



NOTICE OF MEETING

Scrutiny Review - Registered Housing Providers

MONDAY, 7TH MARCH, 2011 at 18:30 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Adje, Alexander (Chair), Beacham, Christophides, Schmitz and Watson

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest **and** if this interest affects their financial position or the financial position of a person or body as described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct **and/or** if it relates to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to them or any person or body described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct.

3. LATE ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 9 below.

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (PAGES 1 - 6)

To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 7th February 2011.

5. TENANT SERVICES AUTHORITY (PAGES 7 - 44)

John Craig-Sharples, Senior Risk & Assurance Manager, Tenant Services Authority

Attached: 1) The social housing regulator, business as usual: all change
2) Location, Location, Location: Achieving efficiencies through stock rationalisation Tenant Services Authority

6. NATIONAL HOUSING FEDERATION (PAGES 45 - 46)

Belinda Porich, Head of London Region, National Housing Federation

Attached: Background briefing about the National Housing Federation

7. CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING

Cllr John Bevan, Cabinet Member for Housing, London Borough of Haringey

8. UPDATE ON REVIEW PROGRESS (PAGES 47 - 50)

- Verbal update on consultation event with local housing providers on April 7th 2011
- Submission from a London Council on a stock rationalisation project
- Submission from Homes for Haringey: Campsbourne Pilot Project (briefing attached)

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ken Pryor
Deputy Head of Local Democracy and Member
Services
5th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green, London N22 8HQ
Tel: 020 8489 2915
Email: ken.pryor@haringey.gov.uk

Martin Bradford
Scrutiny Officer
7th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green, London N22 8HQ
Tel: 020 8489 6950
Email: martin.bradford@haringey.gov.uk

**Scrutiny Review Registered Housing Providers
Panel Meeting 7th February Draft Minutes**

Present: Cllrs Alexander (Chair), Adje, Beacham, Christophides & Watson

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 Cllr Schmitz

2. Declarations of interest

2.1 None received.

3. Late items of urgent business

3.1 None received.

4. Minutes of previous meetings.

4.1 These were agreed by the panel.

5. Homes for Haringey

5.1 HfH provided a verbal presentation to the panel on issues pertaining to partnership working within the registered housing provider sector. The following provides a summary of the key points made and subsequent panel discussions.

5.2 Homes for Haringey (HfH) is an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO), managing housing stock on behalf of Haringey Council. HfH was created as the main delivery vehicle for the decent homes programme in the borough. The management agreement has been extended until 2016.

5.3 HfH is primarily a housing management organisation, which is reflected in their funded activities and overall budget (i.e. just 5% is for environmental improvements). In terms of capital investment in HfH stock, this is delivered through Decent Homes, though it was evident that there would be significant reduction in funds administered through this programme in the future.

5.4 It was noted by the panel that with the development of the Tenant Services Authority a much stronger lead had been taken with regulation of housing associations. New standards had been developed which came in to effect on April 1st 2010 and these were applicable to the whole of the social housing sector, not just housing associations. HfH were thus included within these new service standards.

5.5 The panel noted that there were a number of ways in which HfH works with other housing associations and on collaborative housing projects within the borough. It was noted that:

- HfH are members of the Integrated Housing Board with other housing associations to discuss strategic housing issues in the borough
- HfH have undertaken a pilot project working with other housing associations to look at issues on a multi-landlord estate (Campsbourne)
- HfH participates in other local forums such as Asset Management, Customer Access and ASB
- It was noted that together with a number of other housing associations, HfH were active contributors in the affordable warmth group

5.6 The panel noted that HfH have a good knowledge of local housing stock and issues affecting local tenants. The panel noted that HfH had undertaken some intensive consultation exercises to support this, as illustrated through the local door knocking exercise to collect data from local tenants. It was felt that this knowledge has the potential to increase the place shaping role of the organisation (in collaboration with other organisations).

5.7 It was reported that HfH do provide housing management services for a number of smaller Housing Associations in the borough, for example, out of hours repair service. The panel noted that whilst this area provided considerable developmental and expansion opportunities for HfH, it was also an area of high risk, as the organisation did not have as developed knowledge about this housing stock as their own. This was not a straightforward issue as there were many complicating factors, including VAT implications.

5.8 The panel were keen to understand what the main issues facing HfH in working with local housing associations. A number of points were made to the panel which included:

- There are so many housing associations/ registered social landlords in the borough which makes engagement difficult
- And following on from this, it is difficult to engage with housing associations without knowing which associations have stock where. In this context the panel noted it would be beneficial if social housing stock was GIS located and mapped. GIS mapping would also help link to Experian social mapping tools.
- There is lots of community investment undertaken in the borough through housing associations and it would be useful to have further knowledge of what is provided by whom
- Partnership arrangements may not always be straightforward as there may be complex lease and transfer arrangements in place around social housing stock (e.g. a housing association has 8 properties in Broadwater Farm which are leased from the Council).

Agreed: that GIS mapping of social housing in the borough is developed to facilitate partnership in this sector at both operational and strategic levels.

5.9 In terms of stock transfer, the panel noted that the council itself had approximately 400 properties external to the borough in Waltham Cross, Enfield and Hackney. These properties are managed by local housing associations or by HfH. In Waltham Cross, two estates had voted to transfer

over to a RSL and one to remain with the council. An option appraisal paper has recently been presented to Cabinet about the future of these properties. Any future disposal may reduce expenditure and increase capital receipts.

- 5.10 The panel noted that housing associations receive dedicated funding for community improvement projects such as training, employment, ASB and other community projects. Of importance to the review was the degree to which these are provided singularly or in partnership and whether there was the potential for joint service provision or if synergies and efficiencies could be obtained through collaborative provision.
- 5.11 It was felt that new technologies and software would play an increasing role in facilitating partnerships in this sector. The panel heard that Hfh had profiled housing stock and were beginning to map service hotspots for ASB, youth disengagement and other locally held data. With this data and greater knowledge of where housing association stock was located, more coordinated work with housing associations could take place.
- 5.12 The panel were keen to understand what might lay beyond the 2016 for HfH, when the current management agreement expires. The panel heard that HfH had a good local track record; successful in securing decent homes funding and delivering improvement, had a strong track record in tenant engagement and were active partners in a wide range of local service planning and delivery. Whilst the housing policy landscape and finance structures were changing rapidly, it was felt that this track record put them in a strong role for continuing this work.
- 5.13 HfH responded to a number of issues raised directly by the panel concerning partnerships with housing associations:
- ASB: the council's ASBAT team coordinates this work for high profile issues of ASB irrespective of tenure. HfH deals with lower level issues with its tenants.
 - Sub letting: HfH works closely with council in this field and the work in the authority is supported by two fraud officers. There is not a lot of partnership work in this field with other local housing associations (assuming larger associations have their own officers)
 - Community projects: as was demonstrated through pilot work, housing associations fund a broad range of community activities but these are not necessarily joined up with the work of the council or other housing association undertaking similar work in the area
 - Estate walkabouts: there was the potential to have joint estate walkabout where there were multiple landlords, and this was noted to occur with one larger landlord (L & Q) on one estate. Landlords are not systematically invited.
- 5.14 The panel noted that there may be synergies and efficiencies from more coordinated or integrated provision of community services provided by housing associations. Although partnership work was key to the delivery of more coordinated provision, the panel were keen to understand the

challenges in this approach. From their experience of such initiatives, HfH noted that following were important:

- Getting interested parties around a table discussing issues of common concern
- Building relationships and building trust on projects
- Dialogue to help map out common services
- Tenant consultation – common processes

5.15 HfH reported to the panel that a lot of work had been done to improve resident involvement and engagement structures. The panel noted that in recent HfH board elections there was a high turn out of 48%. It was noted that additional work was about to commence with a pilot project to improve resident involvement for all tenures.

5.16 In respect of developing common social housing standards in the borough, the panel heard that many RSLs and housing associations may be wary of such an approach given the structure of these organisations (i.e. with stock dispersed over a wide range of boroughs). Developing common standards, would inevitably present logistical and workload problems if housing associations were to be developed with all local authorities in which stock was held. For smaller housing associations, this would be very difficult.

5.17 Nonetheless, there was a perception that some RSLs may have become very detached from tenants, especially where stock is dispersed across a wide geographical area. Thus the development of local offers by the TSA was established to help promote further engagement with tenants to reach agreement on standards which tenants felt to be important. All RSL and housing association are in the process of publishing their local offers so tenants can be clear about what to expect from their landlord. HfH was noted to be a 3 star service in terms of resident involvement.

5.18 The panel noted the new council structure which would see the implementation of Area Committees. It was felt that there should be further consideration as to how community work and projects developed through the housing sector are aligned and integrated in to these new decision making and accountability structures.

6. Campsbourne Pilot Project

6.1 Homes for Haringey gave a verbal presentation on the work of the Campsbourne Pilot Project, an initiative to bring together the work of a number of housing associations (n=6) on multi-landlord estates in Hornsey. The following provides a summary of the main points from this presentation and subsequent panel discussion.

6.2 This project commenced in April 2010. The aim of this project is to bring together the work of social landlords in this area to help develop and improve services for local people. The premise was that many landlords would be facing the similar issues in working with tenants in this area, so it may be more effective to work collaboratively in resolving community needs. Given

housing associations reticence on working on issues related to common standards, an operational approach was taken with the project, which aimed to look at partnerships and joint working arrangements at a more practical and localised level. It was felt that this approach would help to build up trust and sound working relationships among project partners.

- 6.3 During 2010, this project has undertaken tenant consultation with all social landlords and developed 6 strategic priorities. Social landlords involved in the project signed up to a partnership agreement, which although not legally binding, provided a statement of intent of stakeholders.
- 6.4 The pilot project sought to identify all the community initiatives that housing associations were providing in the locality. A number of common projects were identified across the partnership team including employment, language courses and youth training provision. The project has also undertaken tenant engagement on a collective basis across all social landlords in the area, with a singular tenant consultation survey developed for all social landlords in the area with a door knocking exercise. This had helped to understand local needs and shape local priorities.
- 6.5 It was reported that national stockholders may be relatively easy to engage in such partnership work given the scale of operations and the presence of dedicated workers to support such collaborative projects. It was however difficult to engage smaller stock holders, not because they were not interested in participating or supporting such an approach, but because they do not have the capacity to engage. The panel noted that a key challenge for projects like this was how to successfully engage and support the participation of smaller housing associations.
- 6.6 The panel noted that although some housing associations may have relatively small resources to invest in community services, if priorities were aligned and resources pooled, the potential value of community investment could be significantly larger and operations may be more efficient. The panel were keen to ensure that these principles should be explored further with housing associations through the consultation process and ascertain best practice in this sector.
- 6.7 Stemming from the work of the Campsbourne project (e.g. pulling together work on different community initiatives undertaken by respective social landlords, consultation with tenants) three distinct objectives have been developed:
- Develop community bids from the collaborative
 - Recruit a community development post to work across RSLs and with the local community
 - Develop a local residents association
- 6.8 The panel heard that the project had developed a number of key services in the community which had facilitated the development of this project. The panel heard that links had been made with the head teacher of the local

primary school in which pupils had contributed to the tenant consultation process. In addition, neighbourhood management had provided additional input in to the Campsbourne pilot project, and indeed, in a contributor to its success. It was noted that neighbourhoods are in the process of handing over related work.

- 6.9 The panel noted the successful development of this project and were keen to understand key learning points from it which would facilitate the application of this model in other locations across the borough. HfH agreed to submit further information to the panel on what lessons have been learnt and on the practicalities of this model being applied elsewhere.

Agreed: that HfH would submit to the panel a summary of the key learning points from the Campsbourne Pilot Project which may inform future use of this approach in Haringey.

7. Liaison structures in other Local Authorities

- 7.1 A brief overview of the liaison and engagement structures with housing associations at a number of other Local Authorities was presented to the panel. The purpose of this presentation was to help benchmark service provision in Haringey and to guide and inform later discussions on service provision. The presentation is attached for information.

- 7.2 It is anticipated that further data collection will take place with other authorities and analysed with data already presented to identify key themes and trends which will inform the review process.

8. Future evidence to the panel

- 8.1 The panel agreed a new date for the consultation with housing providers. This would be confirmed with panel members.
- 8.2 It was confirmed that the National Housing Federation and the Cabinet member for housing would be attending the next panel meeting (March 7th 2011). It was hoped that a representative from the TSA would still be able to attend, although a confirmation is awaited.

February 11th 2011
Cllr Alexander
Chair of Panel

The Social Housing Regulator

Business as usual -

All change



Contents

- We are the social housing regulator - TSA strategy to April 2012
- Social Housing Regulation – the next 15 months
- Background – Review of social housing
- The Legislation – The Localism Bill
- Economic regulation and Affordable Rent
- Consumer Regulation
- Difficult times, resilient sector
- Implications for providers

We are the social housing regulator

We have five strategic priorities to April 2012:

- Ensure we realign our regulatory policies to implement the Government's new approach to social housing regulation
- Ensure our continued economic regulation is effective and maintains the confidence of lenders
- Ensure we deliver change and cost savings in a way that is fair to staff and ensures the regulatory functions are properly resourced within the context of a future fee regime
- Ensure we continue to work with key stakeholders in a co-regulatory way
- Ensure we work collaboratively with HCA and CLG on the transition programme

Social Housing Regulation - the next 15 months

- We will continue to review financial information from providers and publish our quarterly analysis of the sector and engage with the people that we regulate
- We will continue to be an intelligent regulator taking account of the wider economic environment in which providers operate



Background – review of social housing

- Our economic and consumer regulation functions to be transferred to a statutory regulation committee within the HCA
- This committee will be legally separated from HCA's investment functions
- Maintaining lender and investor confidence, and protecting taxpayers remains vital
- The role of consumer regulation will focus on setting clear service standards for social landlords

The Legislation - Localism Bill

- The Bill received its second reading in the House of Commons on 17 January 2011
- The Localism Bill will implement the changes recommended by the review as well as:
 - o Reforms to allocations policy - greater powers for local authorities to decide
 - o Greater flexibility of tenancies - shorter, fixed term tenancies, from two years in length
 - o Powers of the HCA in London transferred to the Mayor and GLA

Economic regulation

- We have a clear track record of strong economic regulation and despite a challenging environment, this will continue
- Delivering new homes: there are new challenges for how we support the delivery of new homes
- We will work with the sector to develop a greater focus on how providers deliver value for money for the taxpayer

Affordable rent

- Core product for the HCA's 2011-15 Affordable Homes Programme with c £1.8bn of funding available
- RPs entering into delivery agreements allowed flexibilities to manage existing stock to support new supply e.g. converting a proportion of vacant social rent units to AR
- TSA is consulting on changes to Tenancy Standard to:
 - o Confirm AR is social housing
 - o Allow rents to be set at up to 80% of market rent
 - o Allow AR to be let on tenancies with a minimum occupancy period of 2 years

Affordable rent

- TSA will review proposals to ensure viability is maintained and they are capable of delivery
- Early liaison and consultation with Local Authority partners is key to successful delivery of the Programme
- Framework document to be launched in the next few weeks

Consumer regulation

- It will be for boards to decide how best they meet the new localism agenda but they will need to consider how they engage positively with and resource effective partnerships with local government and their tenants
- Providers will continue to work with tenants to ensure co-regulation continues to flourish in local communities
- There was near-universal support from providers in submitting Annual Reports for tenants
- Good examples of co-regulation and local co-operation between providers, tenants and other agencies

Consumer regulation

- Development of new Tenant Panels
- Democratic filter –Complaints will continue to be dealt with by providers in the first instance with an increased advocacy role for MPs and Councillors
- Enhanced role of the Ombudsman
- We are committed to collaborative working to establish what does 'serious failure' looks like
- Local Offers in place by April 2011

Difficult times, resilient sector

- Latest figures from the quarterly survey demonstrate that the social housing sector remains resilient in an uncertain economic environment
- The sector has remained attractive to funders as evidenced by over £1.5 billion worth of new facilities arranged in the 6 months to 30 September 2010
- The number of unsold low-cost home ownership (LCHO) homes continued to reduce for the 8th successive quarter and now stands at below 40% of the peak reported in January 2009

Difficult times, resilient sector

- Providers continue to deliver new supply and business plans for the next 12 months based on prudent market assumptions
- The majority of respondents believe that finance and housing markets were unchanged over the quarter. However, a downward shift in sentiment was seen for the second quarter in a row with 24% respondents believing that the finance markets had deteriorated and 28% believing that housing markets had deteriorated (July, both 15%)

Implications for providers – what we will do for you?

- We will maintain strong economic regulation with a continued focus on the viability and governance of private registered providers and a greater focus on value for money for the taxpayer
- We will develop and consult on proposals for fee charging arrangements
- We will work with Government and providers to realign our regulatory framework and standards to reflect the legislative proposals in the Localism Bill
- We will work with the sector to support providers and local authorities to build on the co-regulatory arrangements embodied in local offers and to strengthen tenant involvement and empowerment at a local level



Implications for providers – what does this mean for you?

- Boards and Councillors must be ready to accept major new responsibilities
- Strong engagement with the regulator from providers will be important as the regulatory framework changes

Conclusions

- We are changing ourselves to be a more intelligence led, more focussed regulator
- You will have fewer but more focussed engagement with the regulator
- Together we will maintain a healthy, resilient, value for money social housing environment for tenants, providers and lenders

Contact

Tenant Services Authority

www.tenantservicesauthority.org

0845 230 7000



This page is intentionally left blank

Location, location, location

Achieving efficiencies through
stock rationalisation

TSA

**TENANT
SERVICES
AUTHORITY**

Contents

Introduction	2
Expectations	4
Local authority protocols	5
Barriers to rationalisation	6
Arena Housing	8
Family Mosaic	9
Home Group	10
London Borough of Croydon	11
Moat Housing Group	12
Orbit Housing Association	13
Places for People	14
Riverside Group	15
West London rationalisation initiative	16

Introduction

Housing association stock rationalisation is a particularly unlovely piece of housing jargon. In layman's terms, it simply means swaps, transfers, management agreements and better partnership working that improve housing and neighbourhood services for residents and increased cost effectiveness for housing associations. It also helps to deliver the neighbourhood agenda, which is a key element of the work of a large and growing number of housing associations.

An increasing number of housing associations are successfully responding to the call made initially by the Housing Corporation and the Local Government Association (LGA) for the wider rationalisation of stock holdings and management through swaps, transfers and management agreements. This call continues to be supported by the Tenant Services Authority as part of its mission to improve services to tenants. With as many as 50 or 60 associations working in some local authorities, some of them with only one or two homes, there is plenty of scope for action.

Rationalisation is a key feature of a national protocol Working Together to Build Homes and Strong Communities, published in 2006 by the Housing Corporation and the LGA to provide a baseline for closer partnership working between associations and councils. Seven of the local

protocols set up in response to the national initiative feature rationalisation.

Working with local authorities and residents, associations are breaking down the barriers to rationalisation, which include the costs, the legal arrangements, the problems of assembling matching swaps, reaching agreement on valuations and the issue of paying VAT on management fees. Associations are also overcoming their traditional reluctance to give up toeholds in local authorities that might once have led to development programmes.

The Housing Corporation produced a guide and toolkit in 2007 to support this work. It encourages housing associations to review their stock "to ensure they optimise the delivery of high-quality services to tenants on a cost-effective basis and to support the effective delivery of local regeneration and neighbourhood management initiatives". The LGA supports local authorities as housing enablers to promote negotiations between associations to reach agreement on stock swaps and management agreements.

This publication gives some examples of how associations have approached rationalisation and offers some useful guidance that others may like to adopt. A toolkit will follow later in 2009.

The case studies confirm that the most important ingredient for successful rationalisation is two or more willing partners. However, even where there is complete agreement on the need for action, swaps, transfer or management agreements can take some time to complete. Another common factor among the case studies is the thorough analysis of the potential for rationalisation carried out by the associations involved before they committed themselves to change.

It is critical, of course, to consult widely among residents, and this is a characteristic of all the examples contained in this report. After all, it is residents' lives and homes that are affected by a change in ownership or management. They must be content with the new arrangements.

Background

The debate about rationalisation started in the 1980s. It followed the dash for growth of the late 1960s and 1970s that saw housing associations buy and build homes with little strategic thought in their post-Cathy enthusiasm to deal with homelessness and poor housing.

More recently the issue was flagged up in a Housing Corporation Rationalisation and

Restructuring Paper (2002) and the Government's Sustainable Communities: Homes for All (2005).

Two independent commissions – one in Manchester and the other in South Hampshire – produced reports on rationalisation in 2006. In the same year the Housing Corporation and the LGA published a joint national protocol, Working Together to Build Homes and Strong Communities. The document offers a template for local protocols that includes rationalisation.

In 2007 the Chartered Institute of Housing and the Housing Corporation produced The Rationalisation of Housing Stock, which drew on their own research and the findings of the two commissions. This was supported by a rationalisation guide and toolkit for associations.

All of these publications can be downloaded, free, from the Housing Corporation legacy website (www.housingcorp.gov.uk) or the Communities and Local Government website.

The examples in this publication show that rationalisation can improve service delivery to residents, support neighbourhood management and place shaping, produce cost efficiencies and improve relationships with local authorities and local communities.

Expectations

The 2007 rationalisation guide and toolkit expected all housing associations to consider rationalising the ownership or management of their homes as part of their asset management strategies where retaining stock cannot be justified from an efficiency, neighbourhood management or customer service point of view.

The issue is high on the agenda of the Tenant Services Authority, which has a keen interest in progress with stock rationalisation as part of its objective to raise the standard of services provided to tenants.

The guide and toolkit has a list of trigger questions associations should ask when they consider rationalisation:

- Is dispersal or distance from management centres a barrier to service improvement?
- Are residents in dispersed stock less satisfied than those in concentrated stock?
- Does it cost significantly more to maintain dispersed stock?
- Does it take longer to respond to local problems, such as anti-social behaviour, in areas where homes are dispersed?
- Is it possible to engage with the wider agendas, among them regeneration, neighbourhood management and tackling worklessness, in areas where homes are thinly spread?

- Are too many social landlords in one neighbourhood a barrier to progress with these agendas?

It also includes a range of rationalisation options for associations to consider:

- stock swaps between associations
- stock transfers between associations
- disposals on the open market
- retaining ownership while entering into management agreements
- retaining ownership while entering into leasing agreements
- partnership working, such as policy harmonisation and joint maintenance contracts between associations

Each involves different requirements and costs.

The Rationalisation of Housing Association Stock says, "All housing associations should explore the scope for undertaking all forms of rationalisation as part of their asset management strategy – focusing in particular on community engagement, service delivery and neighbourhood regeneration – and based on robust cost-benefit analysis of the options available."

Local authority protocols

Rationalisation of stock holdings and management is flagged up as a key issue in the national protocol, Working Together to Build Homes and Strong Communities, agreed by the Housing Corporation and the Local Government Association in 2006.

The central aim of the protocol is to “provide a starting point for discussions and a baseline from which the Housing Corporation, local authorities, registered social landlords and other social housing providers can be inspired to take levels of partnership working to a higher level”.

Liverpool is showing the way, not least through its work with housing associations working in the city's Pathfinder areas. It has worked with associations to provide a framework for stock swaps and handed over the management of its stock in the Kensington Pathfinder area to Community Seven Housing Association following a ballot among its tenants.

The Corporation used the national agreement as a template to develop local protocols with targets and monitoring agreements with selected local authority partners. Seven local protocols feature rationalisation as one of their key objectives.

Barriers to rationalisation

Common barriers to rationalisation are identified in the reports of the Manchester and South Hampshire commissions and by other research. These include:

- low-level regulatory pressure, fragmented policies and the lack of a strategic lead by some local authorities has fostered a reluctance among associations to address rationalisation
- associations retain small numbers of stock in several areas in the hope of attracting future development funding
- the high cost of surveys, valuations and conveyancing
- the amount of management time absorbed by what is often a lengthy process
- the difficulties in reaching agreement over valuations
- the loss of contributions to overheads and borrowing capacity for transferring associations
- the difficulty of assembling matching stock swaps
- VAT payments on management fees
- the fear among small associations that stock rationalisation could threaten their future

However, the experience of willing associations grasping the nettle of rationalisation shows these barriers can be broken down to the benefit of tenants, communities and the associations themselves. More pressure will come from the Tenant Services Authority seeking a better deal for tenants through its range of new, more focused regulatory powers, from the growing number of local authorities taking a more strategic role, from the Government seeking better value for money and from tenant organisations.

A body of good practice for dealing with the technical issues is building up, such as the leasing agreement reached by the four associations operating in west London, and experience has shown that smaller associations need not necessarily suffer from rationalisation. Inquilab is the net gainer from the west London initiative, and smaller associations, such as Tung Sing, are benefiting from transfers following mergers with larger associations.



Arena Housing

In a rationalisation exercise of its own, Liverpool City Council has provided a framework for the most effective use of housing association resources in the city's Pathfinder areas. Four years ago the council created four zones of opportunity for housing associations engaged in the areas. Working with the associations, it then assessed the level of their activities in the areas in four LIFE categories: Leader, Influencer, Follower and Exit. Associations are encouraged to concentrate their activities in those areas where they fall into the first two categories and look at exit opportunities through stock rationalisation where they sit in the other two.

Arena Housing, identified as a Leader association in the Stanley Park area and an Exit association in Wavertree, agreed a stock swap with Riverside Housing, whose profile in these areas was the exact opposite. The swap involved 49 Arena homes in Wavertree going over to Riverside and 39 travelling the other way in the Anfield and Brackfield neighbourhoods of Stanley Park. "We see this work as part of our wider corporate responsibility initiative," says Arena Chief Executive Brian Cronin.

"The swap took 18 months and was incredibly difficult to do," says Dave Litherland, Director of Partnerships (Neighbourhood Communities), Arena Housing. "Desktop evaluations, carried out for every property, were accompanied by a lengthy and costly legal process, and we had to obtain consent

from the Housing Corporation. Quite properly, extensive tenant consultation was carried out through newsletters, meetings and door knocking." Government incentives for rationalisation would help the process, he argues, and might encourage unwilling associations to join in.

The Anfield transfer supports Arena's proposed joint venture with English Partnerships (now the Homes and Communities Agency) and the city council to deal with 730 homes in a deprived area through an accelerated clearance and renewal programme, which will be ring-fenced to ensure perpetual investment.

Arena has also supported local black and minority ethnic associations working in Liverpool by transferring homes at book value: 15 homes have gone over to Steve Biko Housing Association and ten to Pine Court, an association that works with the Chinese community.

In Greater Manchester, Arena took advantage of a merger with Tung Sing to transfer 79 properties it had tried to dispose of several times without success. "Local management using local maintenance contractors provides a better service for tenants and is better for place shaping," says Dave. "How many light bulbs does it take before a long-distance contractor will come out?"

Family Mosaic

Family Mosaic has produced a framework strategy to inform the stock transfers it is carrying out in several local authorities to support its 'big but local' corporate theme.

In those local authorities where it has fewer than 100 homes it is transferring stock to other housing associations where agreement can be reached. It has sold 30 homes in Slough and Harrow to Inquilab and is negotiating the sale of six homes in Kingston to a local association. In Camden, it is talking to Innisfree Housing Association about the sale of about 40 homes. In some boroughs it has found associations reluctant to engage in sales or swaps.

In the London Borough of Lewisham it has swapped homes on an estate for street properties with London and Quadrant to produce a better management fit on the estate. In Islington, it has taken a ten-year lease on homes owned by Islington and Shoreditch, ASRA and London and Quadrant to bring all the homes under its management wing on the Quill Estate where it is the fourth social landlord.

In those boroughs where it has between 100 and 500 homes, Family Mosaic is trying to set up management agreements for its houses and flats with associations that have a larger local presence.

"The bottom line for sales, swaps and management agreements is providing a better service for our residents," says Family Mosaic's Chief Executive, Brendan Sarsfield. "It makes no sense for us to hang on to small numbers of homes in boroughs across London and beyond. However, it is not always easy to find willing partners for swaps and transfers, and it has proved very difficult to find management partners.

"Sales and swaps have to be approached with a broad brush, rather than arguing about the values of individual properties. We have overage agreements on the homes we sell as tenanted properties and are entitled to further payments should the homes be emptied, for example, and sold on. Selling stock in these difficult times also helps associations raise money to cover other risks taken elsewhere."

Buying the homes from Family Mosaic is a practical way for Innisfree to increase its stock during a period when new development is difficult, says the association's Asset Development Manager, Mairead Mooney. "It also means we can increase numbers in Camden to make our local management more cost effective and provide better services for residents. It makes good sense for all associations to look at the potential for transfers to tighten up their operations."

Home Group

The transfer of 400 houses and flats by the Home Group to other housing associations in the south and west of England followed a 'footprint rationalisation' exercise, which will see about 700 homes transferred nation-wide.

The Group scrutinised its activities in every local authority where it works to assess whether it had enough homes in management to sustain local services and if it could expect future development opportunities. Where the answer to both questions was 'no', Home is negotiating a series of transfers with local housing associations.

The only exceptions are local authorities in which it has a small number of homes next to another authority where it has a substantial number in management. In these cases it has put the management together in one local organisation.

"We are really pleased with the way it has gone," says Tracey Lees, Director of Home South. "We expected it would take a lot longer than it did. Employing an independent tenant adviser to support customers was a great help, and residents took part in selecting their new landlord."

The work was handled by Home South's property and asset management team, but the housing management team was also deeply involved. The successful transfer team, which includes property

experts Savills and legal experts, is organising the next phase of Home's transfers in London, Kent and the North West. "I don't believe we can sustain good quality services to customers from a long distance or fully engage in the neighbourhood agenda, which has become such an important part of our work," says Tracey. "Also, it is not cost effective to provide long-distance services."

Following consent from the Housing Corporation, the homes were sold at tenanted use value to Swaythling Housing, Weymouth and Portland Housing and Westlea Housing who bid in competition with other housing associations. The valuations were set independently. "We looked at swaps but we got in a right pickle," says Tracey.

"Weymouth and Portland Housing bid for the homes because we believe that by providing a more local service, we can respond more effectively on issues such as response repairs and anti-social behaviour," says Managing Director Kevin Dey, "and we wish to consolidate our position locally."

In a related initiative, Home is acting as development association for Greenfields Housing Association in Braintree, Essex, and will piggyback on the local association's management services for its own housing in the area. It is joint funding a community development officer with Greenfields and other associations working in Braintree.

London Borough of Croydon

The Housing Corporation and the London Borough of Croydon launched a stock rationalisation pilot early in 2007. The initiative covers the New Addington and Fieldway wards, where estates largely developed after 1945 share some of the worst indices of poverty and social exclusion in the borough and a great many social landlords.

The council has looked at the dozen or so associations who work in the wards. Some own only a handful of homes. Croydon wishes to slim down their number to improve services to residents, make the associations more cost effective and support the place-making agenda. The pilot is part of the council's strategy of reducing in number the 50 or more associations working in the borough, and is a good model of a local authority seeking to enhance the effectiveness of its partner associations.

"Croydon is committed to developing strong communities and resident involvement in the development of services to enhance residents' satisfaction with their homes and neighbourhoods," says Peter Brown, Director Assets and Renewals, Department of Adult Services and Housing.

"The council's vision is for this initiative to deliver a reduction in the number of housing associations directly managing housing in Croydon while retaining a range of associations catering for different needs. We want strong housing

management partnerships to develop with those associations committed to going the extra mile in their relationships with Croydon and in delivering high quality services to residents."

Many small associations see rationalisation as a threat to their future. Not so Croydon Churches Housing Association (1,300 homes in management). "We have offered to move out of New Addington, where we have 60 homes, if there are no objections from residents," says Chief Executive Ozay Ali. "It's right for the estate and it's right for us. We can concentrate on providing good services in those areas where our general needs homes are concentrated."

Managing stock on behalf of larger housing association builders is one way forward for small associations, argues Ozay. "We have a five-year agreement with Logic Homes to manage 132 new homes in four schemes through a partnership that will help maintain our independence, improve our efficiency and offer good, local services to residents. Ownership of the homes remains with Logic, who will pay VAT on the management fees.

"Both we and Logic believe good management will reduce costs – not enough to cover the whole cost of the VAT, perhaps, but allied to the provision of excellent services, our partnership is a good deal for everybody concerned."

Moat Housing Group

“Two willing partners” are the key to the stock swap agreed by the Moat Housing Group and Kelsey Housing Association (now A2Dominion London and part of A2Dominion Housing Group), says Nigel Poole, Managing Director of A2Dominion London.

Moat exchanged four shops and more than 270 rented and leasehold homes – most of them flats in Brent, Ealing and Hillingdon – for 202 Kelsey flats, street properties and family houses in Hastings, Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks. The swap was initiated by Moat, which is focusing its efforts in the Thames Gateway, the M11 corridor, Kent and Sussex and the south east London boroughs. It carried out an in-depth analysis of the potential for rationalisation and identified four associations as suitable partners for a stock swap.

Kelsey was the only one of those associations approached to respond positively. It was looking at the prospects for the rationalisation of its stock in Kent and East Sussex, where it had a small number of homes scattered over a wide area. The M23, which divides Sussex, East and West, was its natural eastern boundary, the association concluded.

The two associations completed the swap in September 2008. Consent was obtained from the Housing Corporation and independent valuations carried out. “Overall, the transfer went smoothly,” says Mark Jervis, Moat’s Regeneration Manager.

“Coming to an agreement was relatively easy and the legal process relatively simple. However, the necessary consultation with tenants and leaseholders was time consuming, and the exercise is not only about swapping the stock. It also involves each association absorbing management information supplied by the other and dealing with issues like rents and service charges.”

Both associations believe they will provide a better and more cost-effective service to their customers as a result. “The long-distance management of our homes in west London was difficult and expensive,” says Mark. “The new arrangements will also support our neighbourhood work.”

Moat’s merger in 2006 with Bourne Housing Association offered an earlier opportunity for stock rationalisation. About 130 Bourne homes in Hampshire and Dorset were sold to Hyde, A2 and East Dorset Housing Association following consultation with residents. The money was re-invested in Bourne’s stock in London, Sussex and Surrey.

In April 2008 Bourne, which is based in Wallington on Greater London’s southern fringe, took over the management of about 1,500 Moat homes in Surrey and Sussex bringing the total it manages to about 3,200. Residents were consulted about before the new management arrangements were put in place.

Orbit Housing Association

Sovereign Housing Association bought 841 homes and nine commercial premises in Bristol, South Gloucestershire, North Somerset, West Wiltshire, Bath and North East Somerset from Orbit Housing Association in April 2008. The transfer also saw 12 Orbit staff move to Sovereign.

Following a strategic review, Orbit decided to withdraw from the South West believing it could no longer offer the quality and range of services to the standards it wished for its customers in the region. Sovereign was selected from 14 associations approached by Orbit. Selection by Orbit's board and residents followed a thorough process that included drop-in events in Bath, Bristol, Portishead and Trowbridge where residents and staff had a chance to question the short-listed associations before voting for their preferred new landlord.

Property consultants advised Orbit on the marketing of the portfolio of rented, leasehold, shared ownership and commercial properties. Sovereign brought experience in the transfer market to the table. Two years earlier it had gone through a similar exercise, withdrawing from Cornwall by transferring its stock to other associations.

"We are confident Sovereign will provide an excellent service," says Orbit's Managing Director, Stewart Fergusson. "As a key development partner in the South West, it is also building new

homes in the region and this will open up further opportunities for our residents – either to transfer to different accommodation to suit their changing needs, or to step onto the home ownership ladder."

By virtually doubling the number of homes it has in the region, this transfer gives Sovereign a real opportunity to bring greater economies to service delivery, says Paul Crawford, Managing Director. "This is particularly true of repairs and maintenance work, since we now have our own Bristol-based maintenance team. From our Bristol office we deliver services to residents of nearly 1,000 rented and shared ownership homes – and we are building about 150 homes in the region each year."

From February to April, Sovereign and Orbit staff worked together to smooth the path of change. Following a residents' conference on 1 March, they finalised the complex legal requirements, made the new arrangements for rent payments and ensured Sovereign was ready to provide management and repairs services from day one.

The Orbit staff who made the transfer to Sovereign will initially manage their existing patches and maintain continuity for residents. Sovereign contacted all transferring residents with a welcome pack that included a services guide and advice on tenant involvement. A special phone line was set up to deal with initial enquiries from the 'new' residents.

Places for People

Places for People (PfP) is transferring about 380 homes to the Adactus Housing Group in response to Manchester City Council's drive to rationalise the number of housing associations working in the city's housing market renewal Pathfinder areas.

The council produced a framework for rationalisation by dividing the Pathfinder areas into north, south and east zones and categorising the housing associations working in them by activity in three groups – Lead, Support and Exit.

PfP is a Support association in the north and south zones and an Exit association in the east. Adactus is a Lead association in the north and east. The two associations began talks about transfers in 2006. As a first step PfP sold 37 homes to Adactus at net present value in the northern zone. "In effect this was a pilot transfer," says Scott Wise, Head of Market Renewal, "which set out the basic arrangements for future agreements."

PfP talked to several associations before identifying Adactus in January 2008 as its preferred partner for the transfer of about 340 homes in the east zone. "They offered the best fit," says Scott, "and were ready to transfer 24 homes across to PfP in the south zone."

The second agreement is more complex, he says. It includes tenanted homes, long-term empties, the

transfer of land cleared by the demolition of older terraces and a bursary of £2.5 million to buy more private sector homes.

PfP's experience confirms that no two transfers are the same, says Scott. "Furthermore, we have learned there is no point in trying to be selective in choosing homes for transfer. It is necessary to include popular homes as well as the less popular."

The transfer process is costly, he adds. "It has cost us about £1,000 a home for project management, legal fees and other professional costs. It is important to have two willing partners who trust each other. While we are working for the same goals, we are businesses in competition."

Buying the 340 homes is a big financial commitment, says Garnet Fazackerley, Assistant Director of Development, Adactus Homes. "But it is an opportunity to add to our stock in one of our key areas of operation. We believe the new arrangements will work well. Sorting out the principles in the first transfer has made the second transfer easier to manage, despite its complications."

Both associations believe the transfers will put Adactus in a stronger position to resolve long-standing housing and neighbourhood issues in east Manchester, reduce management duplication and provide good local services.

Riverside Group

Community Seven (C7), a member of the Riverside Group, is a bespoke housing association tailor-made to work in Kensington, Merseyside's largest renewal area. Housing associations working in Kensington were encouraged to transfer their stock into a new organisation to create C7 in 2002 following consultation with residents. Liverpool City Council tenants in the area voted for a transfer of the ownership and management of their homes to C7 in the following year.

Regeneration of the area, which has more than 5,500 homes and a large Victorian park, will see the demolition of 900 homes and their replacement by more than 500 new homes, plus a great deal of community regeneration. C7 is working on a new development of 175 homes for rent, shared ownership and sale. It is improving its own stock and bringing empty homes in the area back into use for sale or rent to residents affected by the clearance.

C7's investment in local services and facilities is yielding a huge community dividend for all Kensington residents. Its award-winning team of 14 community wardens has patrolled the neighbourhood since December 2003 helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime. The team has reported more than 6,000 environmental incidents from fly-tipping to dog-fouling and identified around 600 incidents of anti-social behaviour.

C7 set up a local social enterprise – the Clean Team, which has helped transform the previously blighted open landscape in Kensington. The team looks after 73 green spaces and alley entrances, clears 'grot spots' and plants communal gardens, filling nearly 150 skips a year with the rubbish it collects.

C7 also supports sports and arts projects, runs a young savers' scheme in partnership with a local credit union, part-funds a cooking project and supports Summer Fun programmes. It works in partnership with a large number of organisations, among them the local community safety team, residents' organisations, voluntary groups and the city council. Its contribution is vital in an area where five of the eight Super Output Areas are in the top 1% in the national deprivation league.

The work of C7 confirms the view that local place shaping is best managed by one housing association, rather than a group of associations working semi-independently. It has also been a critical facility for the local authority and other key partners in the New Deal project to liaise with and direct resources through one rather than a multiple of accountable partner organisations. The associations who gave up their stock to set up C7 put the future of Kensington and the welfare of its residents first and are a model for others to follow.

West London rationalisation initiative

Four housing associations, A2Dominion, Catalyst Communities, Inquilab and Notting Hill Housing Trust, are planning to rationalise the management of their stock on estates in west London. Under the proposals, management of about 1,400 homes will be transferred between the associations through a 21-year full-repairing lease with an option to renew. Ownership will remain unchanged.

Rationalisation was first proposed by Notting Hill. "In some cases, seven associations are managing homes on the same estate," says Chief Executive Kate Davies. "Seven different landlords providing seven different services with different standards and charging seven different rents doesn't make sense, and we decided to do something about it.

"The willingness of all four associations to address the situation helped us reach agreement after a lot of work and lengthy negotiations. I favoured a proper stock swap, and I suspect that is what will happen at the end of the 21-year leasing agreement. However, the lease agreement will improve customer services significantly, and that it is the most legitimate reason for change."

The purpose of the lease is to transfer the full operation of these homes rather than to provide services. By using an operational lease the associations do not incur the payment of VAT on management charges, which makes

a straightforward transfer of management an expensive proposition. Under the terms of the lease the associations will have full autonomy and be responsible for the management of the homes and emergency, cyclical and major repairs.

The houses and flats covered by the lease were built in the early 1990s in the first flush of private finance for housing associations. They form part of the stock on the nine separate estates, some of which are large schemes where there is a housing association consortia made up of several partners.

The Housing Corporation gave Notting Hill an Innovation and Good Practice grant to support the development of the leasing model and a Housing Corporation Regulation Analyst, Joann Walsh, was seconded to Notting Hill on a part-time basis. "This new approach will provide joined-up management that offers better housing services to residents, better value for money for the associations and is better for the neighbourhood management agenda," says Joann.

"Setting up the lease involves many of the same issues as a full transfer, among them systems alignment for rent, housing benefit and repairs services. During an eight-week consultation period there was minimal feedback from residents, who displayed little brand loyalty but did use the opportunity to raise other issues."

Our offices

Maple House
149 Tottenham Court Road
London W1T 7BN

Fourth Floor
One Piccadilly Gardens
Manchester M1 1RG

For enquiries, contact us at:
Tel: 0845 230 7000
Fax: 0113 233 7101
Email: enquiries@tsa.gsx.gov.uk

www.tenantservicesauthoriy.org

Location, location, location

Achieving efficiencies through stock rationalisation

Rationalising housing association stock involves swaps, transfers, management agreements and better partnership working. The aim is to improve housing and neighbourhood services for residents and increase cost effectiveness for housing associations. It can also help associations deliver a greater sense of neighbourhood. This publication gives some examples of how associations have approached rationalisation and offers some useful guidance that others may like to adopt



Haringey Council

Briefing for:	Scrutiny Review of Registered Housing Providers
Title:	The National Housing Federation
Purpose of briefing:	To provide a brief background about the National Housing Federation
Lead Officer:	Martin Bradford, Overview & Scrutiny Tel: 0208 489 6950
Date:	February 28 th 2011

About the National Housing Federation

The National Housing Federation represents 1,200 independent, not-for-profit housing associations in England and is the voice of affordable housing. Its members provide two and a half million affordable homes for more than five million people. More than 90% of housing association stock in England is owned or managed by Federation members.

Aims of the National Housing Federation

The mission of the National Housing Federation is to support and promote the work that housing associations do and campaign for better housing and neighbourhoods.

It has five strategic aims:

- Create the conditions for our members to flourish
- Ensure housing associations have a strong and positive reputation
- Lead the housing and neighbourhoods policy agenda nationally and locally
- Provide excellent, highly valued organisational and business support for all our customers and their tenants
- Ensure the National Housing Federation is an exemplary organisation and a great place to work.

The work of the National Housing Federation

This includes the following:

- Campaigns at a local and national level to ensure housing associations can continue to deliver affordable housing.
- Developing policy on key housing and neighbourhood issues such as sustainability, care and support, equality and homelessness.

- Runs events, conferences and exhibitions to provide up to date information and the latest good practice in the social housing sector.
- Provides a comprehensive national training programme specifically aimed at housing professionals and board members across the sector.
- Publishes guides, books, manuals, online resources and free downloadable documents for housing professionals.
- Provides organisational and business support for Federation members and their tenants.

Facts about the London region

- London has about 350 housing associations which own and manage around 400,000 properties - providing a home to one in ten Londoners.
- The largest 15 London housing associations contribute £6-7bn a year to the economy.
- London housing association weekly rents average £85.56 - less than half private sector rents of £206.62.
- Nearly 7% of households are overcrowded - more than 2.5 times the national rate and the highest proportion in the country.



Report Title	Campsbourne Housing Partnership – Key Learning Points
Reporting Officer, Team, Role and Contact Details	Aaron Peake, Project Officer 020 8489 1769
Executive Director	Paul Bridge, Chief Executive
Status of Report	Non-confidential

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper provides an update on the Campsbourne Housing Partnership pilot and a summary of the key learning points to date since the pilot began in March 2010. Additionally, a brief list of recommendations and a 'what next' overview for the Campsbourne pilot is included.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Campsbourne Pilot began as an initiative to develop and foster productive working relationships with RSLs operating in Haringey.

- 2.2 The pilot has the following aims:

'The Campsbourne Housing Partnership agrees to work together to improve lives and homes in and around the Campsbourne estate by:

- ◆ Establishing areas for joint working
- ◆ Optimising resources
- ◆ Opening up new possibilities to partners
- ◆ Working with the community'

3. KEY LEARNING POINTS

- 3.1 **Build Trust** – When starting the pilot there was a distinct sense of unease between the RSLs and the 'local authority'. This was partly due to the new 'local standard' pressures introduced by the TSA and partly because of a history of perceived local authority demand to tie RSLs down with localised benchmarking and PI's.

To counter this, we initially focused on the operational 'quick wins'. In working together effectively on planned and ongoing projects the group built a relationship of trust and responsibility in equal measure.

- 3.2 **Appoint a lead coordinator** – In order for the joint working group to operate smoothly, there needs to be a recognised lead to coordinate the groups work to maintain momentum.

There should also be agreement around who distribute and follow up on actions, booking venues and providing updates. Also, the lead may be required to assume strategic responsibilities, such as contacting and meeting potential new partners and relevant agencies (see 3.4 below), designing forward plans for agreement and initially taking the lead on new projects if applicable.

In respect of this project, Homes for Haringey have taken the lead although strong support has been provided by the neighbourhoods service.

- 3.3 **Minimise formal reporting** – Though it is essential that the groups work measures its impact, we avoided formal reporting measures such as targets or performance indicators which people felt would be burdensome.

Instead, we're looking at regular satisfaction surveys across all residents in the area to see if they see the impact of the work. Furthermore, Housemark, the social housing sector's leading provider for performance improvement, has begun researching methods for evaluating community projects. The Campsbourne pilot has started to draw on this work and will involve the group's partners.

- 3.4 **Engage all landlords in the area** – Across Haringey, and many London boroughs, there are areas with a large number of landlords operating in geographically small but densely populated estates. To date we have engaged three of the largest RSLs operating in the country – Circle 33, Metropolitan Housing Partnership and London & Quadrant.

Engagement with Hornsey Housing Trust have been unable to commit staff time to the project.

Engagement therefore will work for landlords in different ways depending on their presence in the borough and their priorities at any given time.

- 3.5 **Keep strategies simple** – We've found it has been beneficial not to overcomplicate strategies and structures. The groups' main purpose is community outreach work and resident involvement and our aims reflect that. It has helped to maintain a focus on specific issues instead of widening the work too far.

- 3.6 **Cohesive communication** – Given that a number of organisations are undertaking projects in a given area at any one time there is an issue around how residents receive information. This project has looked at joining up the way we talk to people as a partnership, as opposed to separate organisations.

A recommendation of the group and a function currently being explored is to create a joint communications plan, i.e. newsletters, estate bulletins, virtual forums, that encompasses all events, opportunities and resources known to the group to all residents to minimise conflicting information.

- 3.7 **Build the reputation** – The Campsbourne group is growing in reputation in Haringey and organisations have become more aware of the group. As such, the group is often engaged at an early stage on projects. This has been important to ensure the group can influence the various initiatives in the area.

- 3.8 **Keep the core group number to a minimum** – There was a temptation to involve as many groups, teams and organisations as possible from the start. This approach was tested on the Northumberland estate and resulted in a forum of committed members but each with a specific agenda that did not immediately lend to a cohesive vision. We have found it beneficial on Campsbourne to keep the core group to a minimum.

When necessary, the Campsbourne group has engaged other agencies on specific issues, such as the ASB problems between the existing Campsbourne estate and the newly built New River estate.

- 3.9 **Consult residents** – we initially selected the estate for this pilot following feedback from residents after a door knocking campaign. It was clear from people that satisfaction was low in the area, especially in comparison to other residents near by. This initial work has helped us focus our early efforts and we are now proposing further consultation to ask residents what they want the group to focus on.

4. WHAT NEXT?

- 4.1 **Resident consultation and involvement** – We're undertaking a cross-landlord door knocking campaign to prioritise the actions outlined in our 2011 forward plan. As a result of this work and a food growing project on the estate we are aiming to identify 'resident leads' who the Campsbourne partnership can support in building a strong involved resident group.
- 4.2 **Meeting the priorities** – Following the consultation, the group will plan projects/activities and allocate resources accordingly.
- 4.3 **Community worker** – Using the door knocking data and existing information, we plan to submit grant bids for a community worker. The community worker will work with local officers of the partners, i.e. tenancy management, resident involvement teams, and act as a conduit/resident liaison for the Campsbourne group. We expect the bid to be submitted before the end of the financial year with the support of the whole group.
- 4.4 **Evaluation** – conduct another door knocking/resident feedback exercise in late 2011 to evaluate the impact of the group. Draw on and pilot new methods of community project evaluation, i.e. Housemark framework.

This page is intentionally left blank