities, they can provide training and play a catalytic, brokering role with partner agencies.
- Paid workers have dedicated time to initiate, set up and help manage projects, and keep community activists going.
- There are still many tough problems to tackle when building communities, for example, housing allocations, high turnover, poverty and resentment and a lack of social infrastructure.
---

Wendy Spray was a community worker on the Hornsey Lane Estate in Islington between 1981-91 where she worked with residents on a £4.5m rehabilitation scheme and helped set up a tenant management organisation to protect and maintain the improvements.  The estate has now been turned round from a 'no go', difficult to let area into an attractive and desirable place to live.

She ran the National Certificate in Tenant Participation course at Oxford Brookes University between 1994-6 which is a unique qualification, relatively recently set up, that accredits the work of community representatives.

Wendy is currently employed by a consortium of 4 housing associations led by Ealing Family Housing Association, on a new development of 2,000 homes which are on the edge of the existing Blackbird Leys Estate, in Oxford.

The older part of Blackbird Leys is a deprived, peripheral local authority estate that suffered from disturbances in the early 1990s.  The new development was built between 1990-8, is multi-tenure and multi-landlord (54% rented from housing associations, 17% shared ownership, 30% private houses for sale).  Around half of the new units are family houses, and child densities are high.  50% of the households in rented accommodation have at least one child under 16 years old, and the average age of the children is only 6.

There are many 'Housing Plus' initiatives on the estate, which include:

- a community centre and children's centre
- after school provision, toy library, parenting support and a young mums group
- a credit union
- parks, play areas, and nature park

- local housing office and community caretakers
- a newsletter  - this is an important vehicle for the other projects and now employs 10 local people
- a pathways project for people with disabilities
- a community arts project
- a playgroup
- under 8s work
- job training e.g. in maintenance
- community businesses e.g. sandwich making

This work is only possible through partnership, between the landlords themselves and with the Housing Corporation, the City and County councils, as well as with contractors, Business in the Community, the church, Oxford Co-operative Development Agency, the TEC, Government Office for the Region, the SRB Partnership and others.

Most of the initiatives have been funded either through SRB money, section 106 planning agreements or the lottery.

### *Building Communities: Toughest Problems and Possible Solutions*

- lack of good infrastructure e.g. on Hornsey Lane Estate the rehabilitation of the housing was crucial, but the estate needed shops too
- we need to tackle the issue of allocations even on mixed tenure estates
- poverty, as well as the problems low income creates for families, living in poverty saps energy and creates resentments
- lack of community development resources – community building requires training, a meeting space, office resources, grants, and staff
- community development requires partnerships e.g. with the media,  youth workers, businesses etc
- lack of community involvement - solutions must be owned by the community, there should be a mix of top down and bottom up action
- crime and insecurity –  safer estate agreements and strong tenancy enforcement can help overcome these problems
- demoralisation and high transfer rates - need to develop pride and confidence of residents
- lack of continuity of funding

Above all, Wendy's experience is that community development and tenant participation workers' role is vital to community building – only a very few communities can do it totally by themselves.  Those communities that have achieved gains credit the support and training they have received.  Support staff bring crucial skills and confidence building to communities, they can provide training and play a catalytic, brokering role with partner agencies.  Paid workers have dedicated time to initiate, set up and help manage projects, and keep community activists going.

# *Two Innovative Ideas*

## Dr. Anne Power – Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE

## Neighbourhood Management

*What is neighbourhood management?*
It is about tackling problems, managing the delivery of a broad range of local services, monitoring and enforcing standards, and co-ordinating refuse collection, street cleaning, security, policing, lighting, and special needs provision. Neighbourhood management would tackle disturbance and disruption, and be a catalyst for better conditions.

*Why do we need it and who has a stake?*
Government, local authorities, residents and business all have a central stake in neighbourhood management. We need it because of complex urban conditions, acute decline, polarising pressures, poor standards, weak enforcement and the threat of breakdown in the most difficult areas.

*How much is involved? Which services?*
£10m per annum per 1,000 units are spent by government departments on neighbourhood based services. This amount of spending means a huge task of co-ordination and delivery, and involves at least 350 jobs per small area.

The services that lead spending at the neighbourhood level need to be involved - housing, police, local authority services, income support. Housing management and policing only work effectively at a local level.

*Can it make a difference?*
Hands-on management raises performance, hits problems, increases involvement, and improves morale. It is a classic Hawthorne effect.

*Local versus linked and long term*
Neighbourhood management needs a wider framework, many services are broader, for example secondary schools, leisure facilities, transport. Therefore, neighbourhood management must be linked to the mainstream, and needs support and reinforcement. It must be long term - you manage businesses permanently, including social businesses.

*Which areas? Are council estates the focus?*
All areas need to be linked to delivery systems, but the poorer the area, the weaker the organisational and informal links - in spite of greater demands. Therefore, the key focus should be neighbourhoods that are most vulnerable to failure and most costly to public services. This includes social housing estates and run down inner areas, often with high ethnic minority populations. You have to start somewhere and some advantages in tackling the worst first are that you make the biggest leaps most quickly.

*Arm's length management*
It is important not to create another layer of bureaucracy, therefore neighbourhood management needs arm's length structures. The organisation or company must have

local budgets, a decision making management board, elected local representatives, and not be politically dominated.  The local authority role is about rowing not steering.  All this will give the structure the clout to tackle problems.

**DISCUSSION**
➢ If you treat people at the worst end, then you don't get to the wider problem  - the people at highest risk don't make up the biggest group numerically.

➢ BUT, you have to tackle the worst even if not most numerically significant.  There are large gaps, the worst cities are closer to the national average than those cities are to their worst estates.

➢ Need to look at groups of people as well as areas?  But, the government has traditionally taken the groups approach and has ended up in 'vertical silos' of policy.  Need to use areas as the link between different policy fields.  An areas is best to work holistically, but this doesn't sit with the way policy is made and the way politicians are accountable – that is all vertical.

   The centre needs to re-invent lateral connections.  We have two tools for doing this – New Deal for Communities is an area based strategy for estates, and the Government is talking to the LGA about their New Deal for Regeneration proposal.  We can also use the SRB as an example of what can be achieved on an area basis.

➢ Priority Estates Project didn't work with schools because they seemed to work.  Money for schools and the police should go to the police and schools.  Some vertical work is OK - people getting on with their jobs. Because services are delivered to areas, and problems collect there that we need neighbourhood management.

➢ What adds value to local services?  When there are huge bureaucracies, the micro politics make a difference if the service works at local level e.g. if got 1 brilliant worker makes a difference. We also need structural change at a bigger level.

➢ 2,000 units = 5,000 people – this is a viable size for example for a primary school.  But, local government doesn't operate at that level, not that it should, but this means that you either have to train people to break through the bureaucracy or operate at a low enough level – i.e. neighbourhood.

➢ Services should operate at the lowest possible level, this could be as small as 310 units like Elswick.  BUT does this carry extra costs? What would be the budget? What would be the relationship to the local authority?

➢ If we concentrate on the frontline we need to invent a new set of highly skilled frontline people.  How and where do we get them from?  We do have a model for a new breed of frontline person from the 20 years experience of PEP.

# Gerard Lemos - Co-organiser, School for Social Entrepreneurs

## Rebuilding Communities

Gerard Lemos is co-organiser of the new School for Social Entrepreneurs, and also runs Lemos and Crane, a publishing company focusing on housing law and practice, racial harassment, business and management and social change.   He is a respected analyst and commentator on housing policy, and has recently co-authored a book on the breakdown of stable communities and the role of mutual aid, together with Michael Young, *The Communities We Have Lost and Can Regain*.

They argue that strong communities have a thriving moral economy, ie. the voluntary exchange of care and support and the regulation of right and wrong.

*The things that go in to making up a moral economy are:*
- length and stability of residence develops residents' attachments to people and areas, and affects the perception of potential residents.   Therefore, landlords' role in allocations and lettings is crucial in reinforcing stability of residence;
- the three generation family. The more generations of a family live in an area, the stronger the neighbourhood and kinship links are, and the networks that provide informal care and mutual aid.   Horizontal families may have become weaker, but vertical families (and quasi families) are still strong;
- but, although kinship is important, increased mobility has made other networks more important in contributing to the moral economy, e.g. friends who provide informal mutual aid;
- as well as informal mutual aid, there are more formal structures of care and support, for example from the landlord, or community organisations;
- and local leadership by both individuals and organisations helps set standards of behaviour and provide a focus.

*What is Disturbing the Moral Economy?*
- Allocations to social housing
- Equitable rationing of social housing based on the assumption that housing demand outweighs supply in all cases.   Erroneous concerns about race have led to bureaucratic lettings that disregard families.  The effects of homelessness legislation have been to concentrate people by need rather than by networks of support.
- Dis-integration of local services

*What Can We Do?  The Proposals*

1. **Transferable housing points for social needs.**  Take social needs into account for social housing allocations.  Points for social needs would be transferable e.g. to a person willing to meet that need.

2. **A Mutual Aid Compact** – a formal agreement, signed by residents, that they will make a contribution to their community.  The Compact would be an expectation not a requirement, persuasive not enforceable, custom not law.

**DISCUSSION**

➢ What about the strong homelessness lobby and demands for increased building of social housing?

➢ Shelter is sympathetic to the need to re-think social housing rationing to help build back communities. Building isn't the answer – it would create more demand.

➢ Housing demand varies a lot depending on the area and region, even where there are serious housing needs. Some global demand figures mis-represent the mismatch between demand and supply, and the problem of lack of demand in some areas.

➢ If there was a neighbourhood manager, they could manage demand locally. We see housing the wrong way round as a local resource managed nationally, whereas it is a national resource that should be managed locally. We have a cumbersome gate keeping system which needs to be more flexible.

➢ Some housing associations do have local allocations systems, but they rely on narrow definitions of equitability and 'meeting needs'. If we don't have an overall under supply of housing then the purpose of housing is to create viable communities.

➢ Any allocation system is rationing and involves social engineering. Giving the $10^{th}$ house to someone different isn't social engineering, just good housing management. Manchester has abandoned a points system in favour of a date order system within broad categories of need.

➢ The allocations system does not deal with other problems, such as housing paedophiles. Homelessness isn't just about access but support once there.

➢ Mixed tenure may not be the answer, but it does contribute to the viability of an area e.g. to attract businesses in.