

Solutions for entrenched deprivation on small estates

Scoping paper January 2009

There are many small social housing estates, where residents experience profound deprivation and disadvantage. These can be amongst the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in an area, but are often not big enough to attract substantial regeneration funding or management initiatives. These estates sometimes become the housing of 'last resort', home to the most disadvantaged and excluded families and individuals.

This project will identify solutions to long-standing problems in such estates, drawing on the lessons from intensive work on three estates as well as wider research and practical evidence. In each estate we will bring together a range of stakeholders – public agencies, community groups and local residents – to identify the issues that affect residents' quality of life, and design and develop approaches to alleviate these for local people. We will develop a toolkit of approaches that could work in other similar areas.

This scoping paper examines the context of housing and regeneration policy, and explores the impact of changing economic circumstances. It looks at the issues from the perspective of public services and residents and suggests different approaches to finding workable solutions.

1. The project

The project aims to generate radical and practical solutions to tackle the root causes of deprivation and exclusion on small estates in England. Small estates have been defined as being less than 500 homes. We will take a holistic approach to developing these solutions, working collaboratively with service providers, community organisations and residents. We will:

- focus on three contrasting small 'estates', areas of persistent and profound disadvantage where the majority of residents live in social housing
- establish partnerships with key stakeholders in each area, including the local authority, social and private landlords, and agencies that support disadvantaged and vulnerable residents
- scope the problem through interviews with agencies and in-depth community consultation
- explore the wider context in which each estate is located:

- what function does the estate serve within the wider area, for example as housing of last resort?
- what is the impact of local patterns of spatial segregation, and the movement of residents in and out of the estate?
- are national and local policies and practice creating perverse incentives to sustain disadvantage, for example through the housing benefit regime?

The project will result in an individual action plan for each of the estates which will be developed with the support of all the neighbourhood's key stakeholders. The intention is to devise potentially radical options, addressing social, environmental, physical, economic and tenure issues, not simply looking at the conventional range of regeneration or management approaches. Finally, the Young Foundation will draw together the experience of this approach across all of the estates to produce a toolkit of replicable approaches that could be used on other small estates in England, with a focus on those that can be delivered against a likely background of recession and scarce public sector resources.

The work is being funded from an Innovation and Good Practice Grant awarded by the Housing Corporation but now managed by the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH).

What we mean by small estates

This project will focus on three small estates, which we have defined as those under 500 households. This figure is to some extent arbitrary, as an estate of this size in a densely populated urban area is relatively much 'smaller' than a similarly sized estate in a rural town. We have chosen to focus on estates outside London.

We are interested in exploring areas with a range of characteristics. We will identify three estates which fall into these categories:

- small estates within generally deprived urban areas, where there may be other social housing. It is likely that estates in this category may have benefited to some extent from Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), or even Housing Market Renewal (HMR) pathfinder funding in the past
- small estates within a more affluent area, where the majority of neighbouring homes are owner-occupied. These estates may have benefited from SRB funding at some stage, though this is less likely
- small estates (which may appear relatively large) in or at the edge of a rural settlement.

We hope that at least two of these will fall outside Neighbourhood Renewal Funding areas.

2. The context

Social housing: changes in role and ownership

Diversifying tenure

Since the 1970s, the role of social housing has shifted from providing working class housing for a range of incomes to acting as a safety net for poor and vulnerable households, many of whom, for a variety of reasons, are not economically active. The change in role has been fuelled by a change in ownership. Between 1980 and 2003, 1.7 million homes were sold under the Right to Buy leaving local authority stocks heavily depleted. The homes that have changed tenure are often the most desirable – either because of their design or size, or because of their location in popular geographical areas. The Right to Buy has had a particular impact on the supply of affordable housing in rural areas.

The other major transfer of ownership has been from local authorities to housing associations and Arms Length Management Organisations (ALMOs). Since the mid 1990s around half of England's four million social homes have been transferred. The incentive has been the need to raise the funding needed to tackle housing renewal and improvements, in particular to bring social housing up to the Decent Homes Standard, a legal requirement by 2010.

The overall effect of these trends has been that even small, originally homogeneous council estates now have a varied pattern of ownership and tenure.

Increasing concentrations of deprivation

The impact of changes in tenure has been to concentrate social housing, and therefore social housing tenants, in the most deprived neighbourhoods. As the overall supply of available units has shrunk, competition for social housing has grown, with scarce resources being allocated to those with the highest needs. The residualisation of social housing, and increased levels of vulnerability amongst social housing tenants, are further compounded by social housing allocation policies which indirectly, or directly, push those with most acute needs into the least desirable housing.

New approaches to allocations, including choice-based lettings, have tried to increase options for people in housing need and given landlords more local flexibility in allocations. However, the reality is that those who are most desperate for housing are still most likely to move into the least popular housing because they do not have the option of waiting for a better offer. Levels of housing need remain high and will increase with rising numbers of repossessions and falling household incomes. The Homes and Communities Agency reports that 1.7 million households in England are currently on housing waiting lists.

Building mixed communities

Policy for the last decade and more has sought to mitigate these trends by encouraging the building of mixed developments, with a range of housing type and tenure, and through various new low cost home ownership initiatives. However, new social housing is still disproportionately built in the most deprived neighbourhoods and in those areas owner

occupation has not provided the expected recipe for success or stability. Houses and flats originally bought under the Right to Buy are often let or sublet to people on low incomes, and high turnover amongst this group generates further instability for local communities.

For the government, the advantages of promoting socially mixed communities have, until the recent collapse in the housing market, been practical as well as theoretical. Government has been able to ride on the back of booming private sector housing construction and ensure that social housing is built within new housing developments, or other contributions made to local infrastructure, using Section 106 agreements. The private sector has also been seen as an answer to the regeneration of large council estates. Through demolition, and sale of land to private developers, new, better quality affordable housing can also be funded and built, thereby creating both socially mixed communities and good quality social housing. The downside is prolonged disruption to existing communities, making it more likely that those who can will move out, and also further reductions in the stock of social rented housing as new developments typically include high proportions of various forms of home ownership. Another unintended consequence has been the further concentration of those in the most severe housing need in the most disadvantaged places, as those who can wait choose the better quality new housing, and those who cannot (or who are not offered housing in new developments) gravitate to the housing of last resort.

Questions for this project

- To what extent do housing allocation policies (locally and nationally) compound the problems of small estates by tacitly or explicitly increasing concentrations of disadvantage?
- What is needed to support concentrations of deprivation and vulnerability?
- How could vulnerable, deprived and 'difficult' tenants be housed (or rehoused) in other areas of the local authority, diluting their concentration in the most deprived areas?
- What can be learnt from the experience of developing mixed communities?
- What is the role of housing benefit policy as a deterrent to taking up work?

Regeneration policy: tackling disadvantage

Area-based approaches

Since the 1960s, successive governments have sought to ameliorate disadvantage through area-based programmes, variously targeted at cities, districts, neighbourhoods and estates – some issue specific, others more comprehensive in their approach to physical, economic and social disadvantage. The SRB Programme was one of the longest lasting, funding a huge variety of both public service and community-led activities. Some small deprived neighbourhoods within wealthier areas benefited from SRB.

Since 1998 area-based programmes have been more geographically targeted. The Labour government's most comprehensive and strategic intervention has been the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, launched in 2001 with the aim that 'no one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live within 10 to 20 years'. Under the strategy the 88 local

authorities with the most deprived neighbourhoods received significant additional annual NRF funding. The emphasis was on using NRF to instigate change in the delivery of mainstream services. All councils in receipt of NRF had to establish local strategic partnerships (LSPs) – bringing together the public, voluntary and community and private sector. Besides the allocation of NRF, the designated local authorities benefited from advice through the government's Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU), received additional funding and support to build community capacity and became the seed bed for a range of new area-based programmes designed to tackle particular issues, such as Sure Start centres and parenting programmes. Other relevant initiatives have run alongside this, such as the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) pathfinders, designed to revive local housing markets rather than regenerate particular areas. Although these covered large geographic areas, delivery focused on small estates.

One of the unintended consequences of government policy has been the twin tracking of local authorities and communities. Those in receipt of NRF, most of them urban areas, have been in a much better position to develop new forms of local accountability and experiment with innovative ways of delivering services than other areas.

The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy overall has not been evaluated; however one element of this, the New Deal for Communities (NDC) Programme, a 10-year £2 billion programme ending in 2008 directed at 39 of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the country, has been subject to a longitudinal evaluation. The programme was designed to tackle education, health, crime, housing and the physical environment and economic problems in the neighbourhoods. The mantra was that residents would be 'in control', forming the majority on local partnership boards responsible for allocating the funding and running the programmes. The evaluation of NDC has shown some successes particularly in housing, the physical environment and crime, with a moderate impact on education, less so on health and economic activity. However the government's unpublished analysis of the Index of Multi Deprivation (IMD) still shows that 'patterns of concentrated deprivation have remained largely the same for the past 25 years'.

The new regeneration framework

Since 2007 there has been a shift in government policy from area-based approaches to a focus on the economic aspects of disadvantage – taking as its central premise that 'weak economies are at the heart of poor outcomes for communities' and 'work is the route out of poverty'. This underlay the move from the broad approach of the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund to the concentration on economic issues in the working neighbourhood fund and regeneration framework. The government's new Regeneration Framework, to be published early in 2009, also recognises and seeks to address one of the acknowledged problems of area-based programmes – that local economic growth cannot be engendered in isolation from the regional and national economy. The new framework will focus regeneration investment on tackling the underlying economic challenges that hold back deprived areas, linking local action more effectively to macro-economic policy at the regional level. However, this approach may marginalise the needs of particular isolated concentrations of disadvantage which fall outside of larger concentrations of deprivation. The indications are that the responsibility for such areas will fall on the local authority rather than any initiatives emerging from the new national framework.

Empowerment and engagement

Community empowerment has been a thread running through interventions to tackle deprivation since the community development projects of the early 1980s – sometimes appearing as government policy, sometimes providing a platform for opposition to those policies. The latest incarnation is in the Community Empowerment White Paper *Communities in Control: real people, real power* published in July 2008. This paper focuses on all active citizens rather than on people living in deprived areas; the aim is to reinvigorate and strengthen local democracy. While the aims are broad the paper supports many approaches which are of value in building residents' participation in deprived neighbourhoods.

Many of the most enduring and dynamic examples of community engagement have emerged outside of the control of agencies, driven by residents' efforts to tackle their grievances and improve their lives. Some of these have involved a strong social enterprise focus, developing trading initiatives or assets for community benefit, sometimes running alongside grant-funded activities, sometimes freestanding.

The contribution of mainstream budgets

While small pockets of deprivation are unlikely to get additional regeneration funding, local (county and district) sustainable community strategies linked to Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets are more likely to provide that focus – not so much in respect of the place but targeted on the people who live there. Many LAA targets focus on improving people's prospects – whether through increased educational attainment, better health or less crime. To achieve those improvements attention is being given to those populations with the worst prospects – people living in the most disadvantaged areas.

From April 2009 the new Comprehensive Area Assessment will change the way the performance of local authorities and their public service partners is measured. The new assessment will look at performance against the LAA and national indicator set and there will be much more emphasis on how local people assess the public services they use. The CAA will also bring a renewed emphasis on effective partnership working. Taken together (the LAA, strategy and CAA), this new structure will make it more difficult for local authorities to ignore the problems that people face in areas of deprivation. However, they will still need to address those problems within main service budgets which are likely to decline sharply after 2010.

Questions for this project

- What can be adapted from the neighbourhood renewal experience to the needs of a small estate?
- Given the changed context of the regeneration framework, what other resources could be mobilised to tackle the problems of small estates, looking beyond the usual regeneration funding options?
- How can other mainstream services, for example children's services, be targeted more effectively?
- What is the potential in the community empowerment White Paper to develop new approaches to local empowerment and accountability?

- What can be learnt from the experience of neighbourhood management – both formal *and informal initiatives*?
- Are there lessons that can be learnt from the experience of social enterprise?
- What is the balance between interventions that target vulnerability and individual problems, versus those that tackle geographically-based problems?

Recession

The impact on people who are already in poverty

Recent and unforeseen events in the global economy will have a significant and lasting impact on local neighbourhoods. Although the pattern of recession is still unfolding, we know that life for many residents of deprived areas will be shaped by increased worklessness and falling household incomes.

However, this recession is going to impact on different groups than previous recessions, and the characteristics of newly unemployed people will be different from the long-term unemployed, often the long-standing casualties of previous downturns. The 'new unemployed' are more likely to be professionals or from higher paid jobs. All will have recent experience of work and more job-ready skills than those who have been in no or marginal employment in recent years. Competition for support from the variety of agencies that support people back to work may emerge, pitting the new cyclical unemployed against those who have been jobless for a number of years. Agencies will find it easier to get newly unemployed people back into work – it will be easier to find work for a recently employed financial services employee than someone who has been out of work for a decade.

What does it mean for agencies

A number of factors come into play that will, separately and cumulatively, hamper agencies' efforts in deprived areas. Housing and regeneration agencies working at the local level will be affected by the slowdown in house building, and problems with private finance may hamper their ability to act and deliver services. Voluntary agencies are being hit by the reduction in corporate and trust income, and decline in individual donations. The decline in public spending after 2010 will affect agencies across sectors.

Rising housing need

Increased repossessions and falling household incomes are already increasing levels of housing need and putting a larger burden on housing waiting lists. Against this backdrop, initiatives encouraging balanced and mixed communities may well be scrapped in favour of finding ways to house people quickly, in significant numbers.

Questions for this project

- What will be the impacts of the recession and declines in public sector spending at the very local level?
- How to preserve the interests of the long-term unemployed versus a different group of more recently unemployed people?
- How to continue the intention of creating mixed communities against a background of rising housing need?

The 'neighbourhood effect'?

Since the late 1980s academics and policymakers have debated whether deprived neighbourhoods with high concentrations of poor households in turn generate greater levels of deprivation through 'the neighbourhood effect'. Comparisons between deprived and more socially mixed neighbourhoods have found that the poorest in deprived neighbourhoods are relatively socially isolated and lack social networks beyond the boundaries of their estate. In deprived areas people who work and have higher incomes often choose to leave the neighbourhood.

The underlying assumptions of the 'neighbourhood effect' are:

- where people live in relative isolation from other geographical areas they have little context through which to view their surroundings, and therefore poverty and deprivation become the norm
- where few residents have paid employment or positions of responsibility, communities do not have the kind of social networks that can help individuals in finding paid employment
- in workless, isolated communities, cultural and behavioural norms can emerge that sanction low expectations and achievement, and condone behaviour that is more often deemed unacceptable in wider society
- in areas of high worklessness, the breakdown of social relationships and tolerance of anti-social behaviour generates additional costs for those managing the area, and management standards and landlord responses are less effective than in less deprived areas.

It has also been suggested, controversially, that not only is there a 'neighbourhood effect' but a 'social housing effect' – that the experience of living in social housing itself causes poverty. Social housing, the Centre for Social Justice has argued, rather than being an 'aid' to social mobility has become an 'anchor', and that 'many of the stable and prosperous working class communities of the 1960s and 1970s have degenerated into sink estates trapping their tenants into lives on benefits from which few ever escape'.

In answer to this issue, 'mixed communities' have been seen as a desirable outcome for both new and existing neighbourhoods. However, evidence of the benefits of mixed communities is as yet inconclusive. Some claim that the neighbourhood effect is less important than other social and economic factors. Cheshire argues in *Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities* that communities of similar people naturally develop in, as he terms,

'specialised neighbourhoods' and that these can offer many benefits to those living there. He argues that the most efficient use of public money is to target resources to support the education and skills development of people living in deprived neighbourhoods, enabling them to settle elsewhere if they so choose.

3. Different perspectives

This project intends to tackle the causes rather than the symptoms of disadvantage and exclusion and to tackle the different dimensions of an estate's problems in a unified package.

Service providers and residents tend to have different perspectives on those problems and residents may themselves see things differently depending on whether they are thinking about the estate as a place to live or about the problems they and their families face, and their aspirations for the future. Residents' perspectives will also be influenced by their age and by where they come from.

The project will bring together an understanding of the issues facing the estate from the perspectives of residents and service providers. It will attempt to draw a dynamic picture of what is happening and to explore the opportunities that dynamic provides for change. We will try to inspire residents and agencies to think creatively outside their immediate experience and environment.

The service perspective

From a service perspective, while the rhetoric may be of customer and citizen, people are more often seen in terms of the problems they present. This is a general point but particularly applicable to the residents of deprived neighbourhoods. The emphasis on levels of deprivation backed by the increasing sophistication of neighbourhood statistics has provided evidence for what was probably already a pessimistic view of particular neighbourhoods. The translation of statistics into targets has focused service attention on particular issues. These include (in no order of priority):

- high rates of benefit dependency, particularly lone parents and people on incapacity benefit
- reported crime and anti-social behaviour
- children at risk
- low educational attainment
- high numbers of young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs)
- high rates of teenage pregnancy
- levels of obesity
- high numbers of people requiring adult social care.

These all represent important issues but pursued separately they do not reveal the dynamics of what is going on for individuals and families. This project will need to understand the perspective of service providers and if it is to succeed in developing a viable action plan it will need to ensure that the plan can deliver on their priorities, in particular setting the project in the context of the LAA and sustainable community strategy.

Residents' perspectives

When consulted or asked to participate in efforts to improve the neighbourhoods they live in, residents tend to come up with a list of issues including:

- quality of housing, maintenance, speed of repairs
- local environment, cleanliness, fly tipping, abandoned vehicles, litter, drugs detritus, street and path lighting, safety and cleanliness of green spaces
- community safety: crime, fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, drug dealing, noise, concerns over particular individuals, families or sections of the local population, lack of police officers, slow police response or occasionally heavy-handed police response
- children and young people: either negatively or because of a lack of things to do and safe places to play
- lack of local shops or problems around local shops, pubs and other places where people gather
- public transport to the town centre, supermarkets and the local hospital – isolation and poor transport links are a serious problem for many rural estates
- how the neighbourhood and its residents are perceived.

This list should not lead to the conclusion that residents' experience of living in a particular estate is always negative. Residents may strongly defend their estate against what they see as the misconceptions of outsiders and may not see their neighbourhood as a bad place to live. An analysis in the Regeneration Framework compared the 10 per cent most deprived Local Super Output Areas with the English average on a number of indicators. While the percentage perceiving high rates of ASB was over twice the national average, the percentage of people who enjoyed living in their neighbourhood was only slightly less (94 per cent). Research evidence such as Power and Wilmot's long-term study of neighbourhoods demonstrates the importance of local social networks and social trust (social capital) to how people feel about living in their neighbourhood.

When asked questions that focus on the neighbourhood perspective, residents are less likely to raise issues of education, lack of sufficient income, employment or health that affect them individually, although they may refer to people who cause problems to others, for example because of their mental health or drug use.

However, when asked about their own experiences, a different list of concerns often emerges, including:

- poverty: how to get enough money to live on and meet their own and their families' needs and wants
- jobs: the difficulties in getting and keeping work, particularly when jobs are poorly paid and uncertain; the barriers to getting a good job, lack of skills and opportunities
- children: how to look after and get the best for them; how to stop them getting into trouble and manage when they do
- caring: the difficulties of caring for both children and sick and elderly relatives; the problems faced by young carers
- health: the limitations imposed by poor health
- violence: the impact of violence within the home and the difficulty of escaping from it, violence from neighbours, families and other groups, particularly the impact of racial harassment. Violence here encompasses the threat and fear of violence.

Residents living in areas that are difficult to live in because of the concentrations of poverty and deprivation may well report that their main aspiration is that they, or their children, can move away and live somewhere less stressful.

4. Our approaches

There are different prisms through which we can view these issues and this project.

i) the neighbourhood environment: from a neighbourhood perspective the safe, clean and green agenda, coupled with housing management issues, is the staple of residents' and tenants' meetings. It is vital that there is effective partnership working at the neighbourhood level to respond to these issues. Progress will not be made in other areas until those immediate concerns are either met or there is mutual understanding of what can and cannot be done. However it is equally important for this project that it does not get bogged down in issues that are mainly symptomatic rather than causal and require ongoing attention.

- *From this point of view, the options that may emerge for small estates are likely to emphasise housing and neighbourhood management, tackling anti-social behaviour through enforcement and support, mechanisms for making different landlords work better together, improving local amenities, upkeep, landscaping, and design. The key to these may be resource availability.*

ii) the local context: the development of wider local authority (or other wider area) policies and approaches will also be key to the future of each estate. This will include housing policy and overall approaches to worklessness. The analysis of each estate and the wider local policy context at the beginning of the project will identify whether these issues are part of the problem and therefore potentially part of the solution. Questions include: whether housing allocations policy is effectively, if not intentionally, using the estate as a dumping ground for people with social problems? What could be done to attract and keep more people who are in paid employment on the estate? Whether more successful residents are moving off the estate and what, if anything, should or could be done to keep them? The balance of agencies' effort between supporting entrenched long-term worklessness and newly emerging unemployment, and which group is the subject of local priority, will become important.

- *From this perspective, discussions emerging are likely to focus on the implications of housing allocations policy, both within the estate and across the local authority, and reappraisal of the overall approach to worklessness.*

iii) engagement and accountability: building community capacity and providing opportunities for residents to participate in decision making on aspects of local service delivery is an important component of regeneration. Neighbourhood management if it is linked to local accountability provides a good, positively evaluated model, although it would need to be adapted to the needs of a small neighbourhood. However, these estates will have small populations from which to draw community activists, and often may have little structured community activity. Increasing engagement, social networks and

accountability are likely to be an important part of the way forward, and one element in finding ways to retain more economically successful residents. However these initiatives can only be a partial solution, particularly for the entrenched problems facing many individuals and families.

- *this lens will point us towards solutions that encourage the development of social networks (including time banks, initiatives that encourage neighbourliness), the menu of options for empowerment (participatory budgeting, development of formal and informal community initiatives), through to the development of community assets and social enterprise.*

iv) life experiences, a pathways approach: this would focus on the issues that individuals and families face. The pathways approach has been used as a way of conceptualising the different needs individuals have as they move from economic inactivity into employment, starting with engagement and then building self-esteem and aspirations, learning, skills and experience. At each stage in the pathway needs and opportunities are assessed and gaps in services identified. It has also been used in analysing the needs of individuals with different levels of disability.

A similar approach could be taken to a neighbourhood, identifying the pathway that families and individuals take living on the estate, from childhood to adulthood and old age, then working with residents at different stages in their own lives and the relevant services to identify needs and opportunities at key points on that pathway. This could include parents when their children are very young, children in transition to secondary school, adults moving house, and older people needing help to stay in their homes.

- *this perspective could lead to exploration of a variety of ways that improve options for residents at key points in their lives, including ways of supporting parents with young children; access to opportunities for carers to develop their own skills; outreach provision from the FE college; childcare; improving the transition from primary to secondary school; encouraging young people aged 16-19 to progress into training and employment and working with local employers to provide work placements and apprenticeships; tackling transport links; the provision of local jobs that are accessible to people with caring responsibilities.*

Developing local action plans

Developing an action plan is a complex process even on a single issue or a specific funding stream. Neighbourhood action plans have traditionally dealt with community safety and environmental issues. The ambition for this project is that the plan should encompass social issues. The trick in action planning is to marry neighbourhood priorities with those of the local authority or other relevant public service so that the actions are achievable. There is no point in creating a wish list. Here the role of the local advisory group, involving residents and stakeholders equally, will be crucial. This is not a democratic process, nor part of the local authority structures for accountability or participation. The project will make recommendations to local agencies and residents and encourage the endorsement of local stakeholders; it will then be for them to agree how to progress these.

The Young Foundation will work with local advisory groups (including residents and people working in the areas) to use the information gathered through the initial research

stage of the project to identify priorities and possible solutions. The pathway approach offers a route to identifying the issues and potential opportunities which are most important for particular sections of the population. The service lens will offer a different perspective and will help inform our understanding of the wider context. We will facilitate the development of solutions in dialogue with the members of the local advisory groups and key agencies to identify specific achievable actions in the short and long term. Additionally, the Young Foundation will draw on our wider experience in this field. We will draw on the learning from our neighbourhoods programme over the last four years, the work of our Local Wellbeing Project and our work on social needs.

5. Methods

The Young Foundation has extensive experience of working on neighbourhood issues with residents, local authorities and other partners, through both our **Transforming Neighbourhoods** consortium and our current **Neighbourhood Action Network**. This work led to our recent project, **Neighbourhood Taskforces**, which explored how best to tackle community conflict within neighbourhoods. We piloted an approach of bringing groups of residents and representatives of community organisations and public agencies together to identify an issue of concern and to develop a practical and achievable initiative that would help to tackle it.

We will look to implement and develop in this project the approaches that we have already used in the course of our previous work. There are three key roles the Young Foundation will play. The first will be to draw together a group of people (the local advisory group) from the residents of each estate, and from service providers, the local authority and other agencies, which are committed to developing and implementing solutions to the problems of the estate. Our role in facilitating this process, maintaining the momentum of discussions and ensuring that all the project stakeholders support the solutions will be vital. Secondly, our role will be to gather the local information we need in the early research phase and help stimulate thinking about innovative solutions. Thirdly, we will seek to broker those solutions with the services that will make them happen

Timetable

2009	<i>January</i>	Experts seminar
	<i>End January</i>	Scoping paper and selection of three estates finalised
	<i>February</i>	Initial research starts, identify members of local advisory groups
	<i>End April</i>	Interim findings on the three estates
	<i>End June</i>	Local work in three areas finished
	<i>End September</i>	Local action plans finished, models developed for toolkit
	<i>End October</i>	Toolkit draft finished
2010	<i>Mid January</i>	Launch seminar

Clare Demuth, Nicola Bacon and Liz Bartlett, Local Innovation Team

January 2009

www.youngfoundation.org



The Young Foundation is a unique organisation that undertakes research to identify and understand social needs and then develops practical initiatives and institutions to address them

Bibliography

Centre for Social Justice (2008) *Housing Poverty: from social breakdown to social mobility*, London

Cheshire P. (2007) *Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities, A critical analysis*, JRF. Available at: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubID=891>

CLG (2008) Community Empowerment White Paper *Communities in Control: real people, real power*, London

CLG (2008) *Transforming places; changing lives A framework for regeneration* (consultation version), London

Hanley L. (2007) *Estates, an intimate history*, Granta Books: London

Hills J. (2007) *Ends and Means: The Future of Social Housing in England*, a summary of CASE report 34, ESRC Research Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion: London

Kintrea K. (2008) 'Social Housing and Spatial Segregation', in eds. Fitzpatrick S. & Stephens M., *The Future of Social Housing*, Shelter: London

Lund B. (2002) 'Safe as houses? Housing policy under New Labour,' in ed. Powell M. A., *Evaluating New Labour's Welfare Reforms*, The Policy Press

Lupton R. (2003) *Poverty Street, The dynamics of neighbourhood decline and renewal*, The Policy Press: Bristol

NRU NDC Evaluation 2000-2005 Research Report 17 (CRESR) Sheffield Hallam University

Power A., Willmot H., *Social Capital within the Neighbourhood*, CASE report 38, June 2007

Social Exclusion Office (Jan 2001) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal – National Action Strategy* A Report for the Cabinet Office, London. Available at: <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=85>

SQW (October 2008) *Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders: Final Evaluation Report – People, Places, Public Services: Making the Connections*, report for CLG, London. Available at: www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/neighbourhoodmanagement