Tenants and their communities: summary Report to the Department for Communities and Local Government on the consultation with tenants at Trafford Hall on the Future Roles of Social Housing

Anne Power, London School of Economics

November 2007

Acknowledgements

Contents

1. Background to the follow up consultation
2. The organisation of the event
3. What participants told us in the workshops
4. What the "brainstorming" session told us
5. Conclusions and summary of main ideas

Annex one: List of participants
Annex two: Programme for consultation
Annex three: Outline of issues and questions for discussion

1. Background to the follow-up consultation

Communities and Local Government identified four key questions that they wanted tenants' ideas on. They also wanted to sound out proposals. The core questions were:

- How could social landlords involve tenants more in improving the social housing stock?
- How could social landlords, working with other agencies, help tenants access work, taking account of the barriers they face through location, low income and lack of contacts?
- How could the government support more mixed communities, not only in new build areas but also within existing areas?
- What was needed in order to increase the supply of housing overall and affordable housing in particular?

The four questions the government was posing helped participants to focus on concrete ideas to be fed back directly to government ministers.

Communities and Local Government, the department responsible for social housing, wanted the consultation to take place in a neutral venue where tenants from a wide range of backgrounds would feel free to express their views and explore these issues in more depth. The event was to be discussion-based and open-ended, without attempting to represent the views of different interest groups, rather to gather a cross-section of opinions and explore how far there was a consensus on what helped and what might work. It was agreed to base this event on the earlier consultation event that fed into the social housing report, which took place in February 2007 at Trafford Hall, home of the National Communities Resource Centre, near Chester. LSE Housing based within the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion at the London School of Economics organised both events with the Trafford Hall team.

Background to Trafford Hall and LSE Housing

Trafford Hall offers training, support and pump-priming grants to residents and volunteers in low-income communities to help them tackle local problems within their communities. Since 1994 when the Centre opened, around 70,000 participants have been on residential courses leading to action plans based on sharing experiences and practical learning.

LSE Housing is a research and consultancy group within the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) at the London School of Economics. We aim to develop understanding of the dynamics of disadvantaged neighbourhoods; explore new models of housing and neighbourhood management; uncover ways to support community and resident self help especially in social housing and low income areas; and help shape government policy. Our research considers the impact of poor neighbourhood and area conditions on residents and the role of local people in regenerating and improving their communities. LSE Housing evaluates the impact of policies on the ground, finding solutions to poor conditions and tensions in deprived areas.

The event brought together a cross-section of forty tenants with community-level experience who were willing to share that experience constructively, openly and honestly. This short report summarises those findings, reflecting only the views of participants, not the report writers.

2. The organisation of the event

The event included tenants from different regions, sexes, ethnic groups, and types of renting, leaseholders and right to buy owners. The **list of participants** is attached in annex one

Known community representatives with a track record of contributing to their local areas were invited so that the discussion would be grounded in hard-won experience; national community representatives were not included to allow a freer discussion, to avoid tension

between particular and sometimes conflicting positions, as opposed to the detailed reflection of how things work on the ground. People were asked to express their views in their own personal capacity, even where they were involved in other organisations.

Four facilitators were identified with a track record in consultation who were used to running open-ended discussions on difficult issues. The event was workshop-based in small groups in order to give the maximum number of participants a chance to contribute. The four facilitators recorded the key points from their two workshops on flip-charts and then fed back to the whole group on the key findings from each topic after each workshop. In the afternoon, we organised a brainstorming session with people seated around tables in café style in order to solicit views and test out in more depth some of the ideas that had come up. Annex two shows the **programme for the day**.

We agreed a series of ground rules for the workshops to establish a consensual and open-minded approach. The ground rules worked well and people were enthusiastic about their contributions and pleased to be included in this event. The methods of recording what people said and of checking the findings before finalising the report, the "brainstorming" method to pool the very best ideas were explained and agreed.

"Brainstorming" session

During the four years of Trafford Hall's development up to its opening (1991 – 1995) we held regular "brainstorming" sessions in Chester with active tenants' representatives from around the country on how the centre could work, how best it could help improve conditions for residents, how residents could have more say and influence, what training ideas would be most helpful, how small grants following training and action planning could be distributed and so on. Without these sessions the centre would have struggled to hit the right note and attract the support it enjoys. We decided to use the same technique in exploring ideas on the future of social housing in July. Most participants were new to the approach. As in earlier sessions it produced many ideas and people greatly enjoyed contributing directly. It formed the basis of our main findings.

---

3. What participants told us

<u>a) Giving tenants more say</u>

Participants were unsure how tenants could be given more say, stressing that *"it is a minefield"* and that "*the minister must be part of it*", if it was going to have any value. Many participants made the point that existing organisations already represent tenants collectively. Although creating a new government-backed National Tenants' Organisation could be useful, it would have to be independent, non-party political, inclusive of all types of tenants, and not cutting across existing organisations.

In order to make social housing areas work better, landlords should work with the community, so that they can encourage people who get jobs or who have a little more money to want to stay. To make this work, community representatives need a voice. The housing revenue account funds (tenants' rents) are there to provide tenant services, so it should be obvious that tenants are involved in what happens to their homes. If people become involved, then they know more, are less afraid and feel more relaxed, understanding and tolerant. This more participatory approach would have big knock on benefits. People thought that tenants had more input into ALMOs and into local management structures than into bigger and therefore more remote landlords.

Existing communities
At a more local and practical level, tenants had many ideas on how to gain more say:

- information should be more accessible and more widely distributed locally;
- representatives should be given more status at the local level, rather than just a few being given a lot of nationally promoted involvement;
- landlords had to take on positively the agenda of local involvement;
- landlords needed to adopt a constructive attitude towards tenants and offer real resources to support the development of strong community networks;

- the commitment to tenant involvement had to be backed with real money, in order to work;
- there was a big need for more training for residents in order to play a stronger role.

Participants thought that people would be more active if they thought they could make a real difference. They argued for better childcare, being listened to more, having better guarantees of their rights as tenants. Landlords should deliver on what they promised in order to encourage tenants to develop a more positive rather than negative involvement.

Several participants thought that mergers and restructuring of social landlords had negative impacts and that multi-tenure estates were more difficult for both management and for community involvement.

The result of tenants having more say should be an actual transfer of power to a more local level and to actual communities, leading to real change.

b) Access to work

The ideas we gathered on work fell into three parts. Firstly, what government should do, secondly, what employers should do and thirdly, what should happen in local communities.

What government can do to help people into work
Government needs to offer help into work at the local level, with the right agencies directly **accessible locally and working together**, for example, benefits, job training and recruitment. **Support workers** can make a big difference in helping people who have little confidence into work. There should be much more active recruitment of non-working tenants into work, particularly into local jobs. At the same, there need to be changes within the benefit system so that the **poverty trap** is reduced, and housing benefit supports the time frame of a new job. Tax credits need to be more secure and clearer. The whole issue of the benefit trap and fear of going to work and becoming poorer and more insecure as a result dominated the discussion.

What employers can do to help people into work

At the employer level, there is **competition for new, low paid jobs from new immigrants**. This partly reflects the very low wages that can be paid to immigrant workers. Lots of participants felt that this was unfair and that realistic wages that matched local conditions were a must. A second problem was **subcontracting**, which **undercut viable jobs** through **illegal labour**. The lack of proper apprenticeships, particularly in construction and maintenance were barriers for young people. Participants called for the creation of repair apprenticeships and more stress on skills development to help people into work. People thought that **accreditation of training**, so that people got more recognition for what they did, made a difference. This should include accrediting volunteer experience so that people like themselves, who worked hard, covering many different areas without pay or recognition, could get their experience accredited. Local employment was considered very important.

What communities need to access work

On the community front, **transport and its cost** dominated much of the discussion and people suggested both better transport links and free bus passes for people accessing low-paid work. There were no specific proposals on how this should be done. At the same time, people felt that **housing transfers** should be accelerated if a family needed to move either for family support reasons (for example childcare), to help access work or for a job. Such families should definitely get priority and it was stressed that **family support** could often lead to people being able to work once their children were taken care of. People also thought that new estates, and particularly the proposals for large, new eco towns, had to be linked into transport infrastructure and local jobs, otherwise they wouldn't work. One worry people expressed concerned young people, who received training and got work, moving away from their community. Encouraging young workers to stay was important in order to create **more mixed and more stable communities**.

c) Mixed communities

On the question of more mixed communities, the following issues dominated discussions:
- participants took 'mixed' to mean **ethnically and socially mixed**;

- new development offered a **good chance for integration** and that this should be pushed;
- it seemed to have worked with the garden city idea;
- participants generally were very much **against segregated communities** and thought that immigrant communities should be encouraged to mix rather than to consolidate into separate areas;
- proper integration of housing would help this, so building in streets and "mixing on the doorstep" were very important issues;
- the way property was allocated helped to determine the social mix of estates and because of the shortage of properties, **allocating on a more mixed basis was difficult**;
- at the same time, listening to local people when allocating at the local level was important to **avoid creating "little ghettos"**;
- housing officers should not simply allocate people as though they were computer numbers or machines;
- more thought should go into making communities work.

Some suggestions for making mixed communities work better were:
- educating people so that they respect each other;
- increasing access to transfer so it is easier for people to get the kind of housing they want;
- creating good facilities so that people use them and therefore mix;
- developing anything, that creates a sense of community around points of contact;
- having community workers in housing areas to encourage community life and reduce tensions.

Tenants thought that:
- **choice-based lettings were fairer**;
- it was critical for applicants to know what was happening to their re-housing position so they could track their progress;

- a **mix of people by ethnic group, tenure and age** should be built into all regeneration programmes;
- new build schemes should include social facilities and some social housing *"with no get-out"* for developers;
- social housing should be mixed in with the rest;
- sheer housing need was a huge problem and that **anybody in genuine need should get overriding priority**.

Nobody could reconcile how you did all this while creating more mixed communities.

d) Supply

On the affordable housing supply, people expressed many worries. For example, if you build affordable "social" housing more cheaply, you will "*mark it with signals of poverty*", in contrast to the wealth of owners.

- **People in low-income brackets may not be able to afford home ownership under almost any circumstances**, even with high subsidies.
- Creating a level playing field across tenures, so that **renting becomes more acceptable**, is very important.
- House building should be split, one-third social, one-third part ownership and one third private owner occupation.
- Housing should be **built with management in mind** so that people start with high quality design, a clear tenancy agreement, and a proper repair and maintenance system so that **renting becomes indistinguishable from buying**.
- The quality of homes and environments should be upgraded in social rented areas so that social housing becomes more acceptable.

People couldn't resolve in the new agenda **how to keep housing that was built to be affordable, truly affordable**. For example, the right to buy is popular, but using the right to buy in order to make a profit is seen as a big problem. Buying to let is seen as all right, as long as the people who rent, need a home and "***behave respectfully***" within the community.

But monitoring landlords so that they reach a reasonable standard is a big issue and **leaving housing empty is a scandal**.

Many participants felt very upset by the number of empty property in their estates because of lack of repair and need for major repair. They commented on the large numbers of homes that were constantly out of action. When asked, at least half of the participants said that a high rate of un-repaired empty property was a problem in their areas, including high demand areas, in the South-East.

4. What the "brainstorming" session told us

Each participant was asked to write down their three main ideas in answer to four questions written up on big charts. The questions followed on from the workshop sessions of the morning to fill in some gaps. The four questions were:

- How can we get more younger people involved?
- In your community, what do you want more say over?
- How could you make your estate more mixed?
- What should the government do next about social housing?

We collected up to a hundred responses on each question, a total of about 300 responses. We grouped people's responses under some main themes. Below we set out a summary of the responses, grouping the responses offering a particular view. Some quotes highlight different issues. On all the topics there was a wide spread of views and many more detailed comments and points we could not fully reflect in this summary. The quotes help to illustrate the wide range of ideas.

1. How can we get more younger people involved?
All participants were very keen that involving young people should happen and had many ideas on how.

Table A: How can we get more younger people involved?

Main issues raised	Frequency with which the issue was raised
'Grab' their attention / more **'tailored'** approach	16
More **services/ facilities** for young people	12
Through **education**	9
More **dissemination**	9
Through **community events**	5
Involve them more	5
Support/ Guide them	4
Financial incentives	3
More **consultation**	2
Remove **stigma** of social housing	2
Social housing as **housing of choice**	2
Access to social housing	2
Treat them **equally**	2
Policing	1

Box A: How can we get more younger people involved?

Getting young people to care
- *'More personal contact'*
- *'Make topics more interesting – make them more welcome'*
- *'Have meetings when they can come...not in school time'*
- *'Text them'*
- *'Go to people rather than expecting them to come to you'*
- *'Have meetings in local areas not always in the centre'*
- *'Organise meetings around the younger people'*
- *'Make meetings more informal...no suits'*
- *'Hold meetings in night clubs with free entry'*

Involving young parents
- *'Hold events at reasonable times for young mothers – maybe when children are at school'*
- *'Provide childcare'*
- *'Have someone who can look after children...a nursery nurse'*
- *'Provide facilities for single mothers and younger children'*
- *'Lay on crèche facilities'*
- *'Organise coffee morning with child play for parents'*

Providing facilities
- *'Make a more young person friendly estate'*
- *'Build a purpose built centre'*
- *'Provide training with qualifications'*
- *'Start involvement from a very young age'*

Reaching young people - communication
- *'Community involvement should be part of school curriculum and community activists can help deliver it'*
- *'Involve them from the beginning rather than expecting them to jump in at the deep end'*
- *'Get information into schools'*
- *'Put newsletters in youth club and local school'*
- *'Talk to schools about social housing'*
- *'Text them'*

Organising events and activities
- *'Publicise local events and organizations through the national youth organisations'*
- *'Organise youth exchange visits between housing areas around the country*
- *'Organise networking events'*
- *'Hold away days with prizes'*
- *'Organise fun days'*
- *'Aim community events at a particular groups of young people and make them fun'*

Support
- *'Set up a mentoring scheme'*
- *'Lead by example…offer local role models'*
- *'My daughter is involved with our group – because I think she's seen me working with the committee on the work we do'*

Incentives
- *'Reward young tenants with rent rebates depending on attendance at meetings and proactive involvement in tenant activities'*
- *'Develop reward schemes for young people'*
- *'Make it easier to get a tenancy (if you're active in the community)'*

Attitude
- *'Ask for their views'*
- *'Ask them what they want'*
- *'Young ones could get a house early without waiting'*
- *'Don't look down on them'*

2. In your community what do you want more say over?

People had strong clear views on what they wanted more say over, most of which were locally focussed. Table B groups the answers by theme and Box B gives some flavour of different people's views.

Table B: In your community what do you want more say over?

Main issues raised	Frequency with which the issue was raised
Facilities/ Services	11
Neighbourhood management	7
Police/ Policing	6
Allocations	6
Local environment	5
Everything	4
Changing **regulations**	3
New built	3
Finances	2
Educating residents	1
Involvement	1
Traffic	1
Decision taking	1
Planning/ licensing	1
Integrating generations	1
Repairs/ Refurbishment	1

Box B: In your community what do you want more say over?

Local Services
- *'Use of school grounds'*
- *'Provision of services'*
- *'Monitoring of services'*
- *'All things that concern social housing'*
- *'Would like to have more say in everything! Voices count'*
- *'Local communities should be involved in everything to do with council housing'*

Need for local control and supervision
- *'A big say on the quality of maintenance'*
- *'A say in how the estate is run'*
- *'Children playing in the street without parents watching.'*
- *'Street cleaning'*

Finance and spending
- *'Budgeting for environmental services and green space'*
- *'Setting rent levels'*
- *'How budgets are allocated'*
- *HA income/spend*

Access to housing
- *'How allocations are decided'*
- *'Who gets the allocation (make a chance to orally put their case forward and not rely on points'*
- *'Change the law on where subletting is happening'*

Big decisions
- *'I want to have a say in the design quality of any proposed new build'*
- *'More involvement with strategic side of housing'*
- *'Understanding how the management decides "what tenants want"'*

Community ownership and control
- *Rrespect, self-worth, pride to take ownership of residents area'*

Local Environment
- *'More windmills or hydro'*

3. How could you make your estate more mixed?

We asked participants in this question to give us their realistic assessment of whether it was actually possible to achieve a greater mix in existing areas, and whether or not they were in favour of the idea. Table C summarises participants' ideas and the quotes in Box C reflect people's hope that it could happen. Many participants understood "mixed" to mean ethnically mixed, and views reflect social exclusion as covering income, status and ethnic origin.

Table C: How could you make your estate more mixed?

Main issues raised	Frequency with which the issue was raised
Facilities to promote social contact	6
Integrate **generations / races / religions**	5
More **New built**	4
Image	4
Education	4
Housing **design/ flexibility**	3
Change **Rules/Regulations**	3
Housing tenure	3
Already mixed	2
Physical **environment**	2
Housing quality	2
Think **strategic/ long term/ wider**	2
Match **supply and demand**	1
Neighbourhood management	1
Community assets	1
Transport	1
Focus on the **existing**	1
Community events	1
Consultation/ Involvement	1
More **investment**	1
More housing **choice**	1
Jobs/ Employment	1

Box C: How could you make your estate more mixed?

Facilities to bring people together
- *'Improve the estates community centres and all play areas'*
- *'Provide facilities for ethnic groups'*
- *'Encourage the use of facilities by all'*
- *'Introduce play areas, community gardens, places for people to meet'*
- *'Include activities and training for all ages in a local centre for a minimum charge'*

Allocations and access to housing
- *'Put like minded people together no matter age, gender, colour, creed'*
- *'Intermix tenures and income'*
- *'Advertise the area'*
- *'Change "transfer policy" to enable people to have more say about 'their' homes''*
- *'Change the percentage of new lets to even out mix'*
- *'Some over-housed to move to a smaller property on estate and vice versa'*
- *'Give people choice of where within an estate they wish to live'*

A different image of estates
- *'Be prepared for new build on areas of land not being maintained by the council'*
- *'Make it less of a stigma to live in social housing'*
- *'School children to talk to parents'*
- *'Get rid of all council houses and start again, with help from local community groups'*
- *'Education on tolerance'*
- *'Make them fit for purpose'*
- *'Build new social rented housing in "nice" areas and not just on large estates'*
- *'Allow landlords discretion to create a mix'*
- *'Build with a view for long-term living'*

Fairness
- *'Migrants, indigenous, asylum seekers, should be subjected to the same rules'*
- *'Build with a view for long-term living'*

Tenants having more of a stake
- *'Change all rents into mortgages'*
- *'Build properties with the option to purchase part of the property'*
- *'Bring all houses' up to the same standard*
- *'Go for community ownership of some form'*

Work being accessible
- *'Improve transport to economic centres'*
- *'Concentrate on improving incomes / aspirations of those already living on the estate'*
- *'More jobs for everyone with realistic salaries'*

Already happening
- *'Mine is mixed – there are 16 different languages'*

4. What should the government do next about social housing?

The views of participants on the role of government came with a top down and bottom up perspective. From the top down perspective, government should change the way many things are done at the moment, and from the bottom up perspective, there should be more community management and more involvement. Table D summarises the main issues and Box D gives some if the direct suggestions people made.

Table D: What should the government do next about social housing?

Main issues raised	Frequency with which the issue was raised
Encourage more **Community management/ involvement**	8
Change **the rules/ regulations** so it works (for example allocations / rents / transfers)	7
Attract more **Investment**	5
Support more **New build**	4
Raise quality of housing **Design/ Flexibility**	4
Protect **Affordability**	3
Improve **Image**	3
Restrict **RTB**	3
Encourage **Consultation**	2
Support **Facilities**	2
Learn from **Past lessons**	1
Improve **Housing quality**	1
Improve **Services/ Management**	1
Enforce more **Integration**	1
Raise **Education** standards	1
Reduce **'empties'**	1
Support **Disadvantaged groups**	1

Box D: What should the government do next about social housing?

Encourage community involvement and control
- *'Allow communities more control to manage'*
- *'Provide more local control'*
- *'The right to manage in the RSL sector'*
- *'Encourage greater community involvement and neighbourhood management'*
- *'Put more money for communities but not to councils'*
- *'Build more community centres…with mixed cultures'*

Ensure an affordable supply
- *'If they buy their homes, they must sell back to housing association or council at a reasonable price'*
- *'Set rules re affordable homes and enforce them'*
- *'Bring private rented housing in to line'*
- *'Ban building social rented housing for sale'*
- *'Provide all high quality rentals with a choice to buy after set period'*
- *'Should allow councils / ALMOs to receive funding so they can build new'*
- *'More resources to renovate estates'*
- *'Release more money for more houses'*
- *'Put more money into good housing'*
- *'Make the social housing properties more liveable'*
- *'Improve quality and range of stock'*
- *'More disabled and old people housing is most important to our area so build more sheltered homes'*
- *'Make it easier and cheaper for young people to buy their first home and to resell should they move at price first bought'*
- *'Affordable should mean open to ALL not just the ones who can afford deposits'*
- *'Keep the right to buy but do not allow people who have bought then rent at extortionate prices, i.e. £60 social housing, £105 private rent – same houses, same street'*
- *'Stop RTB'*

Design quality
- *'Make the design quality equal to the private rented'*
- *'Design so homes are fit for purpose, often there is no space to sit down and eat as a family, space for bikes, pram etc'*
- *'Make the design quality equal to the private rented'*

Tighten up access and supervision
- *'Vet tenants'*
- *'Enforce more rules and not make it up as we go along'*

Change the image of social housing
- *'Have a more optimistic vision for the sector as housing of choice'*
- *'Help change the ethos of social housing to DECENT affordable housing, not just houses'*
- *'Try to persuade people to think that being in rented property is not necessarily a bad thing'*
- *'Make laws to stop tenants misbehaving without losing their home'*
- *'Consult on a national basis what young people, from 18 to 28, want for their future housing'*
- *'Ask local people what they want and don't just think they want what you offer'*

A bigger, longer view
- *'Take a step back and evaluate all of the information government has to the present date'*
- *'Look after tenants, don't just expect rent without making sure everything else is fine'*
- *'Link social housing to the rest of the community (schools, shops, businesses etc) – cannot look at housing in isolation'*
- *'Find out exactly how many high cost voids there are and make sure those landlords bring them into occupation so the government gets true figure of the waiting list (that is, how many homes we're actually short of)'*

5. Conclusions and summary of main ideas

The workshop provided a fairly unified tenants' perspective on some key issues of great significance for the future of social housing:

- Tenants should have **more say in what happens** but many sceptical voices were raised over creating "*just another national tenants organisation*". "*Surely it is better to use the ones we have*", listen more carefully and devolve more real power to the grassroots.

- Existing communities would work much better with **more involvement**, **locally run** facilities and services, stronger **local management** and **better control** over conditions.

- Tenants who want to work often have few qualifications, poor transport links and little confidence. So we need **more work-linked**, **accredited training** and **apprenticeships**, **more support and advice** in one place and **better transport** links.

Young people should be particularly targeted. Offering more local jobs to local people was a popular idea.

- The **benefits and poverty trap** stops many people from taking jobs, for fear they will lose their security and all benefits in one go. Helping people through longer, slower reductions in benefit and tax credits would help a lot.

- **Mixed communities in existing areas were most participants' ideal**. By far the biggest step was to create a "better sense of community", i.e. more direct mixing, between families, age groups and ethnic groups who live in an area.

- Most participants brought up ethnic barriers and wanted above all to "*avoid ghettos*". They felt different groups should be more open, more welcome, more equal but **not concentrated** in particular blocks or areas.

- Raising the **quality of social housing and of estates** generally would encourage better social mix. Reducing stigma and marginalisation can only happen if quality is higher – quality of repair as well as design.

- Participants were exercised about both **housing pressures (access) and costs**. There seemed little point having "affordable" homes for sale that then became "unaffordable".

- **Renting should be given much higher status**, and should be treated equally with owning. Private renting should be better quality, more accessible and better managed.

- **Young people are vital** to the future and communities should work much harder at keeping them involved. There should be **more fun events**; information should be better presented; and "*carrots*" for getting involved should be offered.

- **Young mothers need special support** and **help with childcare**. They also need to get together and join in; this needs proper help for them.

- Access to social housing is a mystery to most people and getting a transfer is very difficult. Much more **transparent, open access systems** would help people see where they are and stop them just "feeling like computers".

- Most participants raised the problem of **empty homes**. There were many homes sitting **waiting for repairs**. This caused real local distress and there should be a strong, concentrated attempt to tackle this.

- Government should do a lot more to create the **right incentives** and to make it possible for communities to do more for themselves.

There were many more issues people wanted to discuss and think through. Consultation events of this kind in a quiet, neutral venue, offer a cross section of residents the chance to share their views on real issues affecting their lives as social housing tenants, thereby guiding government on what policies may work and what practical applications are most urgent.

Footnote: Participants had greatly enjoyed both the workshop sessions and the brainstorming. They felt that discussions had been rushed to cover a wide agenda and would like longer to talk things through more carefully. They specifically asked whether there could be a follow-up training event at Trafford Hall for residents, covering the future directions of social housing.

.

Annex one: List of participants

First name	Surname	Organisation
Maggie	Cooke	ECAT
Brian	Potter	
Laurence	DaSilva	Cremorne Residents Association
Amanda	Yates	Kidz Together
Roy	Curtis	Sunnybrow Residents Association
Michelle	Ashmore	Witton Lodge Community Association
Linda	Hines	Witton Lodge Community Association
Gillian	Richardson	
Patricia	Forsyth	East Rose Community Group
Margaret	Jepson	Glenfield Community Group
Lynn	Stonehouse	Old Hall Community Group
Gloria	Foster	Childwell Valley EMB
Terry	Edis	Burrows Street TMO
J Clive	Furber	New Charter + Federation
John	Challinor	Bacup & Stacksteads TMO
Jennifer	Holmes	Claybrow and Holland Moor EMB
Ann	Speers	
David	Speers	
Peter	Olds	Nunsthorpe and Bradley Park TARA
Gerry	Foxhall	Wrekin Housing Trust Tenants Panel
Roy	Read	Bloomsbury EMB
Frank	Evans	Bacup and Stacksteads TMO
Brian	Monnell	Mendip Community Group
Cora	Carter MBE	Taroe
Ken	Yates	Kidz Together
Chrisitine	Gethins	New Charter + Federation
Graham	Knapper	CLG
Greg	Finneron	Trafford Hall
Barb	Watson	Trafford Hall
Elise	Watson	Childwall Vally EMB
Anne	Power	LSE
Paul	Moffat	North Staffordshire Furniture Mine Stoke on Trent
Richard	Crossley	CLG
Judith	Quinn	Broadoak Community Group
Freda	Griffiths	Tenant Forum
Richard	Hurst	Tenants Forum
Ian	Ward	Glenfield Community Group
Paul	Mancrief	Tenot Estate Board
Hayley	Evans	Trafford Hall
Joan	Minard	Childwell Valley EMB
Wayne	Rimes	Furniture Mine
Trevor	Bell	NFTMO

Annex two: Programme of consultation event

The future for Social Housing

Tenant discussion event at Trafford Hall, Friday 20th July

Time	Topic
10.30am – 11.00am	**Arrival and coffee**
11.00am – 11.20am	**Welcome and introduction by Anne Power** **and Communities and Local Government**
11.20am – 12.20pm	**Breakout session 1** - **increasing "tenant voice" or** - **supporting tenants livelihoods**
12.20 – 12.35pm	**Headline feedback from groups**
12.35pm – 1.15pm	**Lunch**
1.15pm – 2.15pm	**Breakout session 2** – **delivering Mixed Communities or** – **providing a varied range of housing options**
2.15pm – 2.30pm	**Headline feedback from groups**
2.30 – 3.00pm	**Brainstorming session**
3.00pm – 3.20pm	**Thank you and close**

Annex three: Outline of issues and questions for discussion

1. Increasing attention to the social housing stock and tenants

Background/introduction: John Hills has raised concerns about very low mobility in social housing, and where tenants have very little "exit power" to leave their landlord they should be provided with a greater "tenant voice" to have an influence over their housing service. Martin Cave has recommended that there should be an independent national tenant organisation.

o Do you feel that there should be an independent national tenant organisation that would provide greater "tenant voice" and promote the interests of tenants?
o If so, what thoughts do you have on how such a national tenant organisation should be run, and how could it best serve the interests of tenants?
o What other ways do you think are available to give tenants a better say in their housing or to communicate what type of service they would like?

2. Housing that supports tenant's livelihoods

Background/introduction:

In the context of increasingly high rates of unemployment in social housing, and concerns about the impacts of rising house prices on tenant's ability to buy a home, John Hills raised the need for social housing to also promote work incentives, job opportunities and economic and social mobility. For example, making available to tenants employment, training and skills advice and support alongside housing advice, or encouraging more home moves within social housing to enable tenants to move to better take up job opportunities.

At the moment advice on employment, training, skills and housing is ordinarily provided by different organisations in different locations. We are exploring how advice and support could be better joined up and made more easily available to social housing tenants. This could also include helping tenants to understand their housing options looking forward and how they could plan for moving house or for moving to another tenure (eg, saving for shared ownership or to buy a share in their home)

o How do you think advice and support on housing, employment and training could be better joined up?
o How do you think it could be made more accessible to social housing tenants?
o What priority or help do you think should be given to households in social housing who want to move to take advantage of job and training opportunities? What barriers are in place that would prevent tenants from moving to take up such opportunities?
o Do you think for some tenants (eg, young people who are ready and able to take up work but are unemployed), there should be a tailored route into social housing for those who are willing to take up job or training opportunities?
o What else do you think could be done to better support and encourage social housing tenants into work? What are the barriers that tenants face in terms of finding work?

3. Delivering mixed communities

John Hills has raised concerns that households living in social housing in recent years have become much more deprived, and are now much more likely to be out of work.

- o Do you feel that, where possible, we should promote a mixed range of different households of different incomes living in areas? If so, what do you think would constitute a good "mixed community"?
- o At the moment access to and the allocation of social housing is based on "housing need", but in some areas this has contributed to high concentrations of people where very few people are in work. One way of addressing this is by allocating a wider range of households into social housing to provide a better social mix.
- o Do you think the current system for allocating social housing is fair and transparent? Are there things that could be done to make it more fair and transparent.

4. Increasing the supply of housing and affordable housing

Background/introduction:

In recent years increasing demand for housing has resulted, in the home ownership market, to substantial increases in house prices. In social housing, this increasing demand has led to increases in the numbers on waiting lists, increasing overcrowding, and increasing numbers having to be housed in temporary accommodation.

The Government is committed to increasing the supply of housing overall, but also the supply of social rented housing. Within this context, we would be interested in resident views on:

- • Do you agree that we should increase the supply of housing overall, and of affordable housing to address affordability and housing pressures?
- • Building new homes in an area can be controversial and raise concerns for existing residents. We would like to know your views on how we could better involve residents in plans for new housing.
- • Concerning the building of new affordable housing, at the moment we provide around 55% for social rent and 45% for low cost home ownership/shared ownership. What views do you have on the proportion of new affordable housing being focused on social rented housing or low cost home ownership?
- • On large new housing developments, what are you views on whether the affordable housing should be mixed throughout the development or whether it should be separated out into its own area?
- • In some areas, high demand on social rented housing can result in significant changes to the ethnic composition or make up of a local community. What are your thoughts on how the government could better manage this change, supporting existing residents and also new tenants coming into an area?