

Report on the consultation with tenants on the future of
social housing at Trafford Hall, home of the National
Communities Resource Centre, Chester, 30th October 2006
by
Anne Power

**Carried out for the Review of Social Housing by John Hills for the Secretary of
State for Communities and local Government.**



**CASereport 36
February 2007**

Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion

The ESRC Research Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) was established in October 1997 with funding from the Economic and Social Research Council. It is located within the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) at the London School of Economics and Political Science, and benefits from support from STICERD. It is directed by Howard Glennerster, John Hills, Kathleen Kiernan, Julian Le Grand, Anne Power and Carol Propper.

In addition to our discussion paper series (CASEpapers), we produce occasional summaries of our research in CASEbriefs, and reports from various conferences and activities in CASereports. All these publications are available to download free from our website. Limited printed copies are available on request.

For further information on the work of the Centre, please contact the Centre Manager, Jane Dickson, on:

Telephone: UK+20 7955 6679
Fax: UK+20 7955 6951
Email: j.dickson@lse.ac.uk
Web site: <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case>

© Anne Power

All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

CONTENTS

Editorial Note and Acknowledgements

Background to Trafford Hall

The consultation on social housing

Feedback from the workshops

 Social housing

 Work

 Estates

 “Stop Selling Council Houses”

 What social housing is good and bad at:

The “brainstorming” session

 Table 1: Suggestions to Government

 Table 2: Suggestions to local councils and other social landlords

 Table 3: Suggestions on what to change in community

Conclusion

Annex 1

Annex 2

Editorial Note:

Professor Anne Power is Deputy Director of the ESRC Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion. The full report of the assessment of the aims of social housing is called *Ends and Means: The Future Role of Social Housing in England*, written by John Hills and published on 20th February 2007. The report is available from the London School of Economics Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion website: <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cr/CASEREport34.pdf>.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Communities and Local Government for funding the event; John Hills, Laura Ratcliffe, Merron Simpson for attending; and particularly Barbara Watson, Barbara Roache, Trevor Bell and Liz Richardson for facilitating the workshops. Catalina Turcu analysed the responses; Anna Tamas typed up the 360 suggestions made, Liz Richardson summarised the feedback from the workshops; and Barbara Watson, her training team, and Mark Ward of Trafford Hall organised event, ensuring a broad representative range of participants. A big debt of thanks is owed to the residents who so willingly shared their time and ideas with great openness, tolerance and sense of purpose.

Background to Trafford Hall

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. This made the centre an ideal base for residents to spend a day sharing ideas and experiences of social housing with others who actually live in it. The purpose of the consultation was to inform the Independent Review of Social Housing, established by Ruth Kelly, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in July 2006. Other stakeholder sessions for housing bodies were held in London and Sheffield in September and October, 2006.

The consultation on social housing

A broad set of questions were posed at all the consultation events:

- What is social housing for and why do we need it?
- Who is it aimed at and how can we prioritise?
- In what ways does it work well and how could it work better?
- What are the main problems, the things it doesn't do well?
- Are there other ways of helping people on low incomes? Could we do more to help people into work?
- How would you run estates so that they are better places to live?
- What would you suggest as ways forward for social housing in the future?

Around forty residents from all over the country, reflecting a broad mix of ages and ethnic groups, regions and tenures, came to Chester and spent 6 hours trying to answer these questions in late October 2006. Annex 1 lists those who attended and the full programme. There were two workshop sessions where residents broke into four groups of ten. Each group had to produce its "top ideas" in answer to each question. In the afternoon, everyone worked together, with pencils and scrap paper, in a "brainstorm" on what they thought the government should do, what councils and other social landlords should do to improve conditions and how their own estates and communities could be

made to work better. This short report summarises the main findings from the consultation and presents the main ideas for improving social housing.

Feedback from the workshops

Social housing

Participants had many different and sometimes conflicting ideas on **why we need social housing** such as:

- People can't afford houses, there is a social need. Affordability is worse in London – but also in the North
- People don't always want the responsibility of owning bricks and mortar over the long term – it's not just paying for it, it's keeping it up. Sometimes, people simply cannot do this and want to rent.
- Low income owner occupiers are in a worse position than tenants – in worse condition houses, with less ability to repair them – so social housing is a solution.

Participants also suggested **how people's needs could be met**. For example, some argued that priority systems are stigmatising. It is better to give everyone a share within defined categories, as the current system means that some will never get to the top of the list no matter how long they wait. The points system can distort things too – people often lie to get extra points, which is unfair. But some argued that the points system is the fairest way to prioritise. It is shortages not the points system, that's the problem.

Some thought that social housing should be a **stepping stone not a permanent home**, except for elderly, people with disabilities etc. Offering social rented housing for life is a disincentive to get into work. Also there is lots of illegal sub-letting in London. But many felt that security of tenure for life is a basic/fundamental right. It isn't right to threaten people with the loss of their homes.

One thing most agreed on was the need to **encourage people under-occupying to move to smaller homes**. We don't support elderly people enough to help them move. They could move into more secure areas and homes. This would solve the problem of them

feeling scared. You can downsize according to your need which releases homes for young families. This can be positively beneficial, e.g. older people with grown up families or after losing a partner sometimes get new lease of life in a new home. But we should not force people out. You have a right to live in your house. So we need to use more carrot and less stick.

There was universal agreement on **major importance of local connections in any priority system**, in particular housing the children of existing residents. Giving priority to family members keeps communities and extended family networks together; it offers care for the elderly and social support. It seems unfair to tenants that their family members have to move away while newcomers get in just because they, the parents, are already in council housing. Sustainable communities need children of existing tenants to get housing. So “we should reserve a % of homes for family members. Asylum seekers will have to wait”. Some argued that social housing should be local housing for local people, whereas many, probably a majority, thought it should be for everybody, but sharing it out would be difficult. While this meant that new arrivals would have to be prepared to wait, there was also lots of **backing for integrated communities**, ethnically mixed communities, and the need for existing residents to reach out and make newcomers feel welcome.

Tenants thought there were other ways to help people in housing need besides providing social housing. For example, they generally thought **shared ownership was a good idea** because people often could not afford a full mortgage. However, some shared ownership was not affordable and participants wondered who defined affordability? There should be some subsidies for people that want to buy on the private market, but “you can’t have it both ways” – if you make a profit/equity gain then you should not get more help. This made some think the RTB was immoral, and took social housing out of the system forever, also that people profit out of it while there aren’t enough social homes.

There should be a **stronger emphasis on renting** because not everyone wants to be an owner occupier. “Why presume young people want to buy?” – not all do. There are

benefits to being a tenant - less responsibility for repairs, and it is helpful for those who can't afford to buy or have insecure jobs. Therefore we should definitely “build more social rented homes”.

One big barrier to people paying more for their own housing was work. Participants gave lots of examples of **disincentives to work** from benefit tapers, poor education, lack of opportunity. The idea of a gentler cut-off point for people ‘trying out’ a job for the first time would help i.e. they could still get help for the first few months in case the job did not work out. But people were not sure about whether alternatives to housing benefit would actually be better.

Work

Ways of helping people into jobs could include:

- Start in **schools**; make sure young people leave school able to read and write; good schools are part of what makes a neighbourhood work because they help parents, children, and young people.
- **Apprenticeships** are positive, particularly traditional ones in trades. The government could require all contractors doing work on social housing to take on local apprentices – examples of this came from Kirklees and Camden; there were also some self-employed businesses taking on apprentices voluntarily e.g. on Woodbury Down.
- It is important to offer **training** for people in work so they can advance in the jobs they have.

Participants said people are often scared of working in case their benefits stop. You need help for the first few months while you get on your feet. Participants had lots of ideas about **getting people into work**

- We need more jobs, ALMOs are trying to create new jobs e.g. Wear Valley
- Rented housing offers lots of jobs itself
- Jobs need GCSEs to get in now so you need better education
- Vocational training for young people would help

- Apprenticeships need to be acceptable to employers and trades unions
- Skills centres offer easy entry, quick starter courses – e.g. hairdressing in 4 weeks. You can use this to go and get an apprenticeship. Do in Enfield
- Housing benefit restricts the voluntary people work can do, e.g. to be a tenant inspector for the Audit Commission you need to come off benefits. Is there scope to change this?
- Regeneration isn't just about improving homes – once the special money has gone, people should have built up skills and be able to get long-term jobs.

Estates

Participants offered many ideas for **making the social housing areas where they lived better** under two main headings: the right infrastructure and services; and “community spirit”.

- Provide the **right infrastructure** such as GPs, good schools; don't build estates away from the rest of the area, people need transport and social housing needs to be integrated into the community.
- Communal spaces could be made more attractive to help the environment e.g. with grassed areas and flowers
- Locally based management helps by tackling local problems, e.g. drop-in centres, surgeries for housing officer, police, councillors, where tenants can go and sort out rent arrears, or get personal advice. These bases could also offer personal support for people, signposting where to get help
- Communities need social facilities – particularly youth clubs and community halls (for dances and events)
- **Community spirit**, a feeling of belonging and knowing you have good neighbours are very important. They don't cost money but you can't manage without them.
- Solutions created by tenants themselves will often work so it is important to make it easier to get grant funding for community projects down to the grass roots.
- Involve tenants more to create better communication between landlord and tenants
- Landlords should encourage more responsibility among tenants e.g. being obliged to let workmen in to repair homes, having to look after your home to a basic standard.

- But the legal system, child protection, CRB checks – all adds complications for community tenants’ groups doing things.
- We should welcome and invite new tenants to join in. We should make an effort and should not be one sided in our approach, i.e. ‘they’ won’t join in.
- Multi-agency work, e.g. police/youth forum in Woodberry Down, could help.
- Landlords should help people who want to do community projects, supporting and encouraging active community groups
- Offer training for people to be involved so people are more confident about getting involved.

“Stop selling council houses”

Some tenants felt strongly that you shouldn’t buy your council house, despite the temptation of a discount, because it is a social asset. Buying a council house to sell on to someone else is “immoral. Young families are priced out which is not fair.” We need a better choice of tenure with an option not to buy and to become a secure tenant. But social landlords at the same time could encourage people to buy houses out of the sector and offer help with costs so as to free up more homes. You could offer social housing on a temporary basis for those who want to buy, but offer permanent homes for older people and those who need it long-term on low-incomes. Social housing should be a stepping stone for younger people, but with the possibility of longer-term if necessary.

What social housing is good and bad at:

Social housing is good at some particular things:

- It is good for communities. “You know your neighbour if you rent”. “Private owners don’t want to mix. In some places when new owners come in they think they’re better than other people. This might be a London thing”. This may not happen so much in northern areas where people have bought. There is also sometimes tension between existing residents and incomers
- Social housing is good for bringing in an ethnic mix and integration. In private housing ethnic segregation is stronger because better off white families won’t buy in Asian areas, but in social housing you get more of a multi-cultural mix. BME

families with children in estates mean all kids go to schools together – this is very important.

- With social housing you get security – repairs are done; if you lose a job then you can get help; if you buy and lose your job, you can't get help with a mortgage. "But that's right – as you can't have it both ways – if you make profit from your house then you can't have help."
- Several people throughout stressed the **differences between north and south**, particularly in social attitudes and "atmosphere", arguing that the north was maybe more friendly but less integrated within communities.

Participants had things to say on **what social housing was bad at**:

- Repair performance was bad – it's now better.
- We need to build more social housing – there's not enough to go round, waiting lists are long, and the system creates unfairness. Waiting list times are terrible. You might never get to the top of the list.
- Social housing doesn't encourage people to get off unemployment, because they get their rent paid, so they have no aspirations. Rent is very cheap and the benefit system means there's no point working – sometimes people are told by benefits office themselves that it's not financially worthwhile working.

The "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 made most useful and so on. Without these sessions the centre would have struggled to hit the right note and attract the support it has. We decided to use the same technique in exploring ideas on the future of social housing in October. A small handful of participants had been at our earlier "brainstorming" consultations, but most were new to the approach. As in earlier sessions it produced many ideas.

First we asked participants without consulting with their neighbours to write down the three things they most wanted to tell the government. They did **not** need to put their names on the scraps of paper we gave out and nine tenths chose not to. We then grouped together similar or identical ideas and recorded the number of participants proposing that idea. By far the strongest support was for more social housing. We show below in Table 1 the ten main ideas that were suggested by six or more participants, representing two thirds of all the suggestions to government on how to make social housing work better.

Table 1: Suggestions to Government

Issues	Total number of times mentioned
More supply/ provision (of social housing)	21
Community enablement/ empowerment	8
More funding for social housing (maintenance, services, community projects; voluntary sector)	8
Diversify social housing (Choice; types; families)	7
Reform social housing organisation (contracts; benefits; receipts; allocations; point system; social landlord structures; access)	7
Quality housing design (design for integration)	7
More community consultation/ involvement	6
Give LAs more power/ funding (devolution)	6
Deal with Affordability	6
Take care of Existing stock	6
TOTAL	82

Note: The full table listing all ideas is in Annex 2.

The following quotations from the “brainstorm” give a flavour of people’s views.

Participants views on what government should do

Bigger supply:

- ‘allow more social housing (good quality) to be built’;*
- ‘Make more housing for social housing’;*
- ‘Local homes for local people’;*

Community empowerment:

- ‘have more say in what is happening in the area’;* *‘provide small pots of money ... direct to local people’;*
- ‘Give communities the opportunity to own and develop social housing’;*
- ‘social housing available to all, not simply the most in need as now’;*

Funding:

- ‘Provide for money for maintenance of social housing’*

Mixing:

- ‘Provide a wider range of social housing to cater for all needs’;*

Make less bureaucratic:

- ‘remove the government’s institutionalised attitude toward those who pay rent’;* *‘create stepping stones within tenure’;*
- ‘open up access’;*

Design:

- ‘you should not be able to recognise a social housing estate’;*
- ‘design for integration (no difference)’;*
- ‘build good quality well planned housing’;*
- ‘stop building houses like boxes and make them look more like private housing’;*

Listen:

- ‘ask and listen to community’;*
- ‘listen to people’;*

Local budgets:

- ‘ring fence receipts so that all payments for social activities and community is paid for from local receipts’*

Affordability:

- ‘More affordable housing’;*
- ‘Make social housing affordable by maintaining standards and increasing housing benefits’;*

Existing homes:

- ‘stop only focusing on new supply – managing the existing stock correctly is as, if not more, important’;*
- ‘bring all stock up to standard now’;*
- ‘pay more attention to existing properties and existing tenants’;*

Next we asked participants to write down their three main ideas for local councils and other local social landlords, following the same rules of doing it independently from their neighbours, on scraps of handed out paper, without names if preferred. People's ideas clustered around ten top ideas about what their social landlords should do. These ten suggestions make up three quarters of all suggestions. Table 2 shows the ten ideas and number of times each is mentioned.

Table 2: Suggestions to local councils and other social landlords:

Issues	Total number of times mentioned
Reform system (allocations, rents levels, access, funding/ subsidies; tenants' selection process; tenancy agreements; council tax; financial flexibility; housing benefits)	16
More community/ tenants consultation/ involvement	14
Quicker delivery/ better efficiency/ services / less bureaucracy	12
Broader focus (amenities, local facilities; diversify portofolio; long-term planning; schools; facilities and activities for young people)	10
Deal with bad tenants - ASB, more power to landlords	9
More money for the public realm/ environment/ regeneration - neighbourhood surroundings, cleaner streets; less graffiti, better lighting etc	7
Local economy - help with employment, local enterprises; build skills	6
Housing stock conditions - upgrading, repairs, empty properties	6
Crime & Safety - more police patrols, less drug dealers	5
Community enablement/ empowerment	5
TOTAL	90

Note: the full table listing all ideas is in Annex 2.

Generally participants thought the housing management system needed reform, the community needed and wanted to be heard, and services could be much more efficient.

People's own words give a flavour of their ideas on the top ten points.

Participants views on what social landlords should do

Less bureaucracy:

- 'Less red tape, regulation';*
- 'revise allocation system';*
- 'allocations transfer systems that aren't need dominated';*
- 'ability to agree with tenants rent/service level trade off';*
- 'change lettings the points system';*

Consultation:

- 'listen to what the people are saying';*
- 'engage community, regular meeting and explanations on policy';*
- 'listen to the residents';*

Efficiency:

- 'prompt response to tenant needs eg light, water, gas, etc';*
- 'reduce costs or at least obtain best value for money spent'*

Broader needs:

- 'provision of amenities';*
- 'landlords should have a chance to think long term about how to look after property;*
- 'clearer and longer term funding and policy from central government';*
- 'better schools in deprived areas to make people want to live there'.*

Enforcement:

- 'Tighter contracts to enable me to dismiss bad tenants';*
- 'Remove tenants who cause trouble with other tenants; don't allow drug dealers onto estate';*
- 'more control of 'civic watch' – anti social behaviour';*
- 'reward good tenants and give incentive for all to look after their properties';*

Local environment:

- 'have a much larger amount of money for the environment';*
- 'more money for better environment';*
- 'stop graffiti and fly tipping';*

Housing conditions:

- 'Build nicer new housing and not boxy apartments wooden 'cul de sac'-s – stick to a grid'*
- 'Make sure that every house has new doors and windows'*

Jobs:

- 'more scope to get tenants into jobs (HB reform);*
- 'To get more people back to work if possible';*
- 'make more jobs'.*

Visible policing:

- 'make police work more and be visible in estates;*
- 'environment should be well lit, police patrol to prevent crime';*
- 'more police on estates, more community wardens, better lighting';*
- 'promote community spirit';*
- 'make sure staff are trained in community participation';*
- 'we should have more choice how the area manages its money'.*

The third question we asked was the top three things people would change in their community. The following table, Table 3, shows what these things are. They strongly correspond with the things people want their landlords to do, and represent two thirds of all the ideas that were suggested.

Table 3: Suggestions on what to change in community

Issues	Total number of times mentioned
Money - spent wisely; control overspending; delegated budgets; 'recycle' to save money	10
Quality of environment - less litter; cleaner streets; more open spaces	9
More/ better neighbourhood/ leisure facilities and transport links - more social care; schools; community centre	9
Safety & Crime prevention - police patrols; ASB; jobs	9
Community Empowerment/ enabling including devolution to local areas	8
Community cohesion - social networks; community spirit; getting together; make voting compulsory	8
Community consultation & participation	8
Reform LAs & RSLs - rents levels; repairs time frame; accountability	7
Young people - more integration; more facilities; more projects; more jobs; bridge the generation gaps	7
Residents' management	5
TOTAL	80

Note: full table listing all ideas is in Annex 2.

The following quotations taken from people's written ideas give a flavour of their views

Participants views on what to change in their community

Money:

- 'make money go further';*
- 'less wasted money';*
- 'who makes the decisions of spending the money and where it goes'*

Environment:

- 'make the estate greener and healthier to live in';*
- 'cleaner streets – grass cutting better – nicer environment';*
- 'better and habitable environments';*
- 'better, safer walking to schools';*
- 'do more about climate change'.*

Community services:

- 'bring council estates and schools together';*
- 'build a community hall and play facilities for all to build better relations';*
- 'level of social care improved – nurseries, community care for the elderly, after school reading clubs.';*
- 'improve the public transport system 24/7';*
- 'better facilities for the elderly; a community centre for all';*

Police:

- 'fewer police sirens – sense of menace';*
- 'be able to leave doors unlocked like in the old days';*
- 'putting proper policemen on the streets';*
- 'take back the streets from the yobs';*

Local management:

- 'more local management by residents';*
- 'give the running of the estate over to residents';*
- 'let council tenants be in control of their own destiny';*
- 'have delegated budgets and decision making powers';*

Community spirit:

- 'people living side by side and respecting each other';*
- 'I will bring back extended family system to run family life;*
- I will train children to learn more about values';*

Consultation:

- 'More consultation on e.g. environment issues';*

Less officialdom:

- 'change the attitude of the officials and stop them ticking boxes';*
- 'Change the way councils run their departments and committees';*

Youth:

- 'More provision for youth to keep them out of trouble';*
- 'Youth projects';*
- 'Get younger tenants involved';*

Residents' management:

- 'better balance of community against government interest';*
- 'better relationship between residents and landlord';*
- 'give the running of estates over to residents who want to run their own area'.*

Conclusion

Overall, several things stand out from residents' views on the future of social housing:

- Firstly, social housing provides invaluable homes to tenants and the need for more affordable rented homes is single biggest issue. Pressures on social housing are growing as owner occupation is accepted as the 'best' option.
- Secondly, tenants find access rules, unclear and conflict prone. They unanimously support the idea of giving families priority so they can stay near each other and support each other. Only with more affordable supply and better management will a stronger community focus be possible. People also want social housing to be more integrated, less stigmatised and more mixed, more part of everything else.
- Thirdly, tenants would like to be more involved, have more say and influence, receive more respect and recognition, and be allowed or encouraged to do more.
- Fourthly, social housing is about more than housing as 'boxes'; how it is run, other services and facilities, the local environment, activities for young people and the elderly, fostering community spirit and generally supporting people are all important. Helping people, particularly helping people get work is important and people wanted more training, apprenticeships and better schools.
- Fifthly, how things are run, how an area is repaired, cleaned, policed, controlled, beautified, serviced, matter greatly to peoples' lives. Many residents think there is too much red-tape and inefficiency and some think that residents should be allowed to manage their estates if they want to. Lots support local ring-fenced budgets and local priorities.

There are many other ideas, too many to list, but we have tried grouping them all in the full tables in Annex 2 to show as clearly as possible the wealth of experience that lies behind tenants' desire to have more say in shaping their own destinies.

Anne Power, 19th February 2007

Annex 1

Delegate List		
Adeleke	Adeymi	London
Nana	Asante	London
Michelle	Ashmore	Birmingham
Trevor	Bell	Facilitator
Tony	Brankin	Burnley
Kenneth	Campbell	London
Cora	Carter	Yorkshire
Rose	Castle	Lancs
John	Challinor	Lancs
Roy	Curtis	County Durham
Laurence	DaSilva	London
Lindsay	Doyle	Lancs
Catherine	Dutton	Merseyside
Peter	Dutton	Merseyside
David	Elson	Bristol
Frank	Evans	Bacup
Gerry	Foxhall	Telford
Mike	Gelling	Yorkshire
Barry	Harrison	Manchester
Margaret	Highton	West Lancs
John	Hills	London
Linda	Hines	Birmingham
Jennifer	Holmes	West Lancs
Hanan	Ibrahim	Middlesex
Sandra	Kirwan	Birmingham
David	Kirwan	Birmingham
Diane	Lee	Watford
Brian	Monnell	Lancs
Kathy	Offer	London
Eki	Ogbeide	London
Maxwell	Ohajah	London
Peter	Olds	NE Lines
Kaushik	Panchal	Enfield
Joan	Panchal	Enfield
Anne	Power	London School of Economics
Laura	Ratcliffe	London
Roy	Read	Birmingham

Delegate List		
Liz	Richardson	Facilitator
Mick	Rivington	Warrington
Jenny	Rooney	London
Barbara	Roxburgh	Facilitator
David	Shaw	Dorset
Merron	Simpson	Chartered Institute of Housing
Debbie	Sinanan	London
David	Speers	Lancs
Ann	Speers	Lancs
Richard	Tarling	London
Felicity	Turner	Chester
Ogy Ize-lyemu	Usuanlele	London
Mark	Ward	Facilitator
Barbara	Watson	Facilitator

Full Programme

The Future of Social Housing, Trafford Hall, Chester - Monday 30 October 2006

Chair: Anne Power

10.30am	Coffee/Registration
11.00am	Introduction and Purpose of event Any questions or suggestions?
11.20am – 11.30am	Brief presentation of the Social Housing Review remit – John Hills - why is government asking questions about social housing? - who is contributing to the debate? - what is not covered? - what are the burning issues?
11.30am – 11.40am	Any questions or suggestions
11.45am – 12.45pm	Break out groups – questions: - why do we need social housing? - what does it achieve? - what does it not do? - who should it house? - how can we prioritise? and who should be prioritised? - are there other forms of help for those who don't get in?
12.45pm – 1.00pm	Top Ideas on why we need social housing - how we can prioritise - how else we can help people in housing need
1.00pm – 1.45pm	Lunch
1.45pm – 2.30pm	Break out groups – questions - what do people most need besides housing? - how could estates work better? - how can people get help into jobs? - what barriers to work do younger older people face?
2.30pm – 2.45pm	Top ideas - helping people and places
2.45pm – 3.10pm	Brainstorm on future of social housing
3.10pm – 3.15pm	Thank-yous and feedback

Annex 2:

1. THINGS TO TELL THE GOVERNMENT...

Issues	Totals
1. More supply/ provision (of social housing)	21
2. Community enablement/ empowerment	8
3. More funding for social housing (maintenance, services, community projects; voluntary sector)	8
4. Diversify social housing (Choice; types; families)	7
5. Reform social housing (contracts; benefits; receipts; allocations; point system; social landlords; access)	7
6. Quality housing design (design for integration)	7
7. More community consultation/ involvement	6
8. Give LAs more power/ funding (devolution)	6
9. Deal with Affordability	6
10. Take care of Existing stock (Housing conditions; empty properties; rebuilding; Decent Homes)	6
11. New branding/ vision	5
12. Transparency / Accountability	5
13. Stop RTB	5
14. Respect	4
15. Residents' involvement in management	4
16. RTM applicable to RSLs and LAs	3
17. Learn from others (Scots and Welsh; Europe; proven housing providers)	3
18. Long term commitment/ vision	3
19. More advice/ support (community; voluntary sector)	3
20. Employment (help with jobs)	3
21. Equal opportunity	3
22. Social mix/ integration	3
23. Stop stock transfers	3
24. More Education (better schools; skills)	3
25. Give LAs less power	3
26. Neighbourhood facilities/ amenities	3
27. Young people	3
28. Work with the voluntary sector	2
29. More local input	2
30. Devolution (to people; direct funding to people)	2
31. Housing courts	2
32. Better communication & dissemination of information	1
33. Partnership (among agencies)	1
34. Diversify funding/ subsidies	1
35. Match better stock and needs	1
36. Give UK residents 1 st choice	1

2. THINGS LOCAL COUNCILS SHOULD DO...

Issues	Totals
1. Reform system (allocations, rents levels, access, funding/ subsidies; tenants' selection process; tenancy agreements; council tax; financial flexibility; housing benefits)	16
2. More community/ tenants consultation/ involvement	14
3. Quicker delivery/ better efficiency/ services (less bureaucracy)	12
4. Broader focus (amenities, local facilities; diversify portofolio; long-term planning; schools; facilities and activities for young people)	10
5. Deal with bad tenants (ASB, more power)	9
6. More money for the public realm/ environment/ regeneration (neighbourhood surroundings, cleaner streets; less graffiti, better lighting)	7
7. Local economy (help with employment, local enterprises; build skills)	6
8. Housing stock conditions (upgrading, repairs, empty properties)	6
9. Crime & Safety (more police patrols, less drug dealers)	5
10. Community enablement/ empowerment	5
11. More partnership (inside LA and with others LAs; financial with other bodies)	4
12. Devolution	4
13. More money from the government	4
14. More control over private landlords	3
15. Incentives to good tenants	3
16. Respect relationship / Trust / Transparency	3
17. More supply/ provision (of affordable housing)	3
18. Community spirit	3
19. Better match between housing stock and need	2
20. More social mix/ less segregation	2
21. Residents' involvement in management	2
22. More accountability	2
23. Less community participation	2
24. More housing choice (families, ethnic minorities)	2
25. Better pay for front line staff	1
26. Housing courts	1
27. Impartiality (in disputes)	1
28. Climate change	1
29. Better quality of housing	1
30. Staff training	1

3 THINGS TO CHANGE IN YOUR COMMUNITY...

Issues	Totals
1. Money (spent wisely; control, who & why; more into; delegated budgets; 'recycle')	10
2. Quality of environment (less litter; cleaner streets; more open spaces)	9
3. More/ better neighbourhood/ leisure facilities and Transport links (care; schools; community centre)	9
4. Safety & Crime (police patrols; ASB; yobs)	9
5. Community Empowerment/ enabling (incl. devolution)	8
6. Community cohesion (social networks; spirit; getting together; voting compulsory)	8
7. Community consultation & participation	8
8. Reform LAs & RSLs (rents levels; repairs time frame; accountability)	7
9. Young people (more integration; more facilities; projects; more jobs; bridge generational gap)	7
10. Residents' management	5
11. Skills & Training (training; local jobs; for TAs)	4
12. Children (family values; education; role of extended families; more parks)	4
13. Quality of local economy (shops, jobs)	4
14. Pedestrian environment (less traffic, cars; safer routes to schools; walking distance)	4
15. More social housing	3
16. Respect (among residents; from LAs and RSLs)	3
17. Less bureaucracy (LAs; officials attitude)	2
18. Quality of housing (design, innovation, colour)	2
19. Housing Conditions (repairs, facelifiting; Decent Homes)	2
20. Housing & Schools together (more education, better schools)	2
21. Private Renting Sector (integration, regulation)	2
22. Affordable local rents	2
23. Delivery (fast, efficient)	2
24. Landlord & tenant (relationship; transparency, agreements)	2
25. Stop transfers/ RTBs	2
26. Partnership	2
27. Rely on local knowledge (less consultants)	1
28. Housing courts	1
29. Voluntary sector (recognition)	1
30. Match up housing supply and need	1
31. Car parking	1