

**New Zealand's Community Renewal  
Programme in an International Context:  
A Literature Review**

*Julie Macdonald and Kirsty Peel, Health by design Ltd  
for Housing New Zealand Corporation*

*19 October 2005*

## Acknowledgements

Kirsty Peel and Julie Macdonald of Health by design Ltd are grateful to the following people for their contributions to this literature review: Blair Badcock, Chief Advisor Housing Sector Policy, Housing New Zealand Corporation, Patricia Laing, Senior Research and Evaluation Analyst, Housing New Zealand Corporation, Alice Foster, Programme Manager Community Renewal, Housing New Zealand Corporation, Diana Dallas, Consultant, Housing New Zealand Corporation, Molly Limm, Reference Librarian, Ministry of Social Development, Hayley Wood, Consultant Health Outcomes International Pty Ltd, and the international social housing experts who directed us to relevant research literature.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
1 Introduction	4
2 Objectives and Method	5
3 New Zealand's Community Renewal Programme	11
Documentation	11
The Housing Sector in New Zealand	11
Community Renewal Programme History and Development	13
Community Renewal Programme Description	14
Outcomes Expected	15
Theoretical Framework	16
Timelines and Overall Funding	18
Project Descriptions	18
Linkages with Central and Local Government Agencies and Community Groups	19
Exit Strategies	20
Evaluations	20
4 New Zealand Community Renewal in an International Context	21
5 Synthesis: Literature on 'what works' and 'lessons learnt'	28
Appendix I - Description of Australian Community Renewal Programmes	31
Appendix II - Description of United Kingdom Community Renewal Programmes	47
Appendix II - Community Renewal in Ireland and Canada	59
Appendix IV – Synthesis of international literature evaluating Community Renewal	60
Overview of the International Literature Evaluating Community Renewal	60
Overall lessons learnt	60
Participation from tenants and community groups	66
Linkages between central and local government agencies	69
Other structural issues	70
Tenure mix and public housing levels and stock concentrations	72
Anti-social behaviour and crime prevention	73
Level of funding and timescales	76
Exit or transition planning	76
References	77

# 1 Introduction

*Health by design Ltd* was contracted to Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) to undertake an international literature review and comparative analysis of social housing urban renewal initiatives, as one component of an overall evaluation of the HNZC Community Renewal programme. This document reports the findings from this literature review and *Health by design's* analysis that has resulted from it.

## Background to the Community Renewal

'Community Renewal' is the name given to a social housing urban renewal initiative developed and led by HNZC in New Zealand. The Community Renewal programme is a partnership between HNZC, local and central government agencies, and the people living in renewal areas to promote safe, healthy and confident communities. More information about the objectives and operation of the Community Renewal programme in New Zealand can be found in Section Three of this document.

## Document outline

This report is in five sections. Section One is an introduction. Section Two describes the objectives and method of the study. Section Three outlines the key features of New Zealand's Community Renewal programme – a social housing urban renewal initiative. It describes both the overall programme framework and the specific projects being implemented.

Section Four considers the New Zealand Community Renewal programme in the context of social housing urban renewal initiatives internationally through comparison between New Zealand's initiatives with those of Australia and England.

Section Five summarises the lessons learnt from evaluations of social housing urban renewal initiatives internationally.

Appendices I and II describe international community renewal programmes in Australia and the United Kingdom respectively. Key features of Australia's social housing urban renewal initiatives are described, with a particular focus on three states; Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia. Both overall programme frameworks in these states and case studies of a couple of initiatives within each state are included. Key features of social housing urban renewal initiatives in the United Kingdom are described, with a focus on England.

Appendix III briefly describes the literature on community renewal in Canada and Ireland.

Appendix IV provides summaries of what published literature reveals on the lessons that have been learnt from social housing urban renewal initiatives internationally, both in terms of what works and constraints to success.

## 2 Objectives and Method

### Project Objectives

The purpose of this comparative analysis reviewing international literature was:

- To indicate how 'Community Renewal' is similar and different from social housing urban renewal initiatives in other countries;
- To indicate how and why urban renewal initiatives are successful; and
- To identify and discuss any constraints that might prohibit success.

The comparative analysis sought to explore similarities and differences in social housing urban renewal initiatives in various countries, including, where possible:

- The scope of demolition, rebuilding, and renovating;
- The extent of participation from tenants and community groups;
- The existence and mode of linkages between central and local government agencies;
- The level of funding and the time scales assigned for the urban renewal;
- Tenure mix and public housing stock concentrations;
- The approaches taken such as a community development approach, a social engineering approach; or social exclusion as a policy framework for regeneration;
- The exit or transition planning undertaken;
- The outcomes expected for the renewal; and
- Lessons learned from evaluations of renewal that have been undertaken.

### Project Scope

HNZC specified a focus for this project on comparing New Zealand to selected relevant programmes in the UK (focusing on England, but including reference to Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales), Australia, Ireland, and Canada. Programmes outside these countries have been excluded.

Community renewal is a broad area and involves many possible partners and approaches. The focus of this international literature review and analysis was on programmes where renewal of social housing was the main or a significant component. Generally government agencies, as social housing providers, were a lead or significant partner. Projects that focused on other objectives without a significant social housing renewal component were not included.

There were descriptive and evaluative components to this work. Descriptive information on programmes has only been included where the programmes have, in some way, been evaluated.

The focus was on recent initiatives / evaluations with literature from 2000 onwards being preferred. Earlier literature was sourced where this appeared to provide information or fill a gap not covered more recently.

## **Project Method**

### **New Zealand Literature**

Documentation on the Community Renewal programme in New Zealand was provided by HNZC in the first instance. Additional references were obtained to provide the context to this mainly early policy and operational documentation.

Most of these references were HNZC authored corporate, policy and planning related reports used by the programme to guide its implementation. There were also some reviews of the housing sector in New Zealand and the synthesis of the Community Renewal process evaluation findings.

During the preparation of this report further New Zealand documentation was made available as this was requested by us in regard to specific project objectives, and as new information was released (e.g. New Statement of Intent in August) or updated (e.g. new Transition Plan in August 2005).

### **International Literature**

A wide selection of international literature was identified on community renewal utilizing a combination of internet and journal database searching. Initially a five year period was searched (2000-2005) and older references were only pursued where these appeared to be specifically useful and relevant. Documents published after 1 August 2005 have not been included.

The search focused on Australia, United Kingdom (including England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland), Ireland and Canada, as specified in the project scope set by HNZC.

The following housing related journals were searched: Housing Studies Journal, Housing Works, European Journal of Housing Policy, Journal of Social Policy, Urban Policy and Research, Urban Studies, Built Environment Matters, Housing Theory and Society.

Once the published reports and articles were located from the search process described above, an interim list of approximately 80 references was shown to the HNZC Chief Policy Advisor in mid March 2005. On his recommendation, a process of direct approach to key authors and researchers was undertaken to attempt to locate any further recent, relevant, or unpublished literature to augment what had already been obtained through the general search process.

The following people responded to the direct contact: Ray Forrest (United Kingdom), Anne Power (United Kingdom), J Sousa (Canada), David Ley (Canada), Ronald van Kempen (Netherlands). Four others did not. Those who responded provided further references where they could. These included published and unpublished reports and conference papers, information and websites relating to community renewal.

Additionally, specific relevant references were tracked down from lists provided by HNZC, and where these appeared in bibliographies we had already obtained (e.g. Summary of Evaluation of Community Renewal from Queensland Department of Housing).

Literature on social housing and community renewal in Australia includes:

- policy documentation,
- descriptions of historical and current policies and initiatives,
- research and commentary from various specialists
- research reports and journal articles from researchers at the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI).
- state level and other documentation on policies and initiatives

United Kingdom (mainly English) literature included:

- government department strategies and action plans
- some journal articles and reports providing an analysis of the context and development of social housing urban renewal initiatives.

The literature review revealed some references to community renewal initiatives and related housing issues in Ireland and Canada.

In total 168 documents were sourced and reviewed in the development of this report.

An internet search starting with a Google-based search was conducted (commencing with the key words: urban/community/neighbourhood, renewal/regeneration, social housing/housing estates/public housing) and relevant sources, publications, and authors related to the objectives of the study followed up as appropriate. Specific housing and/or renewal related websites were searched, including:

## Australia

NSW Department Of Housing <http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/>  
Queensland Department Of Housing <http://www.housing.qld.gov.au>  
South Australia Housing Trust <http://www.housingtrust.sa.gov.au>  
Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute <http://www.ahuri.edu.au>  
The Hawke Research Institute <http://www.hawkecentre.unisa.edu.au/institute/>,  
Australian Institute for Family Studies <http://www.aifs.gov.au/>,  
ACOSS Publications Website <http://www.acoss.org.au/>,

## United Kingdom

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister  
[http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm\\_control/documents/homepage/odpm\\_home\\_page.hcsp](http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/homepage/odpm_home_page.hcsp)  
ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research <http://www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk>,  
Joseph Rowntree Foundation <http://www.jrf.org.uk>  
London School of Economic Housing [www.lse.ac.uk/collections/LSEHousing](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/LSEHousing)  
The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk>  
Renewal Net <http://www.renewal.net/regions.asp>  
Centre for Housing Policy <http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp/hm.htm>  
The Housing Corporation Library <http://www.housingcorplibrary.org.uk>  
Department of Social Development <http://www.dsdni.gov.uk>  
Communities Scotland <http://www.communities.scotland.gov.uk>  
Northern Ireland Housing Executive <http://www.nihe.gov.uk>

## Ireland

Queens University Belfast - Institute of Governance, public policy, and social research.

<http://www.governance.qub.ac.uk>

Office for Social Inclusion <http://www.socialinclusion.ie/>

Irish Council for Social Housing <http://www.icsh.ie>

Social Housing Ireland

<http://www.environ.ie/DOEI/DOEIPol.nsf/wvNavView/wwdHousing?OpenDocument&Lang=en>,

The Policy Institute Trinity College <http://www.policyinstitute.tcd.ie/publications.html>

## Canada

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Ontario

[http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts\\_1\\_21123\\_1.html](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_21123_1.html),

Toronto Community Housing <http://www.torontohousing.ca/>

Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation <http://www.gov.mb.ca/fs/org/eih/mhrc.html>

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation <http://www.cmhc.ca/en/index.cfm>,

## Definitions

The following definitions are provided to assist with clarity of understanding of the terms used in this report. Different countries use different terms to refer to community renewal type activities, and these change over time and as government policies change.

### Community and community development

Community may be defined as a network of people and organisations linked together by one or more factors. The word "community" may describe a geographic community; a community of common interest, identity or whakapapa<sup>a</sup>; or an administrative or political community. (DIA 2002; HNZA 2004c)

Community development is concerned with change and growth within communities, with giving people more power over the changes that are taking place around them, the policies which affect them and the services they use. Community development methodologies increase opportunities for participation, enable the transfer of skills between people, develop self reliance, build organisational capacity and networks of community groups, ensure ownership of projects and decisions, utilise local resources to solve local problems and, in the end, effectively increase the amount of social capital available within a community. The communities, and groups within communities, most in need of this capacity building are those which suffer the most disadvantage and discrimination. (DIA 2002; HNZA 2003a)

### Community renewal and regeneration

Australian researchers note that while the terms "renewal" and "regeneration" are used interchangeably, they suggest that "renewal" means demolition, physical replacement or



refurbishing of existing housing stock. "Regeneration" usually encompasses a wider set of practices such as tenant participation and community development along with physical changes to housing (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). Based on these definitions, the Community Renewal programme in New Zealand is actually involved in regeneration.

## Social Housing

Social housing providers, internationally, include: municipal housing companies, housing associations, non- (or limited) profit companies, and private sector landlords. Increasingly social housing is owned and/or managed by RSLs rather than local authorities, as a direct result of central government policy and funding structures, although local authorities are still the owner of most UK social housing. In Australia and New Zealand, government owned social housing is known as public housing. In recent years in Australia, different models of social housing ownership have emerged, including public private partnerships. Social housing assists people whose housing needs are not met by the private housing market. Social housing programmes are designed 'to help low and modest income households and other disadvantaged groups to access appropriate secure and affordable housing' (HNZC 2005b).

## Sustainability

There are several definitions of sustainability and interpretations of how it can be adapted from its origins in environmental contexts and applied in community renewal contexts. The terms "sustainable" and "sustainability" in the context of housing renewal/regeneration generally denote policies that aim to maintain the level of services or standards into the longer term without recourse to large injections of additional public funds (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The HNZC Community Renewal Strategic Framework (HNZC 2000) defined 'sustainable living environments', which formed the basis for each community renewal project, as 'Places where: people want to live, there is a sense of empowerment and ownership among those who live there, there is a sense of social cohesion, safety and security, the physical environment and housing reflect resident's needs, and there is an integrated range of appropriate support services'. The HNZC Community Renewal programme document study (HNZC 2005e) identifies one draft document: Community Renewal Guidelines (HNZC 2004a), in which sustainability is defined as 'a balanced, inclusive approach that seeks to meet the needs of the present generation, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

A new UK government definition of sustainability has recently been published (ODPM 2005e), with accompanying discussion on the difficulties in defining sustainability in this context, given the complex nature of communities. Common elements of sustainable communities were identified as: decent homes at prices people can afford; clean, safe and green environments; access to jobs and excellent services; and people who have a say in the way their community is run. The new UK Government definition of sustainable communities is 'Places that offer everyone a decent home that they can afford, in a community in which they want to live and work, now and in the future' (ODPM 2005e).

---

<sup>a</sup> Most social service programmes take into account the Treaty of Waitangi and refer to Maori social categories such as whanau/family, whakapapa/relationships and whenua/land. For a discussion of the Treaty of Waitangi see page 17.

## **Social Exclusion**

There are many definitions of the concept of social exclusion. Most definitions highlight the multidimensional nature of social exclusion and include factors relating to lack of income poverty. Narrowly, then, social exclusion can refer to people who are not attached to the paid labour market or those in low-wage work. Broadly, social exclusion refer to more than poverty, income inequality, deprivation or lack of employment. It involves lack of resources, denial of social rights, processes of exclusion resulting in multiple deprivations, and breaking of family ties and social relationships and loss of identity and purpose (Silver 1995 in Peace 2001). The United Kingdom Social Exclusion Unit definition of social exclusion is 'what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown (SEU 1999). In the context of many community renewal programmes the notion of social exclusion is articulated as an initiative to increase social inclusion.

### **3 New Zealand's Community Renewal Programme**

This section of the document outlines the key features of New Zealand's social housing urban renewal initiatives. It describes both the overall programme framework and the specific projects that are being implemented.

An analysis of how the New Zealand programme is similar to and differs from other international social housing urban renewal initiatives can be found in Section Four.

#### **Documentation**

Social housing urban renewal in New Zealand has been initiated and managed by Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) under a programme known as 'Community Renewal'. HNZC provided Health by design with relevant documentation about the Community Renewal programme in order to develop this section of the document. Approximately 60 New Zealand documents were reviewed as part of this project; most of these were HNZC authored corporate, policy and planning related reports used by the programme to guide its implementation, but the set included some overall reviews of the housing sector in New Zealand and the synthesis of the process evaluation findings.

#### **The Housing Sector in New Zealand**

The social housing sector in New Zealand is relatively small, making up only 5.5% of the total housing stock. The private rental sector is comparatively large, making up 26% of the total market, as home ownership levels have dropped over recent years (moving from a peak of 74% in 1991 to 68% in 2003) (Badcock and Waldegrave 2004).

HNZC provides approximately 65,000 state rental houses and as such is by far the largest provider of social housing in New Zealand. In addition, local government provides approximately 13,900 housing units, mostly to older people, and iwi, and third sector providers provide about 4,100 housing units (HNZC 2004e).

Badcock describes the state of the HNZC stock in a discussion paper prepared for Housing New Zealand in late 2000, 'Identification of Current Issues and Gaps in Housing Provision in New Zealand' (Badcock 2000a). In this document he states that HNZ (at the time) was grappling with a number of asset management issues; the average age of the stock was 33 years and badly in need of modernization and; there were some localized pockets of social housing in dilapidated and unsanitary conditions.

The document goes on to describe the further asset management issue of a mismatch between housing need and stock availability, in terms of size and location due to an increase in the need for both smaller (1-2 person) dwellings and suitable sized dwellings for multiple and extended families. A 2004 journal article by the same author (Badcock and Waldegrave 2004) describes these asset management issues as still being relevant for HNZC.

## Overall Policy Context

The New Zealand Housing Strategy (HNZC 2005b), released in May 2005 sets out the government's programme of action for the overall housing sector over the next 10 years, including:

- work with industry and local government to bring about sustainable housing supply
- improve housing assistance and affordability
- improve access to home ownership
- develop the private rental sector
- improve housing quality
- strengthen housing sector capability
- meet diverse needs

While the majority of actions outlined appear not to be directly related to the community renewal agenda, of particular relevance to the Community Renewal programme is a stated action in the Strategy to 'continue to invest in new social housing and modernization of housing stock' (HNZC 2005b).

HNZC is the lead agency for the Community Renewal programme in New Zealand. HNZC is a Crown entity formed in July 2001. HNZC's Statement of Intent for 2004/2007 states the mission of HNZC as 'to provide access to decent homes, helping New Zealanders manage their own circumstances and contribute to community life' (HNZC 2004e).

HNZC identified four long term outcomes to guide it toward achieving its mission and demonstrate contributions to key Government goals. These are: (HNZC 2004e)

- State housing assistance meets diverse housing need
- Development practices ensure sustainability of housing
- Housing provision across the sector is responsive to need
- The social and physical health of communities is enhanced.

The HNZC Statement of Intent for 2004/07 (HNZC 2004e) described that HNZC, as well as providing state housing, also has a number of other roles to support its mission, including supporting better social outcomes by focusing on building the capability and capacity of individuals and communities to better manage their circumstances.

'Community Renewal' was described as one of a number of HNZC initiatives designed to contribute to the achievement of HNZC's mission, long term outcomes and whole of community approach (HNZC 2004e).

The recently released HNZC Statement of Intent (HNZC 2005g) for 2005-2008 replaces the four outcomes described above with three outcomes. These are:

- New Zealanders in the greatest housing need receive appropriate assistance and support
- The social housing sector is effectively supported to deliver affordable, sustainable, good quality homes
- The wider housing sector is effectively supported to provide appropriate housing.

To meet these three outcomes, the 2005 – 2008 HNZC SOI describes four areas of HNZC activity: policy advice, ministerial support, research and evaluation; supply of state housing services (which includes community renewal); support for the social housing sector; and support for access to home ownership.

'Healthy Housing' is another ongoing collaborative HNZC initiative in which HNZC and selected District Health Boards work together to reduce crowding, and the risk of infectious diseases and other housing related illnesses among families in HNZC properties. The pilot operated in the South Auckland and Auckland regions. The programme continues today to operate in those areas and has also extended to Northland. The objectives of the programme are to: increase awareness of infectious diseases; improve access to health and social services; reduce the risk of housing-related health problems; and reduce overcrowding (HNZC 2005a).

Housing responses which form part of the range of interventions of the Healthy Housing programme include installing insulation, ventilation and heating systems (healthy environments) where required, design improvements (modernization), extensions (wing attachments, re-locatable units and building extensions) and transfers (HNZC 2005a). Interventions to create healthy environments and design improvements may also be undertaken in houses in the CR programme as required but this does not mean that the Healthy Housing programme overlaps with the Community Renewal programme because in this context they are not the result of a joint health and housing assessment with health interventions by public health nurses. In New Zealand CR health has recently been included as a result of consultation on the evaluation carried out in mid 2005 (per comm. Alice Foster October 2005).

HNZC modernizes its rental properties in a programme of stock modernization. This involves considering and addressing issues of functionality and amenity of properties, and typically may include upgrading kitchens, bathrooms, living areas and adding other features such as better outdoor living areas (HNZC 2005a) The standards of modernization are implemented in the renovation and building programme as part of Community Renewal.

HNZC also participates in inter-sectoral initiatives, such as the 2003/04 Social Services Cluster arrangements and Sustainable Cities Programme of Action that are designed to implement a whole of government approach to sustainable development (Corporation 2005; DPMC 2003). Into the future, HNZC will be creating new government agency partners (HNZC 2005d) by establishing Community Renewal as a strategic, multi-agency approach (HNZC 2005c).

Other inter-sectoral initiatives operating in the community in New Zealand include Safer Community Councils (administered by the Department of Justice), the Stronger Communities Action Fund (SCAF) projects and Inter-sectoral Community Action for Health pilots. The SCAF administered by the Department of Child, Youth and Family provides funding to some community groups in Community Renewal for the implementation of Child, Youth, and Families' mission. This has led to clustering activities, in, for instance Aranui, Glen Innes, and Eastern Porirua.

## **Community Renewal Programme History and Development**

The 'Community Renewal' programme within New Zealand was initiated via HNZ Limited Board approval of a 'Community Renewal programme Strategic Framework' in November 2000 (HNZC 2000).

The decision to implement a social housing urban renewal programme within the New Zealand social housing sector was made in the context of an upcoming change in the structure of Housing New Zealand on 1 July 2001. At this time the organization changed from a Crown Owned Enterprise (HNZ Ltd) with a business focus (Badcock 2000b) to a Crown Entity (HNZC) where social objectives were no longer subordinate to commercial objectives (Badcock 2000a). This change is reflected in the Statement of Corporate Intent for 2000/01, which included in its strategic goals (HNZC 2000):

- 'To foster strong communities in areas of predominately state housing'
- '(To exhibit) a sense of social responsibility by having regard to the interests of the communities in which it operates'

In February 2001 the HNZ Ltd Board approved the establishment of four community renewal projects with a further project gaining approval in July 2001 (HNZC 2005e). Detail of the specific projects is described further on in this section.

By late 2001, staff had been appointed by HNZC at a national level to provide support to the 5 local projects and a work programme was developed to provide the local projects with a variety of consistent implementation objectives and frameworks within which to operate (HNZC 2002a).

Since that time a further project has been approved, bringing the total number of community renewal projects operating to 6, and the programme as a whole has evolved as further guidelines and policy frameworks have been developed (HNZC 2001) (HNZC 2002b) (HNZC 2002c) (HNZC 2003c) (HNZC 2003e) (HNZC 2003d) (HNZC 2003f) (HNZC 2004a) (HNZC 2004d).

An updated strategic policy framework for the programme is currently under development.

## Community Renewal Programme Description

The Community Renewal programme in New Zealand is a partnership between HNZC, local and central government agencies, and the people living in renewal areas to promote safe, healthy, confident communities (HNZC 2004b). The overarching goal of the Community Renewal programme is: " *to address social exclusion and foster strong sustainable communities*" (HNZC 2004b; HNZC 2005a)

The recent RFP for evaluation of Community Renewal states this as two goals: to address social exclusion by recognizing the interaction between 'people' and places' and to foster strong sustainable communities based on local needs and circumstances (HNZC 2005f).

Community Renewal has been designed to be a long-term intervention to support projects that will be of lasting benefit to people living in renewal areas. As well as housing replacement and improvement, the programme also seeks to address community issues around employment and training, safety, health, education and social service delivery (HNZC 2004b).

The Community Renewal programme applies the following principles (Corporation 2004):

- An agreed vision about Community Renewal outcomes;
- An emphasis on actively involving communities in defining the needs and aspirations as an essential component of planning;

- Open and honest consultation and engagement with residents;
- Coordinated and collaborative initiatives across central and local government, residents, community organisations and the private sector;
- Flexible approaches to community renewal which respond to the diversity of local/regional circumstances and opportunities inherent in specific areas;
- Empowering communities and building their motivation and capacity to solve problems and take ownership of their future;
- A focus on sustainable outcomes; and
- A recognition of the longer timeframes required when working with the community.

The six communities undergoing renewal are characterized by a lack of social integration, limited or no access to social services, lack of infrastructure, high levels of crime and unemployment, low educational attainment and poor health outcomes (HNZC 2003d).

The original renewal projects were selected based on HNZC Area Managers' suggestions, followed by an analysis of community need in these suggested areas based on a range of criteria including housing need and housing management issues, inappropriate housing, deprivation data and measures of social dysfunction. Possible areas were short-listed based on their ranking of social dysfunction, housing need and inappropriate housing (in that order) (HNZC 2000).

In mid 2003 this process was updated to provide a clearer set of criteria for choosing sites as outlined in "Selection Criteria and Process for Community Renewal and Neighborhood Improvement Projects" (HNZC 2003f). The initial focus is on deprived areas (as measured by the NZDep index) with a high concentration of HNZC stock. Further information is then gathered on tenancy and property management indicators (including vacancy rates, turnover, aged housing, PMAS defects, deferred maintenance etc) (HNZC 2003f). This process assists in the management of demand for renewal activity as various communities approach HNZC seeking renewal in their areas. The operation of the selection process is the joint responsibility of the HNZC National Office Community Renewal Team and Housing Services (both Regional and National Office staff).

Responsibility for the Community Renewal programme as a whole lies with the Asset Programme Services of HNZC and is managed by the Community Renewal / Healthy Housing Programme Manager. There are a small number of Community Renewal programme staff based in the HNZC national offices and project staff based at each of the 6 renewal project sites (HNZC 2004a). Protocols have been developed to ensure the relationship between Community Renewal and wider HNZC activities is well managed (HNZC 2001).

## **Outcomes Expected**

Specific objectives for the programme, that also apply to the six individual projects, were first articulated in a January 2002 document 'Community Renewal programme Development' (HNZC 2002a). Since that time they have developed and changed slightly in various documentation and currently the programme and project objectives are to (HNZC 2004c):

- Improve and enhance the physical environment and amenities.
- Use the principles of community development to build community leadership and implement sustainable community-led solutions.
- Provide targeted needs-based tenancy and property management services.
- Create links to programmes that enhance resident employment and business growth.

- Provide access to affordable and appropriate community services that respond to changing community needs.
- Improve neighbourhood safety and reduce crime.
- Build social networks to facilitate residents supporting each other.

Of interest is the fact that the original strategic framework (HNZC 2000) and the first set of objectives (HNZC 2002a) specifically referred to managing ownership profile / social mix within a renewal area but this objective was later removed.

In late 2004, the Executive Team of HNZC endorsed a Community Renewal intervention logic document (HNZC 2004d). This document articulates the relationship between the project-based activities, intended programme results and HNZC's high level outcomes. As well as covering the seven objectives described above, the intervention logic also outlines the following other expected Community Renewal programme results:

- Add capital to the asset base
- Achieve joined up responses and solutions
- Generate social and economic development
- Achieve community participation and ownership

In June 2005 an updated draft Transition Framework for CR Projects (HNZC 2005j) set out indicators of readiness for transition:

- Residents are satisfied with their physical environment and it is increasingly a place new applicants want to live
- Projects are done by the community and HNZC has less presence
- Improved housing management indicators and increased customer satisfaction
- Patterns of dependency are changed
- Community services and facilities that respond to changing needs
- Residents feel safer
- Residents visibly support each other.

'The key driver for HNZC involvement is the desire to identify and ameliorate social exclusion, rather than to improve the value of the stock or free tied-up capital. These projects will require costs and benefits to society to be evaluated as well as the direct financial costs and benefits to HNZC' (HNZC 2005a). 'The success of this programme will be reliant on the communities' involvement and can be measured through reduced turnover or property, reduced vandalism, higher demand reflected in growth in capital values, reduced perception of crime in the area, improved local outlook and improved health conditions of the residents (HNZC 2005a).

## **Theoretical Framework**

The Community Renewal programme in New Zealand has been designed with a focus on reducing social exclusion. This is evidenced in the overall stated goal of the programme; and the original strategic framework that preceded the commencement of the programme in New Zealand states that the key driver of Housing New Zealand's involvement is a desire to identify and ameliorate social exclusion, rather than to improve the value of the stock or free tied-up capital (HNZC 2000).



This approach is consistent with the principles of the Social Development Approach, a strategic framework developed by the then Ministry of Social Policy in 2001 (MSP 2001). At the heart of the strategy is the need for direct government intervention through direct service provision that focuses upon motivating community participants to create and sustain well-being for themselves and others. Community Renewal can be seen as a tangible example of such an integrated programme (HNZC 2002a).

The approach undertaken by the Community Renewal programme across all activities is underpinned by community development principles (DIA 2003). The Community Renewal programme team in the national office of HNZC developed a discussion paper in 2003 *'Community development: What is it and what does it mean for Community Renewal?'* (HNZC 2003c). It outlines principles of community development as they apply to a community renewal project and describes the practicalities of how these community development principles may operate within the context of achieving the overall community renewal objectives. The principles are:

- Open, honest consultation and engagement
- Enabling and ensuring participation by ordinary people
- Building effective and meaningful partnerships
- Working for sustainable and lasting change

These principles are aligned to advice given by the Department of Internal Affairs in 2002 on a framework for developing sustainable communities (DIA 2002). Key learnings and emerging principles from the Community Economic Development Action Research Project (CEDAR 2004) are also applicable to Community Renewal. These include:

- Being clear about the goals of the engagement effort
- Being flexible
- Establishing relationships based on trust and reciprocity
- Being prepared to invest time and resources as engagement takes time
- Working through existing *'bridge persons'*
- Communication
- Practical considerations, and
- Engaging with Maori and Pacific groups

Community development practice in a New Zealand context is based on the Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty adds other dimensions when considering community development frameworks and practice (DIA 2003). 'Community development practitioners need to be able to identify and work with different development frameworks, and manage the contradictions and conflicts between them. Different development frameworks are based on different values and belief systems, demonstrated by the different language and processes each model uses to describe positive change and development. Community development is based on beliefs and values of social action, justice and equity. The focus is on participation, rights to employment and other key economic and social benefits, devolved local decision making, co-operation, and equitable allocation of resources across groups or societies. This model strives to attain social justice, particularly for those who are disadvantaged' (DIA 2003).

## Timelines and Overall Funding

Each Community Renewal project is expected to last from between 5-20 years depending on its size and scope. It is acknowledged that each project will go through a number of key phases as outlined below (HNZC 2003e):

Phase	Objective	Timeframe
One	Raise awareness and establish credibility	9-12 months
Two	Build trust and ownership of project outcomes	12-18 months
Three	Mobilisation	24-36 months
Four	Implementation – Closeout	1-5 years (small) 5-15 years (large)

Four of the six projects are in Phase Three at the moment, with one being in Phase One.

Total programme expenditure over the period 2001/02- 2004/05 of \$50 million included \$43.7 million capital expenditure and operational expenditure covering running costs, as well as community development activities (HNZC 2005h).

## Project Descriptions

Six Community Renewal projects are currently operational in New Zealand.

Each of the projects:

- Exists in a community with unique features,
- Has arisen out of different local needs and drivers, and
- Consists of a 'smorgasbord' of housing interventions and community development activities to address the community's aspirations (Corporation 2004; HNZC 2005f).

Whilst each project meets all seven Community Renewal programme objectives, the projects do vary in scale and in scope. Some have an emphasis on improving the mix and quality of HNZC housing or on improving shared physical space in the community, while others may have a more social focus (Corporation 2004; HNZC 2005f).

Each HNZC Community Renewal project team consists of a Project Manager, Project Administrator and Community Development Manager (or Worker). Project Managers report to the National Programme Manager who is located in HNZC's Wellington National Office. In four of the projects, one or more HNZC Tenancy Managers work alongside the Community Renewal team but report to Housing Services regional management (Corporation 2004; HNZC 2005f).

The following table outlines each of the six projects (HNZC 2005e):

	Aranui	Fordlands	Clendon	Talbot Park	Eastern Porirua	Northcote Central
<b>Location</b>	Eastern side of Christchurch	Rotorua	South west Manukau City, Auckland region	Glen Innes, Auckland City	Porirua, Wellington region	North Shore City, Auckland region
<b>Start date</b>	Project established in September 2000 Board approval in Feb 2001	Board approval in Feb 2001 Official launch in December 2001	Board approval in Feb 2001 Official launch in August 2002	Board approval in Feb 2001 Official launch in October 2002	Board approval in July 2001 Official launch in November 2002	Commenced August 2003
<b>Number of properties in renewal area</b>	1560	481	1600	180	4000	600

	Aranui	Fordlands	Clendon	Talbot Park	Eastern Porirua	Northcote Central
Number (and proportion) of HNZN properties	454 (29%)	159 (33%)	540 (34%)	167 (93%)	1904 (48%)	320 (53%)
Housing redevelopment	Change the physical appearance of HNZN properties, enhance usability for different types of households (ie smaller units and larger homes)	Some housing improvements including energy efficient retrofits	Minor physical work – construction of new smaller units	Demolition, construction or refurbishment of existing 167 HNZN homes, to be replaced by 206 medium density properties	Change the physical appearance of HNZN properties, enhance usability for different types of households (i.e. smaller units and larger homes)	Consultation on plans to upgrade and change appearance of houses

The *Community Renewal Project Evaluations: Synthesis and Discussion of Findings* document (HNZN 2004c) describes some of the key developments of the projects to June 2004. As well as the housing related initiatives outlined in the table above, these include a range of smaller scale physical improvement initiatives (such as rubbish management activities, tree and shrub planting, shopping centre beautification, graffiti removal, park redevelopments, improved lighting, etc), activities to build community leadership and implement sustainable community-led solutions (such as community events, community consultations, establishing community structures, etc), facilitating employment and training opportunities (either directly through HNZN’s asset related activities or through linking with other agencies providing training, employment and business opportunities), having other government agencies operating from the one location, efforts to improve safety and reduce crime (including security upgrades to some properties, building car parking and driveways, establishment of Neighbourhood Support Groups, improving road safety etc).

Each project has developed specific interim project outcomes, relevant to their particular project, which they report on and which is documented in project maps specific to each site (HNZN 2002c).

Completed interventions to 30 June 2005 total 1157 improvements to houses (refurbishment, reconfiguration, energy efficiency retrofit and other capital works), 89 demolitions and other disposals, and 71 additions (build, purchase and redevelopment) (HNZN 2005h).

## Linkages with Central and Local Government Agencies and Community Groups

Collaboration with other government and non-government social service agencies and with local authorities has been seen as an essential component of the Community Renewal programme from the outset, being identified in the 2000 Strategic Framework as such (HNZN 2000) and the Programme Logic (HNZN 2002c). This is an acknowledgment that HNZN cannot and should not take on responsibility for addressing social exclusion in isolation from others with an interest and involvement in the area.

Similarly, the involvement of communities themselves in identifying and prioritizing issues important to them has been seen as a vital part of the programme since its inception and underpins the community development approach undertaken by HNZN and the Community Renewal programme. (HNZN 2000).

Increasingly, documentation on the New Zealand Community Renewal programme is acknowledging this multi-agency approach which HNZN follows. CEOs of social services cluster agencies are developing joint working strategies, and in some projects interagency working is occurring (pers comm. Alice Foster October 2005). When Community Renewal initiatives are

commenced in a high need community, 'consideration is given to where there are existing interventions from other agencies in the area and how these could be effectively linked. Multi-agency working is vital to achieving the majority of the objectives' (AHI 2005).

The following table outlines the key partners and main stakeholders for each of the projects (HNZC 2004c):

	Aranui	Fordlands	Clendon	Talbot Park	Eastern Porirua	Northcote Central
<b>Partners, Main Stakeholders and Collaborative Relationships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Christchurch City Council</li> <li>- Aranui Community Trust Incorporated Society</li> <li>- Stronger Communities Action Fund (CYF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rotorua District Council</li> <li>- Fordlands Community Association</li> <li>- Fordlands Residents and Landlords Association</li> <li>- Sunset Junior High</li> <li>- Sunset Primary School</li> <li>- Rotorua Pacific Islands Development Charitable Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manukau City Council</li> <li>- Clendon Residents Group</li> <li>- Habitat for Humanity</li> <li>- New Zealand Housing Federation</li> <li>- Clendon Community Support Group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Auckland City Council</li> <li>- Glen Innes Collaboration Group</li> <li>- Ka Mau te Wero Stronger Communities Action Fund (CYF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Porirua City Council</li> <li>- Housing Action Porirua</li> <li>- Tokelau Association</li> <li>- Wellington School of Medicine</li> <li>- Stronger Communities Action Fund (CYF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North Shore City Council</li> <li>- Northcote Central Development Group Trust</li> </ul>

In addition to these primary project partners and stakeholders, project teams have collaborative relationships with a range of other organizations and groups (HNZC 2004c) and many of the projects work in collaboration with New Zealand Police and Safer Community Councils (Corporation 2004).

## Exit Strategies

Two draft documents and 'Preparing Local Transition Plans'(HNZC 2005i) have been developed for the Community Renewal programme. This acknowledges that each project will need a plan for how it will transition from a specific project to business as usual within the HNZC structure (HNZC 2005k).

These documents outline some of the principles and practices inherent in the Community Renewal programme that HNZC would want to retain in a business as usual approach, an outline of how HNZC will know when a transition has been successful, suggestions for transition governance and management, funding and delivery and stakeholder arrangements and a draft action plan. It is acknowledged that separate transition plans will need to be developed for each project.

A draft Transition Plan (HNZC 2005j) sets out the strategic approach to the transition of the community renewal projects. Aranui, Clendon, and Fordlands are the first projects selected to make the transition to core HNZC business (HNZC 2005j). The content of transition plans has also been identified (HNZC 2005i).

## Evaluations

A process evaluation of five of the Community Renewal projects was undertaken in 2003 and 2004 and the results have been synthesized into a report by HNZC staff (HNZC 2004c). Lessons learnt from this evaluation are summarized in Appendix IV of this document. An outcome evaluation has begun and will take place in 2005-2007.

## 4 New Zealand Community Renewal in an International Context

### Overview of the Literature

This section compares the social housing urban renewal initiative in New Zealand Community Renewal, with those of Australia and England.

In the project scope HNZA specified the focus for this comparative literature review on comparing New Zealand to selected relevant programmes in the United Kingdom, Australia, Ireland, and Canada. The review of literature revealed that focusing on England and Australia is most appropriate. Most of the published descriptive and evaluation literature related to England and Australia, and so it was possible to build up a complete picture of social housing urban renewal activities in these countries. Also, importantly, the English and Australian housing contexts within which the social housing urban renewal activities occurred were similar enough to New Zealand's to make comparisons valid.

Literature on the rest of the United Kingdom was similar enough in policy context to that of England that it did not need to be covered in detail again, as it did not add further significant information in comparison to New Zealand.

The literature review revealed some references to community renewal initiatives and related housing issues in Ireland and Canada. However, this information was not relevant enough to New Zealand, or complete enough to add up to a comprehensive understanding of community renewal in that country in order that valid comparisons could be drawn.

By definition, a literature review draws together information from published documentation and literature. Therefore the comparisons made in this analysis are based on published documentation and literature only, noting also that drafts have been reviewed by Housing New Zealand Corporation during the development of this report. Different information and so comparisons may emerge in a study which draws from sources other than published documentation and literature.

### New Zealand in an International Context

The following table compares the social housing urban renewal initiatives of New Zealand and those of Australia and England. More detail on the Australian and UK initiatives can be found in Appendices I and II.

This first table summarizes the different contexts within which social housing urban renewal operates in the three countries being compared, which have led to (or driven), to some extent, the different approaches and focuses within the various countries summarized in the next table.

Table comparing community renewal contexts in New Zealand, Australia, & England

	NZ	Australia	England
<b>Social housing volumes</b> - as % of total housing market - as a % in CR initiatives	5%  - 30-50% in most CR projects (93% in 1 project)	5.5%  - Differs by initiative but from 37%-100% in case studies outlined in Appendix I	20%  - Higher concentrations in most deprived neighbourhoods. Average of 37% in housing market renewal pathfinder areas
<b>State of social housing stock</b>	- In need of modernization (Average age in 2000 was 33 years)  - Mismatch between houses and demand (more smaller (one – two people) and larger (multi-generational family) homes required)	- In need of substantial refurbishment (or demolition in some cases)  - Average age over 30 years in 2005, SA average age as high as 40 years. Mix of high rises and houses in different estates  - Mismatched house sizes for modern households	- Badly in need of maintenance to bring up to a decent standard as at 2000  - Problems with low demand housing and empty estates, especially in the North
<b>Social housing sector ownership</b>	- Most owned and managed by HNZC, a national Crown Entity	- Most owned by State Housing departments, Examples in some States (e.g. SA) of private sector management	- Owned and managed by local authorities and increasingly by RSLs (many small and several larger not-for-profit housing associations)
<b>Housing versus whole-of-government vs private sector led community renewal</b>	- HNZC leads CR as an initiative to meet HNZC's mission of '... helping New Zealanders manage their own circumstances and contribute to community life.'  - From 2005 CR appears as part of wider NZ housing strategy  - CR linked to other government agencies where their interventions link to the needs of CR communities. HNZC has driven multi-agency approach, which is now being acknowledged as leading initiative in whole of government approaches to sustainable communities	- State Housing departments (NSW, SA) lead.  - Whole-of-government crime prevention focus in Qld - administered by Dept of Housing  - Increasingly private sector involvement in funding of renewal initiatives (NSW,Qld,SA)  - Structures and scope of responsibility of housing department / private management organisations varies between States	- Neighborhood Renewal Unit of the Office of Deputy Prime Minister leads CR agenda in England  - ODPM also has responsibility for housing, local government and social exclusion – these areas all link in terms of overall ODPM's aim to create sustainable communities
<b>Drivers to community renewal</b>	- Reduce social exclusion in areas of high concentration of HNZC social housing	- Emphases different in different States, all include mix of: - Physical state of housing	- Currently the overall aim is to reduce social exclusion in the most deprived communities although this

		- Disrepair and inappropriateness - Concentrations of disadvantage / social exclusion amongst tenants	focus has evolved over time (from physical renewal focused initiatives in the past)
Decade CR programmes commenced	2000's	1990s	Evolving initiatives since 1970s
Overall approach to community renewal	- Housing and community development aimed at reducing social exclusion  - CR specific project funding	- Housing and community development aimed at reducing social exclusion  - CR specific project funding	- Whole of government approach to reducing social exclusion  - Growing emphasis on targeting of mainstream funding

The next table compares the social housing urban renewal initiatives of the three countries on each of the issues outlined in the project scope.

**Table comparing community renewal action / outputs in New Zealand, Australia, & England**

	NZ	Australia	England
<b>Outcomes expected for the renewal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residents are satisfied with their physical environment and it is increasingly a place new applicants want to live</li> <li>- Projects are done by the community and HNZC has less presence</li> <li>- Improved housing management indicators and increased customer satisfaction</li> <li>- Patterns of dependency are changed</li> <li>- Community services and facilities that respond to changing needs</li> <li>- Residents feel safer</li> <li>- Residents visibly support each other.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mix of housing and physical environment outcomes and community / social outcomes</li> <li>- Overall crime prevention agenda to social objectives in Qld</li> <li>- View towards long term sustainability of communities in public housing</li> <li>- Employment and education opportunities often linked in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing difference between most deprived areas and national average across 5 main areas (housing and physical environment, crime, education, health, employment)</li> <li>- Targets set for each of the five broad areas</li> </ul>
<b>The scope of demolition, rebuilding and renovating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mix of renovation, demolition and rebuild</li> <li>- Drivers for decisions on assets to meet social objectives foremost but also essential to upgrade assets</li> <li>- Some physical developments to match household composition with housing – renovation/rebuild of homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some demolition and rehousing elsewhere</li> <li>- Some renovation</li> <li>- Often a lower number of social housing (a third of what it was at commencement) as a result of renewal – to raise money, to alter tenure mix, and to change mix/types of dwellings and other physical environment changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant renovating driven by need to meet Decent Homes standard</li> <li>- Extensive demolition in some areas (mainly in North, ex- industrial areas) driven by low demand for housing in these areas as population moves south, and because type of stock (i.e. tenement blocks) undesirable</li> <li>- Rebuilding (new building) in South – to keep up with growing population</li> </ul>
<b>The extent of participation from tenants and community groups</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community development principles underlying CR</li> <li>- Resident participation is a principle of CR (at local, project level)</li> <li>- CR has brought about some community organisations and strengthened others</li> <li>- New tenancy management strategies operating in CR areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resident participation is a principle of all CR initiatives – different structures and processes to achieve this</li> <li>- Recognized as requiring considerable support in terms of expertise and finance/resource to achieve meaningful participation – linked to the tenants' long term social disadvantages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resident participation often part of broader structure of social housing ownership (non profit, voluntary, often have tenant participation structures)</li> <li>- Community participation is a key principle of NSNR (LSPs are required to have community involvement) although this appears to be focused on community involvement in decision making rather than on a community development</li> </ul>



			<p>outcome focus per se</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing tenant participation is a goal across all social housing</li> </ul>
	<b>NZ</b>	<b>Australia</b>	<b>England</b>
<b>Extent and mode of linkages between central and local government agencies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No national strategy or high level government leadership of this broader CR issue but CEOs of social services cluster agencies are developing joint working strategies, and in some projects interagency working is occurring</li> <li>- Individual govt departments may have different priorities than HNZA's – some involved in some CR initiatives at local (provider)</li> <li>- HNZA creates and facilitate partnership approach – operationalising the emerging joint, co-ordinated policy mandate across whole-of-government</li> <li>- Linkages between HNZA and local government at local project level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Varies between states. Qld is where linkages seem to be most overtly across whole-of-government (on paper, at least).</li> <li>- When Housing dept led, objectives include linking with other relevant government agencies</li> <li>- All CR initiatives involve local government / councils</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joined-up and whole of government approaches integral part of the NSNR</li> <li>- Each government department (eg health, employment, justice, education, housing) responsible for their own NSNR related objectives / targets and renewal is a priority for all</li> <li>- At a local level, partnerships between agencies are mandated by the setting up of local strategic partnerships – these are most often led by / incorporated into local government structures</li> </ul>
	<b>NZ</b>	<b>Australia</b>	<b>England</b>
<b>Level of funding and time scales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each project expected to last for a limited period based on local circumstances (5-20 years then become mainstream)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previous policies time limited 5-10 years</li> <li>- Current focus is on mainstream joined-up partnerships with no specific timescales</li> </ul>
	<b>NZ</b>	<b>Australia</b>	<b>England</b>
<b>Exit or transition planning undertaken</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparations for transition planning are underway with strategic documents prepared for HNZA Board sign off. Discussion on local transition planning has begun with Housing Services</li> <li>- Expected to be undertaken given time limited nature of projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queensland the only State with specific exit strategy</li> <li>- Also, elements of other State Housing policies, (e.g. related to resident involvement in regeneration) are related to achieving and maintaining sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning undertaken for time limited funding initiatives</li> <li>- Current policy is for more sustainable, long term, joined up solutions with no fixed timeframes</li> </ul>

## Discussion

In general, social housing urban renewal initiatives in the three countries analysed and summarised above have a number of key features in common. These include:

- a focus on reducing social exclusion in deprived neighbourhoods by tackling a variety of issues (including physical housing) in a coordinated manner;
- a recognition of the importance of involving communities and tenants in the process of renewal; and
- a multi-agency approach, involving (at least) central/state government departments, local government, and community representative organisations.

The differences between the initiatives in the three countries include:

- the extent to which social objectives dominate over asset management objectives, with New Zealand seeming to have the most socially focused programme (This social focus may be influenced by New Zealand social services conventions that take the Treaty of Waitangi into consideration in the design and implementation of programmes.)
- the scope of the overall focus, with England in particular having a wider focus including health and education which New Zealand and Australia do not have to the same extent (noting, however, that in New Zealand Community Renewal health has recently been included as a result of consultation on the evaluation carried out in mid 2005);
- the extent to which housing providers are involved in facilitating or leading the delivery of the broader objectives, with housing providers in England tending to focus on housing improvements, whereas in New Zealand and Australia, housing providers are integral in leading and facilitating the wider agenda; and
- the extent of private sector involvement, with Australia seeming to have a greater private sector involvement in social housing urban renewal than in either of New Zealand or, to some extent, England (where significant private sector involvement is planned for the housing market renewal pathfinder initiatives).

These differences can be explained at least in part by: when community renewal programmes were initiated, the history of the housing stock, the priority given to community renewal at a national, whole of government level, the ownership of the housing stock, the political and economic philosophies of the day in each country.

### **When community renewal programmes were initiated.**

There appears to have been a move, internationally, to the social exclusion agenda in recent years, and so countries which started their social housing urban renewal initiatives more recently have incorporated this into their framework, in contrast to the mainly asset management frameworks of the 1970s through to mid 1990s. New Zealand's focus on social objectives can be seen to be partly attributed to the recent introduction of the programme into the country.

### **The history of the housing stock.**

In England there has been an urgent need for updating stock and serious issues of low demand for social housing in some parts of the country. For them this has meant a need for housing providers to focus on the physical suitability and quality and location of the social housing assets. In Australia, there also appears to be a focus on asset redevelopment due to the age and poor quality of the

housing, and the fact that some community renewal programmes are continuations of programmes started in the mid 1990s, when all such programmes tended to be more asset-specific. New Zealand's greater emphasis on social objectives may be due to the fact that asset management objectives are not as pressing, although some projects, such as Talbot Park and Northcote Central, have a major assets focus.

### **The priority given to community renewal at a national, whole of government level.**

In England, and to some extent in Queensland, community renewal is championed at the highest level of government (via an overall strategy) meaning that all government departments have similar levels of commitment to the agenda and all have similar priorities. In contrast, in New Zealand, HNZC has developed its own community renewal priorities (both in terms of areas covered and outcomes expected) that may or may not necessarily link in with other government department priorities (in terms of area covered or outcomes expected). HNZC is therefore required to use its facilitative skills to progress the Community Renewal programme in the absence of a national strategy and mandated local strategic partnerships (as exist in England).

### **The ownership of the housing stock.**

In England, social housing is owned and managed at a local level, and increasingly by small housing associations, that do not have a mandate to lead community renewal. Their focus is on housing specific priorities, including maintenance, tenant participation, neighborhood management etc with other agencies (such as health, education, justice) taking the lead in their areas of influence and having responsibility for their own part in the renewal agenda. In New Zealand and Australia, the same agency that owns the social housing stock is responsible for leading the wider community renewal agenda.

### **The political and economic philosophies of the day in each country.**

This has driven the extent of private involvement or desire for public ownership, control of, and upgrading of social housing. Both the United Kingdom and Australia have been through periods where private sector involvement and market forces in social housing were influential, whereas this does not feature as a factor in New Zealand's Community Renewal programme. The rationale in Australia now is for private involvement in joint ventures, mainly to do with raising the necessary finance to upgrade / maintain social housing stock and develop a balance of social and economically sustainable social housing assets.

In general, New Zealand's social housing urban renewal initiatives appear to be most similar to those in Australia, both in terms of the scope of the renewal agenda and the structures and policy context within which renewal operates.

## 5 Synthesis: Literature on 'what works' and 'lessons learnt'

### International Literature evaluating community renewal

This section of the document provides a summary of the findings from international literature evaluating community renewal on the issues outlined in the project scope. It includes lessons that have been learnt from social housing urban renewal initiatives in Australia and England, both in terms of what works and constraints to success. Appendix IV provides more detail on the evaluative literature.

#### Limitations of the evaluative findings

The relevance and weighting of the information from the various sources in this section needs some introduction. We have attempted to assist readers' ability to assess the usefulness and validity of the information to the New Zealand situation by including the date, author, research method, and original purpose for which each document was written with the key findings.

The date of the evaluation is relevant in terms of what the focus of community renewal initiative was in that country at that time, and how far through implementation they were.

Who commissioned the report and who conducted the research (e.g. community themselves, specialist housing research centre, government department housing or other, commercial organization, local government agency) indicates the independence or particular perspective the report comes from (e.g. economic from government or private funder perspectives, community or residents' point of view, housing associations, research case studies on particular components of community renewal).

The political context at the time is also relevant, but is not described in detail here. What a Community Renewal programme was 'facing' in terms of potential future policies / funding options (e.g. private/public partnerships) and pending decisions could have contributed to emphasis on particular issues surrounding or within community renewal.

### Summarising 'what works' and 'lessons learnt' from International Literature

Drawing together information from a range of published international literature evaluating community renewal it is possible to draw together the following summaries.

#### Characteristics of successful community renewal initiatives

Several high level government documents examine lessons from the United Kingdom's experiences in social housing urban renewal over more than twenty years. Other perspectives also contribute to the understanding of the UK experience in the form of a meta analysis of over sixty research projects in area regeneration from a key UK social policy charity research institution and a large scale longitudinal study of neighbourhood sustainability. State level evaluations of some of the

larger Australian regeneration initiatives are also discussed in the literature. Several of these are conducted by, or have input from, specialist Australian academic housing researchers. These references are outlined in Appendix IV. A very brief summary of the characteristics of successful community renewal initiatives described in these references is as follows:

- Community renewal and housing improvement integrate economic, social, and environmental development.
- There is an overall, long term, multi-faceted strategy involving all relevant agencies, linked to broader area and regional plans.
- The initiatives address physical improvements as well as high standards of housing management.
- There is a plan for sustainability of regeneration after 'special' funding runs out.
- Partnerships are productive and honest relationships, where there is trust among stakeholders, and local residents are included from the beginning. A community development approach emerges as a significant factor in ensuring genuine partnerships.
- There is ongoing investment to confront social exclusion and poverty, and to build community empowerment, cohesiveness, and problem-solving capacity.
- There is commitment and pooled resources from key government agencies and local service providers.
- There is good communication throughout both the planning and implementation phases.
- Appropriate structures, processes and resources are in place. These include training people.

### **Participation from tenants and community groups**

Participation from tenants and community groups is an area of community renewal which has been researched recently in large renewal and regeneration initiatives in Australia, the United Kingdom, and beyond. These references are outlined in Appendix IV. Several of the studies highlighted the considerable amounts of time and resources required to achieve genuine community participation. There is a high level of agreement between the various sources, pointing to the importance of the following factors as significant to the success of community development approaches to community renewal.

- Active, collaborative involvement of residents in decisions around regeneration.
- Government provision of funding, positions, structures and sufficient time to facilitate and support resident participation.
- Ensure residents can see their suggestions/ideas come to fruition.
- Clarity about principles and processes for involvement and regeneration efforts, to ensure shared understanding by all stakeholders.
- Note: potential for emerging public-private sector partnership approaches, where economic goals may conflict with social goals, to make housing authorities attempts to involve residents more difficult.

### **Linkages between central and local government agencies**

Linkages between central and local government agencies would seem to be a challenging and increasingly important area for community renewal initiatives to 'get right'. However, to date, in-depth research on the mechanisms and processes required to optimize these linkages does not

seem to have emerged. Some suggestions of important areas relating to agencies involved in community renewal linking together successfully include the following:

- Housing, planning and integrated social interventions all working together.
- Integrated renewal strategy as part of local planning process.
- Renewal area master plan.
- Locally-based agencies addressing local renewal issues, linked in to relevant agencies and stakeholders through effective, efficient structures and processes.
- Goodwill amongst agencies, communities, councils and other stakeholders.

Other structural issues which were discussed from several sources, mainly Australian, included a suggestion of a requirement for new non-profit agencies/ housing-specific agencies to implement community renewal successfully. A related issue raised by some commentators is a need for whichever housing agencies are coordinating efforts to be resourced and trained and structured to support efficient and effective linkages.

### **Tenure Mix, Public Housing Levels and Stock Concentrations**

Some recent, mainly Australian, literature discusses the various issues of tenure mix, public housing levels and stock concentrations. This argues that there is no evidence to support the frequently stated perspective that lowering concentrations of public housing and developing more mixed income communities is an effective means to reconnect socially excluded public housing tenants to mainstream society or that a balanced social mix is a prerequisite of 'inclusive', 'sustainable', and 'cohesive' communities. There is discussion, also, of possible inadvertent negative consequences of implementing social mix policies.

### **Anti-social behaviour and crime prevention**

Best practice models, management and other policy implications for prevention of crime and anti-social behaviour in areas of public housing is documented, based on several Australian community renewal initiatives.

### **Funding, Timescales, Exit or Transition Planning**

Too little information emerged from the literature to be able to draw useful insights on the issues of funding and timescales of community renewal programme. On the issues of exit or transition planning, Australian literature is becoming available which discusses the importance of adequately resourced, carefully planned and managed exit from regeneration projects as they can be helpful towards sustainability of the benefits for the communities concerned.

## **Appendix I - Description of Australian Community Renewal Programmes**

### **Australia**

This appendix outlines the key features of Australia's social housing urban renewal initiatives, with a particular focus on three states: Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia. It describes both the overall programme frameworks in these states and provides case studies of a couple of initiatives within each state.

An analysis of how the Australian programmes differ from both the New Zealand and England social housing urban renewal initiatives can be found in Section Four while specific detail of the lessons learned to date from the Australian programmes have been incorporated into Section Five summarising what works and doesn't work in community renewal.

### **Documentation**

Approximately 40 documents on social housing and community renewal in Australia were reviewed in the development of this section of the report, including policy documentation, descriptions of historical and current policies and initiatives, and research and learned commentary from various specialists in the field. The selection of literature in this section draws heavily on the research reports and journal articles from researchers at the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI). State level and other documentation on policies and initiatives is also included where this was readily available.

### **Housing Sector in Australia**

Housing is the responsibility of State Parliaments in Australia. Most funding for social housing comes from the national level Commonwealth State Housing Agreement to the relevant state housing departments (e.g. Queensland Department of Housing, NSW Department of Housing, Department of Families and Communities in South Australia) who own and manage social housing in their states. As well as directly providing and managing social housing, the relevant state housing departments are also involved in providing assistance to those renting in the private sector, home purchase assistance, partnerships to provide community housing (with local government, not-for-profit organizations) and community renewal programmes.

Much of the public housing in Australia was built in the post WW2 public sector building programme, to address the then shortage of good quality low cost housing. Much of this, to meet economies of scale, was constructed in the form of large estates and located on the fringe areas of cities where low priced, sizeable land holdings were available' (Arthurson 2004a).

'Despite this initial impetus for public housing, successive Australian Governments provided greater support for home ownership rather than public rental housing. This is evident today in the modest levels of government owned and administered public housing in Australia compared to many European countries. In Australia, 5.3% of households are in public rental accommodation; 69% own

or are purchasing their housing; 20.3% reside in the private rental sector, 0.5% in community housings, and 4.9% in other tenures'(Arthurson 2004a).

'As with many other western countries, Australian public housing is residualised. The tenure is characterized by socio-economically disadvantaged tenants concentrated on housing estates and experiencing low incomes, poverty, and high unemployment rates (89% of tenants in public housing were in receipt of welfare benefits in 2000)' (Arthurson 2004a).

Challenges for housing authorities relate to the physical attributes of the housing stock: ageing, increased maintenance, uniform design, concentrated on estates, mainly three bedroom housing with sizeable backyards, and design principles. Public housing in Australia was originally built to meet the needs of larger families. Present day demand is predominantly for smaller housing, one-parent families, or elderly applicants (Arthurson 2004a).

## Overall Policy Context

Australian State and Federal administrations have become increasingly aware of the problems associated with the concentration of disadvantaged households in particular neighbourhoods (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002). The problems experienced by 'communities in need' in these neighbourhoods are interconnected, and the neighbourhood renewal initiatives in the various states incorporate a diverse range of interventions aimed to address the needs and problems.

Randolph describes the drivers to estate generation in Australian urban / neighbourhood renewal as: concentrations of disadvantage; residualisation of tenants; housing management crises; asset management crises; public housing finance crises; inappropriate stock; location and quality; and political agendas (Randolph 2002).

Housing regeneration initiatives in Australia commenced in the 1990s (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). 'The amount of activity has varied by state, as has the impetus for the intervention. For example in Queensland the current Community Renewal Program is the responsibility of the Housing Department but was introduced as a component of the State's crime prevention strategy. The lead for renewal initiatives may be taken by different departments or a central unit. And while there is a current emphasis on whole of government approaches, there have been varying degrees of inter-departmental co-ordination. Much of the activity is led by housing departments'.

The relative emphasis on particular strategies has differed between states: from asset-based approaches involving disposal, sales and physical improvements to the housing stock, through alternative forms of housing management to community development and various attempts at whole of government approaches (Spiller 2004).

The most up to date AHURI overview of Australian housing regeneration policies at state level is in a 2004 report *Developing Appropriate Exit Strategies for Housing Regeneration Programmes* (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).



## Community Renewal in New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia

Community renewal policies in three states are described in detail below: New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia. These three states have been chosen because they were areas where the most relevant literature was available for comparison to the New Zealand Community Renewal programme, including commentary, research reports and advice/recommendations/learnings from key Australian housing/ community renewal researchers.

The states and examples of initiatives within these states which are described here were not selected because they were necessarily indicative of 'best practice', rather they were areas where the most published literature was available on the learnings from implementing and researching the initiatives. There are some additional (mainly recently established) community renewal initiatives in other States and Territories. Documents on these are referenced (but not described in detail) in this report.

### New South Wales

Social housing in New South Wales is managed by the NSW Department of Housing. As at 30 June 2004, the Department: directly managed almost 130,000 properties, provided more than 13,000 properties through community housing providers, and managed over 4,100 properties on behalf of the Aboriginal Housing Office (NSWDoH 2005).

'In 1994 the NSW Department of Housing implemented a pilot Neighbourhood Improvement Programme (NIP). The NIP aimed to incorporate community development approaches as much as physical housing regeneration.' 'The NIP continued until 1999, when it was superseded by a Community Renewal Strategy, itself refocused into the Community Renewal Program (CRP) in 2003 (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

In *Building Partnerships: Transforming Estates into Communities* (NSWDoH 1999), the range of strategies the Department of Housing was using in 1999 were described as including:

- improving the houses, parks and the places to meet;
- managing community renewal areas – putting people before properties;
- bringing the services to the tenants;
- training and employment (examples of ways the department is achieving tenant employment throughout the state are given); and
- increasing the diversity in our communities (focusing on two areas: building the capacity of individuals and the community and establishing community development projects).

The CRP places greater emphasis than NIP on integrating employment, especially job opportunities available through physical estate regeneration and housing management activities, with community development initiatives. The aims of CRP are:

- To enhance the quality of life of public housing tenants living in areas of concentrated public housing; and
- To increase the value of public housing stock (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

Similar to community renewal activities in other states, the NSW Community Renewal programme aims to involve tenants in decision-making processes about changes implemented on the estates

and this is linked to ongoing sustainability of the communities (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). While the CRP is concerned with aspects of community renewal, physical renewal activity was given to the Housing Finance Investment Group, a separate business unit within the NSW Department of Housing to progress. This unit was disbanded in late 2003 and the physical renewal programme subsumed into 'Resitech', the building and works division of the Department of Housing. A new programme of estate redevelopment based on public-private partnership approaches is being currently explored. However, to date only one physical renewal scheme, at Minto in Cambeltown, has been progressed to implementation stage (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

*Living Communities* is a current community renewal programme for high-need public housing estates in NSW. (How this fits with previous initiatives is not clear from the literature or current website information.) *Living Communities* projects will have three main parts:

- Providing better services and creating new opportunities: In partnership with other agencies and community leaders, the Department will identify ways to upgrade public safety, improve health and community services and create new opportunities for residents to improve their education and skills and find work.
- Building a stronger community: The Department will work with the local communities to build the skills of residents, improve communication, and strengthen community networks and leadership.
- Renewal of houses and public areas. The Department will work with local councils, private sector partners and the community to replace or upgrade poor quality public housing and to improve street layout and public areas. Many new houses and flats will be built.

Community renewal plans covering these three areas will be developed following detailed consultation with residents and service providers. They will be implemented in partnership with councils and local communities, other government departments and community organizations and, where appropriate, with private sector partners.

### Examples of two New South Wales Community Renewal Initiatives: Waterloo and Villawood

Location	New South Wales	
	Waterloo	Villawood
	NSW 3.5 km S of Sydney CBD	NSW
Start date	Mid – late 1990s	Mid – late 1990s
Number of properties in renewal area	2500 Half is high rise stock	253
Proportion of Public Housing Stock (Before %, After %) (Arthurson 2002a)	68.3%, 68.3% (82% of the total population of the suburb)	100% , nil
Project aims	Community development - incl. employment & community facilities Physical redesign – refurbishment and upgrade Asset Management	
Partners / Main Stakeholders / Collaborative relationships	Waterloo-Redfern Community Development Project (WRCDP) – collaboration between the UNSW School of Social Work and Faculty of the Built Environment, the Department of Housing, the Inner Sydney Regional Council for Social Development and the South Sydney Council.  Worked with the neighborhood advisory board, precinct committees, and other service providers	

	Community development work supported by a Housing Communities Assistance Program worker based at regional council.	
Housing redevelopment	To begin with: mix of high rise, three storey walk-up apartments and medium density housing. Unit upgrades  Improved security, conversion 120 bedsits to 2bdr apartments, employment on site of residents, provide gardens, add neighbourhood facilities, e.g. seating, play areas	Demolition and permanent relocation of residents
Timeframe to run	Not given	

## Waterloo

Waterloo estate is the largest of the NSW inner city public housing estates. It comprises approximately 2,500 properties and close to 5,000 residents, which accounts for close to 70% of all dwellings and 82% of the total population of the suburb of Waterloo – one of the highest concentrations of public housing in New South Wales. Waterloo has a high percentage (51%) of high rise flats set in open space (Randolph and Judd 2000a) .

It is a severely disadvantaged community, falling within the lowest 10% the socio-economic indicators for area. It has a well above average concentration of elderly people, single person households, single parent households, Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders, and other ethnic groups. The Waterloo area has suffered from low labour market participation rates, high youth unemployment, correspondingly high social service dependence, a significantly higher incidence of mental illness, problems with drug and alcohol abuse, and high levels of crime and vandalism. By the mid-1990s it had become a stigmatized community with a high rejection rate of housing offers, high vacancy rates, high rental arrears and high levels of nuisance, annoyance and vandalism.

From its commencement the Waterloo NIP sought to incorporate a significant community development component, along with the asset management and physical redesign focus.

The physical or asset strategies of the Department of Housing in Waterloo were mostly concerned with providing electronic security systems to building entrances, improving lighting throughout the estate, unit upgrades and two-to-one conversions of substandard units for the elderly, fencing of common areas, and improvements to the external appearance of some buildings. UNSW architecture staff and students were regularly involved with social work staff and students in community consultation concerned with physical improvements and developing design options for consideration by residents and the department.

Management strategies involved changes to allocations for clients with complex needs, improving maintenance response times, establishment of neighbourhood advisory boards and precinct committees to improve tenant participation and an attempt to implement a place management approach to coordinate the various aspects of the NIP and improve integration with other social service providers.

Social or community development initiatives involving the WRCDP included a neighborhood center, English classes for various cultural groups, employment initiatives, and odd jobbers service, community art activities, youth recreational programs, an after-school education program, three community gardens, recycling projects and the organizing of community festivals and events. The WRCDP also initiated research projects involving university staff and students to inform the neighbourhood improvement and community development process. These included studies of

demographics, design issues on high rise buildings, community cohesion, safety and security on the estate, mental health, community participation and community gardens (Randolph and Judd 2000a).

## **Villawood**

Villawood was chosen for regeneration because of: persistent economic decline of neighbourhood shopping centre; declining housing stock – largely developed in 1950s by Housing Commission; concentration of social disadvantage, and community safety concerns.

Opportunities which were neglected, and able to be built in to the regeneration were the publicly owned assets; access to public transport & road network; and established facilities and human service providers. Planning involved a master plan, Public /Private Partnership, and redevelopment of residential, commercial and public spaces (SSURHS 2004).

'The decision to demolish Villawood estate and disperse tenants' is a recent example of dealing with 'spatial concentrations of disadvantage of poverty through permanently relocating tenants to other areas'. The justification to demolish Villawood estate was that there were "'systematic social and criminal problems" on the estate' (Arthurson 2002b).

Changes included some public housing redeveloped as private housing, and some was upgraded, development of a revitalised commercial centre, and new community facilities to support local human service provision. (SSURHS 2004).

## **Queensland**

The Queensland approach to housing regeneration differs slightly to other States in that there are two separate but complementary renewal programmes aimed at disadvantaged communities: the Department of Housing's 'Urban Renewal Programme'; and the whole of government 'Community Renewal Programme' (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The Urban Renewal Programme is run by the Queensland Department of Housing. The Department has approximately \$4.5 billion worth of housing assets, which includes ownership of around 50,000 public houses. The Queensland Department of Housing goals are to provide:

- Sustainable, social housing for Queenslanders who are unable to access suitable alternatives;
- Increased supply of, and access to, affordable and appropriate housing in the broader housing system;
- Increased opportunities and outcomes in renewal communities achieved through partnerships;
- Improve social outcomes for renewal areas;
- Increase the capacity of renewal communities to harness the full resources of government, business and community sectors;
- Improve responsiveness by Government to the aspirations and needs of renewal communities; and
- A client-focused, innovative and flexible organization (QGDoH 2005).

'The Urban Renewal Programme focuses on improving older style housing estates with high concentration of public housing and socially disadvantaged communities. Earlier regeneration of estates related largely to physical improvements to housing amenity and enhanced security through:

- Consulting with the community in deciding how regeneration should proceed; and
- Training local unemployed people to assist in the process of upgrading and improving the housing stock.

Urban Renewal projects are deployed in 11 areas of Queensland, where there are high concentrations of public housing. The Urban Renewal Programme aims to ensure that public housing tenants have a range of housing options that are secure, affordable and appropriate to household needs. Specific project objectives are to:

- Have a positive impact on the visual appearance and physical environment of the suburb and create an aesthetically pleasant and desirable residential environment;
- Apply the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) in the improvement process;
- Reduce the concentration of public housing in the area by offering opportunities for home ownership at affordable prices to create a more balanced community profile;
- Enhance the physical quality of housing through undertaking appropriate improvement works;
- Provide increased choices in housing by realigning current housing stock to meet changing community needs; and
- Create employment opportunities for local unemployed people through involvement on the capital works programme (QDoH in Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The 'Urban Renewal' and 'Community Renewal' programmes work in tandem thus supporting broader changes on estates than were possible in the past (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). It seems that Urban Renewal funds physical asset-based initiatives and Community Renewal funds broader community initiatives, and that both programmes operate at the same time in the same areas. However it is not clear from the literature, and there is little detail given on the structures or delivery mechanisms, means of co-ordination between the two programmes, or even why two separate programmes are being maintained.

Funding for Urban Renewal is through the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement. Funding for Community Renewal is through the Consolidated Fund. An implication of this is that Community Renewal Funding can be provided more flexibly to support a diverse range of initiatives aimed at achieving the programme's objectives (QDoH 2001b).

'Whilst the Program is administered by the Department of Housing, it has a strong whole-of-government focus and actively seeks to engage other Government Departments' (QDoH 2001b). The Community Renewal Programme (CRP) forms part of the State Government's Crime Prevention Strategy, introduced in 1998. The programme is directed at areas with large concentrations of public housing and communities characterized by high crime rates, low incomes and declining levels of educational attainment. The principal features of the CRP are coordinated across government and agency partnerships and community involvement in identifying solutions to problems of crime and disadvantage. Community Renewal operates in 15 communities in Queensland. It is unclear how this fits with the eleven Urban Renewal areas.

The aim of the CRP is to 'reduce the level of disadvantage and raise the confidence and image of identified communities'. It involves collaboration with community and state agencies, seeking to: 'make government work better and be more responsive at a neighbourhood level' and 'make communities more resourceful and effective in their engagement with government' (QGDoh 2001a). Objectives of the Queensland CRP are to:

- Improve the safety and security of people and property;
- Better integrate socially and economically disadvantaged residents into broader community and economic networks and systems;
- Ensure accessibility of residents to community services and facilities they require;
- Strengthen and expand opportunities for young people;
- Improve neighbourhood amenity;
- Ensure public expenditure is directed to projects and activities which will have lasting and positive impacts on the communities; and
- Make the communities central to achieving program objectives (QGDoh 2001a)

Renewal areas are nominated on the basis of an analysis of indicators of disadvantage drawn from Census data, crime statistics and public housing records. In all of the communities, at least 40% of households live in rented accommodation (59% in Inala). Private renters dominate in Manoora. Most renters in Inala are public tenants (Walsh and Butler 2002).

Other key characteristics of the Queensland Community Renewal Program include: Community Action Plans with a 3-5 year focus reflecting the shared vision of stakeholders and including physical improvements to public housing stock and surrounding environment as well as improvements to community cultural and recreational facilities; acknowledging the inter-related nature of the problems requiring partnerships between government and community; tenant participation strategies and grants; community facilities programme (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

Community renewal projects have been funded in the following categories: employment and training, community services, neighbourhood amenity, community facilities, sport and recreation, community safety, community engagement, arts and cultural development (Walsh and Butler 2002).

### Examples of two Queensland Community Renewal Initiatives: Manoora and Inala

Location	Queensland	
	Manoora	Inala
	Queensland 5KMWCairns	Queensland 20kmSW Brisbane
Start date	1998	1998
Number of properties in renewal area	555	2500
Proportion of Public Housing Stock (Before %, After %) (Arthurson 2002a)	90%, 20-50%	52%, 20%
Project Aims	Crime prevention ( includes public housing estate community renewal; stock upgrades and reduce proportion of public rental) Education, and Training initiatives	Crime prevention ( includes public housing estate community renewal; stock upgrades and reduce proportion of public rental) Education, and Training initiatives
Partners / Main Stakeholders / Collaborative relationships	Cairns City Council Dept of Premier and Cabinet Department of Housing	Brisbane City Council Dept of Premier and Cabinet Department of Housing

	CR funds a Community Training Program, coordinated by University of Queensland and delivered through TAFE. -structured around community needs -pathway to recognized qualifications	CR funds a Community Training Program, coordinated by University of Queensland and delivered through TAFE. -structured around community needs -pathway to recognized qualifications
<b>Funding</b>	AUD\$ 2,769,000 1998-2001	AUD \$ 4,375,000 1998-2001
<b>Housing Redevelopment</b>	Physical redevelopment through urban renewal – upgrade and design improvements [and broader community development – under crime prevention umbrella through community renewal.]	Upgrading old housing Community employment and training Community projects and initiatives
<b>Timeframe to run</b>	Budget commitment made 3 years out at commencement (1998 -2000) then again 2001-2004	

## Manoora

Manoora rural public housing estate was constructed between 1975 and 1990. With 90 per cent public housing, Manoora contains the largest concentration of public housing outside of the Queensland metropolitan area. Residents are socially disadvantaged, with low incomes and declining levels of educational attainment, and the estate is characterized by high crime rates (Queensland Government and Queensland Department of Housing, 2000).

The housing authority in conjunction with the premier’s Department coordinates the various aspects of the Manoora regeneration project and the housing refurbishment is conducted through a corporatised government department (Arthurson 2002a). No further details on the initiative were given.

A community action plan (CAP) that integrated physical and social issues and set out the direction of the entire project over 7-10 years was developed in Manoora (led by the Department of Housing), to establish community agreement and commitment to the renewal initiative from the start. ‘The processes around formulation of the CAP were seen as major tools to include the existing community in the evolution of the vision for Manoora and encourage a climate in which resident initiative and confidence would grow’ (Arthurson 2003).

## Inala

Between the 1940s and the 1970s over 4,000 houses were built in Inala by the then Housing Commission. Currently the Department of Housing owns approximately half of the 5000 dwellings. Most of these are prefabricated three bedroom detached dwellings. The area suffers high levels of unemployment. The rate for 1996 was 21.8% compared with only 9.6% for Brisbane as a whole (Wood 2002b).

Physical revitalization and redevelopment of some of the 2,525 public sector houses was carried out between 1997 - 2001 (QDOH, 2001). This included upgrading some old houses, providing new kitchens, bathrooms and toilets, the extension of some patio areas, installation of carports, new fencing, and new drainage works. Some Baltic pine houses (300) were demolished and the land sold to private developers, with a plan to ‘develop a greater concentration of new houses on the cleared sites’. A community employment and training scheme was introduced later, alongside the urban renewal initiative, and local unemployed people had been employed to do much of the basic work. When the CRS was introduced in 1998 a Community Action Plan was written and a Community Reference Group (CRG) established. This CRG approved a range of community projects and initiatives including: upgrade of youth club, community centre providing a range of childcare services, employment related training and community development, a young person’s holiday project, improved sporting facilities, support for a drugs project, and others (Wood 2002b).

## **South Australia**

Early public housing estate regeneration projects in SA focused predominantly, as in other States, on undertaking improvements to housing and other physical infrastructure aspects of regeneration (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

'In contrast to Queensland and NSW, there is no distinct community renewal programme in South Australia. However, as in the other States, newer urban regeneration projects intend to go beyond previous projects, which concentrated on changes to housing, to incorporate 'community building' strategies' (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). The Urban Renewal Programme aims to:

- Regenerate areas with high concentrations of public housing;
- Create balanced and sustainable communities;
- Provide a better living environment;
- Improve standards of housing; and
- Provide housing more suited to the needs of present-day tenants (SAHT cited in Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The focus in South Australia has been mainly on public housing estates, initially primarily orientated towards asset management but from 1999 when the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) was formed, with a community focus. The SAHT is the State's public housing authority. The Housing Trust's role and powers are based on the South Australian Housing Trust Act, 1995 and the Housing Improvement Act, 1940. The Housing Trust's sources of funds are grants from the Commonwealth and State Governments, rents and other payments by tenants and the proceeds from the sale of houses and other assets (SAHT 2005).

One of the main purposes of the SAHT was to 'contribute to the stability and the renewal of communities'. They set out to consult tenants and develop partnerships with government agencies in a whole of government approach to achieve the best outcomes for communities. Neighbourhood development officers were appointed on some estates from 1999 onwards, whose roles included planning and implementation of community development programmes. The result has been 'greater emphasis on employment initiatives and economic as well as community development'. A variety of consultative mechanisms are in place to facilitate customer involvement (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

Urban renewal in SA has been led by the SAHT. Other initiatives within the Department of Human Services have supported the activity (e.g. neighbourhood and community development programme), and the Department for Transport, Urban Planning, and the Arts (urban regeneration).

The Housing Plan for South Australia, introduced in 2005, includes existing urban renewal programmes. The Housing Plan (South Australia's first ever comprehensive housing plan) aims to: make affordable housing available to more people, provide quality housing for those in greatest need in our community; and renew and reinvigorate neighbourhoods. It comes with \$145 million for initiatives to increase affordable housing for South Australians, reduce homelessness and map out future housing needs over 10 years. The plan is to:

- Establish an Affordable Housing Fund which will support the sale of social housing to existing Housing Trust tenants and reinvest the proceeds into new affordable and high needs accommodation;



- Inject \$15 million to accelerate urban renewal projects in The Parks (Westwood), Salisbury North (Hawksbury Park) and Playford North creating a vital new role for the Housing Trust in renewing our neighbourhoods and better meeting the needs of our tenants; and
- Create new home ownership opportunities for those in public and community housing aimed at encouraging around 1000 social housing tenants into home ownership for the first time.

### Examples of two South Australia Community Renewal Initiatives: Salisbury and The Parks

Location	South Australia	
	Salisbury	The Parks / Westwood
	South Australia	South Australia 7kmNW Adelaide
Start date	Late 1998	Early 1999
Number of properties in renewal area	1390	2460 (+ 500 upgraded prior to regeneration commencing)
Proportion of Public Housing Stock (Before %, After %) (Arthurson 2002a)	37%, 15%	60%, 25%
Project aims	Revised May 2000: to improve environmental and housing quality, social wellbeing and the economic viability of Salisbury North as an attractive and desirable living environment well integrated with surrounding communities (detailed in 14 objectives)	Tackling unemployment and crime Implementing education and training initiatives Upgrading public housing Implementing design initiatives
Partners / Main Stakeholders / Collaborative relationships	Agreement between SAHT and City of Salisbury Council Steering Committee: Membership = Council – 2, SAHT – 2, CRG – 1, DHS – 1) Community Reference Group Metropolitan Division of Dept of Human Services Community Connections Group	Joint Venture between Housing Trust and Urban Pacific Community Reference Group / Community Consultative Team City of Port Adelaide / Enfield Government Commitment Deed across several government departments
Housing redevelopment	No detail on housing developments  Complementary community development strategy (10yr) - youth employment, community safety, traffic management Human services provision & funding developments- families in crisis youth at risk, pre-apprenticeships in house construction and renovation	Demolition of 2,000 older properties Development of 2,400 new houses Improvement of remaining housing landscape and infrastructure (480 refurbishments of which half will be sold)
Timeframe to run	10 years	15 years

### Salisbury North

Renewal work initiated by SAHT and the City of Salisbury in 1997 through the Urban Improvement study. Action research was undertaken to encourage direct involvement of community members as active participants in the research process. Through consultation the following goals were set:

- 'reducing the concentration of public housing in the area, while still retaining a level adequate to meet demand, and introduction of private housing into the area;
- upgrading houses, streets and reserves;
- traffic management improvements;
- opportunities to become involved in landscaping;
- the development of strategies to address safety issues;
- more recreational facilities for youth; and
- more opportunities for community involvement' (Wood 2002b)

The SAHT approved the proposals in October 1998 after clear demonstration of the community's approval and the Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project was subsequently launched. A Neighbourhood Development Officer was appointed to support the strategies and to provide a single direct access point to the process for community members. By 2001 the following had been achieved:

- progressive demolition of 35% of public housing and re-subdivision to create allotments for private house and land packages and some new-built public and social housing;
- upgrading and sale of 30% of public housing into the private market;
- upgrading of all public housing retained (35%);
- improvements to streetscaping, incorporating paving, tree planting, improved street lighting and undergrounding of power commenced and ongoing;
- traffic slowing strategies (detail given);
- CRG involvement in selection of tree species to be planted, student participation in planting, community club establishing a landscape feature and environmental group care for wetlands;
- Safety audit;
- Community police officer and Youth Activities co-ordinator appointed;
- Youth recreational area upgraded;
- New Neighbourhood activities fostered through new Community House; and
- Training and employment opportunities created (Wood 2002b).

A review of the Salisbury North Community Development Strategy was undertaken in May 2000 with the objectives of:

- Ensuring the strategy remains relevant and consistent with community aspirations;
- Ensuring priorities of other key stakeholders are identified and included;
- Including priorities of other key stakeholders in the project since originally formed; and
- include any new directions identified since the original strategy.

Revised objectives were set, under the primary objective of 'improving environmental and housing quality, social wellbeing and the economic viability of Salisbury North as an attractive and desirable living environment well integrated with surrounding communities'. Fourteen physical, economic, and social objectives were specified within this primary objective (Randolph and Judd 2000b). Further detail on the review's findings and how it impacted on the initiative, particularly asset management and financial objectives and their relationships / tensions with social issues and community development objectives is in *Resident Participation in Urban and Community Renewal* p20. (Wood 2002b). Detail on the structures, mandates, and processes for determining priorities in Salisbury North is in a SAHT 1999 paper (Fulcher 1999).

### **The Parks / Westwood**

The Parks estate is 2500 houses over five suburbs, built after WW2. The estate was constructed to attract and service the growth in manufacturing industry in the regions, and so in later years residents of The Parks were disproportionately affected by the decline of manufacturing industry, on which they relied for employment (Arthurson 2002a).

The estate has 60% concentration of public housing and is characterized by residents with low incomes, poverty and high unemployment rates (South Australian Housing Trust and Pioneer

Projects Australia, 1996). The Parks regeneration project formally commenced in February 1999. The project involves a range of activities tackling unemployment and crime, implementing education and training initiatives, upgrading public housing, implementing design improvements (Arthurson 2002a).

The Parks project is a partnership approach between the South Australian Housing Trust and the private sector property developer, Urban Pacific. This partnership goes much further than previous arrangements in that Urban Pacific actually manages the project (Jackson, 1999). Detail on the processes which were required to secure long term commitment to the initiative and Cabinet approval for the joint venture are given in a SAHT 1999 paper (Fulcher 1999).

At the Parks, a community development plan was developed to summarize major issues identified in the regeneration planning processes, outlining the visions for the revitalized communities, and documenting strategies and directions for achieving desired changes (Arthurson 2002a). However, residents at The Parks were not involved from the start in identifying and formulating priority issues from the perspective of the community (Arthurson 2003).

## Other States and Territories

### Victoria

'Providing housing to approximately 17,000 people, Melbourne's 45 high rise towers and numerous walk-up blocks were built in 14 inner city suburbs between 1960 and 1973. From 1980s onwards, Victorian housing policy prioritized upgrading and improving stock'. In the 1990s, up until 1996, Commonwealth funding helped finance a range of large estate redevelopments. In 1999, the government broadened a plan (stated in 1996 but not yet commenced, to demolish the first of Melbourne's public housing high-rise towers) and prioritized major redevelopment projects involving demolition and construction that would take place over five years, Most of these developments involved public-private mix as a way of financing redevelopment' (Hoatson and Grace 2002).

This regeneration agenda occurred in a period 'when the federal government has chosen to invest in rent assistance to private tenants and a decreasing proportion of money is available for the national public housing programme' (Badcock 1999).

'Originally in Victoria, like other Australian States, housing estate renewal projects focused on physical upgrading of housing. 'The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS) introduced by the Department of Human Services in 2000 forms part of the State Government's *Growing Victoria Together* agenda to build more cohesive communities and reduce inequalities (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). Up until 2002, ten renewal projects had been implemented in some of the most disadvantaged areas of the state, with further projects planned (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The overall goal of the NRS is to create vibrant communities where people want to live. In order to achieve this goal the Strategy aims to:

- Increase people's pride and participant in the communities;
- Expand local economies and increase employment, training and education opportunities;

- Improve personal safety and reduce crime;
- Enhance housing and the physical environment;
- Promote health and wellbeing;
- Increase access to transport and other key services; and
- Improve government responsiveness (VGDOHS 2002).

## Western Australia

In Western Australia there are some large scale older style public housing estates undergoing renewal. Changes have focused on: lowering the percentage of public rental housing in the estates; improving infrastructure and streetscapes; upgrading stock to be retained; and introducing security patrols into local communities (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

An urban renewal program of the Department of Housing and Works, 'New Living' introduced in 1995, provides the policy context for initiatives (WAMOH 2001). This programme is aimed at redeveloping older public housing estates to create more attractive living environments, to reduce the Department's rental presence and to encourage home ownership (Eringa 2003). And it is noted that it is 'beyond doubt that New Living has produced some very positive results' (Eringa 2003) but also that 'on balance, it remains unclear to what extent New Living has benefited all people involved, and to what extent the State Housing Authority has found a balance between its own asset management agenda and the social and economic needs of the affected communities' (Eringa 2003).

Similar concerns had been discussed in an earlier paper on the policy context within which Western Australia urban renewal is occurring and the issues associated with the concept of redevelopment which invests in communities. Questions about 'who benefits from urban renewal in the long term', 'who is buying into redeveloped estates, where relocated tenants are moving to, the long term impact of fragmenting communities and the process of re-building communities' are raised (Cameron 2000).

## ACT and Northern Territory

ACT and Northern Territory are not characterized by large-scale social housing estates (Arthurson 1998 in (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004)). Hence, regeneration where it has been undertaken, is small scale and focused on modifying physical design and reducing concentrations of public housing. Tasmania has smaller numbers of social housing than mainland Australian States, and some regeneration activities have been undertaken in these. Recent initiatives have been partnerships between Housing Tasmania and industry partners.

## Resident participation

In a 2002 Positioning Paper on *Resident Participation, Social Cohesion and Sustainability in Neighbourhood Renewal: Developing Best Practice Models*, the following Australian experiences were described. Given the relatively new emphasis placed on this aspect of renewal policy by state housing authorities, there is little in terms of literature or practice experience in Australia on resident participation in neighbourhood regeneration activity. 'Nevertheless, there is substantial experience in community development initiatives in disadvantaged areas going back to the 1970's within the social

policy and social work fields rather than in housing. Few examples of good practice have been produced. Dissemination of the lessons of earlier initiatives, and the role played by resident participation has been limited' (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

'An emerging objective for most of the major Australian public housing estate renewal programs currently being implemented in Australia is to strengthen communities, often within the context of overt statements about community participation. While much of the effective investment in these disadvantaged estates has been to improve asset performance or to increase social mix and diversity through stock management, there has nevertheless been a distinctive move towards increased levels of tenant and resident involvement in the renewal process. This concern has been echoed in wider initiatives to increase citizen participation in government activity' (NSW Cabinet Office, 1998) (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

'More recent initiatives have also included an active community building element to the policy package, with social and employment programs complementing physical renewal activity. These also imply an increased level of resident activity and engagement. But it is not at all clear whether such activities have been successful or have added much value to the physical investment that has taken place, or if they in reality amounted to much more than good examples of consultation, rather than effective participation. Yet these non-shelter outcomes have become core objectives of such initiatives' (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

'For example, the New South Wales Department of Housing (DOH) has a series of tenant based participation strategies, including Neighbourhood Advisory Boards, the Housing Community Assistance Program and the Tenant and Community Initiatives Program, all of which contribute to developing tenant involvement in housing decisions. However, they do not involve direct tenant involvement in decision making or resource allocation and in some cases may actually marginalize tenants as there is no devolution of power or resources to tenants. In South Australia, intensive resident consultation and the establishment of resident reference groups in some urban renewal programs have clearly had benefits in terms of community acceptance of redevelopment programs (Randolph and Judd, 2000). Again, whether these can be seen as examples of active participation is another matter' (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

A 2002 AHURI report *Resident participation in urban and community renewal* describes a qualitative study of six community renewal initiatives in three states; NSW, Queensland, and SA. The comprehensive report provides an overview of renewal initiatives in three states and presents findings from these initiatives:

- Description of renewal initiatives detailed account of rationale for participation as presented by professionals and residents and the perceived benefits of participation;
- Compares and contrasts the various types of structures and processes that have been developed in the localities studies and described how the life experiences of residents in 'disadvantaged' neighbourhoods militate against participation;
- Highlights practical barriers that stand in the way of wider resident involvement;
- Explores the 'good practice' lesson that might be derived from the fieldwork and from other sources; and
- Examines the relative merits of the approaches that have been adopted and identified policy implications (Wood 2002b).

## **Exit Strategies**

A 2004 AHURI report (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004) reviews current Australian practice and developments in exit strategies models for housing regeneration programme. It includes a literature review of innovations and practices from overseas, key paradigms in housing urban regenerations, debates that have shaped housing regeneration policies, overviews of the policy contexts in each State/Territory, examples of initiatives, models and components of exit strategies, and conclusions about the evidence base for exit strategies.

Queensland is the only State with a specific exit strategy, although elements of other State Housing Authority's policies, particularly related to resident involvement in regeneration, are related to achieving and maintaining sustainability (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

The Queensland CRP exit strategy (Transition Planning Policy), in development was described as comprising:

- Recognition that the transition plan begins from the CRP's point of entry into the community and peaks in the final year of implementation; and
- Allows the CRP to exit gradually from a community to reduce the possibility of adverse impacts on the relationships established or the erosion of benefits developed within the targeted communities;
- The central aim of encouraging programme stakeholders to plan for long term improvements in a community;
- Considering the sustainability of successful projects as well as the broader agenda of partnerships between the community, government and the business sector;
- Sharpening the CRPs focus on the need for a balance between locally identified projects and strategic projects aimed at bringing about long term sustainable improvements;
- Workshops with stakeholders to explore 'exit' and 'transition' and 'what they want sustained'
- Developing a transition plan through these processes to guide the CRP's final year of implementation and eventual exit from a community (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

## Appendix II - Description of United Kingdom Community Renewal Programmes

### United Kingdom

This appendix outlines the key features of social housing urban renewal initiatives in the United Kingdom, with a focus on England. Unlike Australia and New Zealand, social housing providers in the UK do not lead discrete social housing renewal programmes but instead participate as part of a wider renewal agenda. The focus in this section, therefore, is on the overall policy and operational context within which social housing urban renewal initiatives operate in the UK. Due to the sheer number of initiatives operating at local level, it has been impossible to develop a coherent set of case studies for the UK such as is possible for the New Zealand and Australia sections of the document. Where specific local initiative information is included in a document that has been reviewed, this is mentioned in the text.

An analysis of how the described initiatives differ from those in New Zealand and Australia can be found in Section Four while specific detail of the lessons learned from UK initiatives can be found in Appendix IV and a summary of these incorporated into Section Five outlining what works and doesn't work in community renewal.

### Documentation

The literature used to develop this section of the document was sourced by *Health by design Ltd.* as part of the literature search, as outlined in the methodology section. Much of the relevant information was found in government department strategies and action plans with only a small number of journal articles and reports providing an analysis of the context and development of social housing urban renewal initiatives. In all, approximately sixty documents were reviewed that originated from the UK. Most of the documentation reviewed related to England specifically and as such, this is the focus for this section.

### The Housing Sector in England

Social housing makes up approximately 20% of all housing stock in England, equating to about 4.1 million homes (Prospectus 2004) (ODPM 2005d). Most of the rest of the housing stock is privately owned (70%) with only 10% of the stock rented privately (ODPM 2005d).

Social housing in England is focused on housing those most in need, and as in other countries is residualised with around 70% of tenants not in active employment in 2003 (ODPM 2005d). Those living in the most deprived areas of England are three times as likely to be living in social housing (ODPM 2005c).

Nearly half of the social housing (1.95 million homes) is managed by nearly 2000 housing associations (known as Registered Social Landlords (RSLs)) and the rest by Local Authorities. RSLs are run as businesses but do not trade for profit. They are independent and run by voluntary boards / committees and may include representation from tenants, representatives from local authorities, and community groups, business people and politicians. Most are very small, owning

less than 250 homes, although the 14 largest own more than 75% of the RSL stock and manage over 2500 homes each. They focus on providing rental housing to those on low incomes but some also are involved in shared ownership schemes (UKHC 2005).

Over recent years local authorities have been in the process of transferring housing stock to RSLs and from July 2005 all local authorities must decide, in consultation with tenants, if they will (ODPM 2005d):

- Sell their stock to RSLs – who can obtain finance from the private sector (unlike local authorities)
- Create an arms length management organization (ALMO) – a company owned by the local authority to manage its homes, although this option will only be available to some high performing local authorities
- Utilize the Private Finance Initiative - government funding for partnerships between private and public sectors where the private sector manages the housing and the local authority still owns the stock

This transfer of stock has been driven by the requirement for local authorities to attract additional resources in order for their social housing stock to meet the Decent Homes Standard and as a way for local authorities to separate their role as a landlord from their role as having a strategic overview of the housing sector within their region. (ODPM 2005d)

Falling investment in social homes in the 1980s meant a reduction in the quality of social housing stock. By 1997 there was a 19 billion pound backlog of repairs and 2 million social houses did not meet decency standards (ODPM 2005d). The Decent Homes Standard was set out in 2000 to 'ensure all social housing meets set standards of decency by 2010 by reducing the number of households living in social housing that does not meet these standards by a third between 2001 and 2004, with most of the improvement taking place in the most deprived local authority areas' (HNZC 2003b).

Demand for housing, including social housing, is not consistent across England - there is huge growth in the South East and excess housing (creating low demand) in the North of the country (with social housing twice as likely as private sector housing to be low demand). This has meant the need for significant development, including the building of new social housing in the South East of England and significant redevelopment of housing in the North to attract people back into these communities (ODPM 2005d).

## History and Development of Community Renewal in England

A report published in January 2005 by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, entitled '*Evaluation of English Housing Policy 1975-2000 Theme 3: Housing Quality and Neighborhood Quality*' (ODPM 2005a) provides an excellent summary of the range of interventions utilized by, or involving, the social housing sector in improving the quality of a neighborhood over the last 30 years. Similarly Ball and Maginn's journal article (Ball and Maginn 2005) describes the changes in urban regeneration policy over the last 30 years with a focus on the development of the 'partnership' approach.

Both documents trace the change from physical centered, housing led initiatives in the 1970s to the more multi-sectoral partnership approaches to tackle the wider issues of social exclusion that are seen today (as described in the next section below).



The ODPM document states that 'since the 1970's at least, it has been recognized in England that the most difficult neighborhoods combine housing stock and housing management problems with a range of socio-economic problems (including high levels of deprivation) and poor quality services. They have made such areas unpopular and difficult places to live. There have been many different initiatives that have attempted to improve existing neighbourhoods dominated by council or latterly by other social sector housing. Typically, policies in this area aim at improving the quality of a neighbourhood in multiple respects, including the quality of housing and the housing service, the quality of the environment, improving other facilities and services, and reducing social problems and crime. While they broadly aim to impact on the same set of problems, there have been important differences in emphases of policies. The document goes on to describe some of the policy drivers and specific initiatives that have operated in England since that time that have focused on dealing with this problem. These are summarized below (ODPM 2005a).

The 1970's could be characterized by local authority-led modernization and other physical changes in the belief that the low physical quality of their housing estates was the reason they were difficult to let (ODPM 2005a) while the 1980's era of the Conservative government led to an increase in privatization and private sector involvement in urban development and left social housing providers funding for themselves, with the consequence being many run-down council estates (Ball and Maginn 2005). Specific initiatives at this time include Priority estate projects, which focused on improving housing management (including increasing the role of tenants) and Estate Action (which had a significant focus on encouraging the transfer of local authority housing to housing associations and the private sector) (ODPM 2005a).

A change in Conservative leader in the early 1990s brought an emphasis back to addressing social issues as a central component of policy and a significant shift in emphasis to partnerships (Ball and Maginn 2005). The Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), started in 1994, advocated broader based partnership arrangements, acknowledging that housing interventions had been ineffective when separated from action in other related spheres such as employment, training, health, policing and the wider physical environment (ODPM 2005a). Estate Action budgets (targeted capital funding for estate improvements) were included along with 19 other previously separate central government budgets in the SRB Challenge Fund which could be bid for by partnerships of agencies (eg local authorities plus agencies concerned with health, crime, the local economy plus the local community). SRB ran to seven budget rounds, finishing in 2001/02 and had a different emphasis each year. The objectives of SRB were broadly concerned with improving employment and skills, local economies, BME communities, environment and infrastructure, the quality of life and community participation, as well as housing. Housing made up about 1/3 of the total spend on SRB projects (ODPM 2005a).

The mid 1990's also saw the rise of the 'Housing Plus' approach, that encouraged RSLs to develop social and economic regeneration activities alongside their traditional housing development and management roles (ODPM 2005a). There appears to have been no specific 'Housing Plus' policy or definition and the recent literature does not feature this term although two Joseph Rowntree research reports sourced in this review describe some of the features of the 'Housing Plus' approach which was taken up by some RSLs (Gaster and Crossley 2000), (JRF 2001) and a Welsh report outlines the evidence for RSL's involvement in community renewal (WAG 2004).

Since 1997 the New Labour government has continued with the multi-agency approach and community involvement characterized by SRB (Ball and Maginn 2005) and since that time central

government policy on improving housing conditions on difficult estates has been tied into a vision of a more comprehensive, strategic approach to urban regeneration (ODPM 2005a).

A programme known as New Deal for Communities (NDC), was announced in 1998 as the first general purpose area based initiative of the New Labour government and is now wrapped into the National Strategy for Neighborhood Renewal.

There are 39 NDC areas, each severely deprived, each with fewer than 4000 households, and all within the 88 most deprived local authority areas targeted in the most recent National Strategy for Neighborhood Renewal (described below). On average NDCs are dominated by social housing with an average 58% living in council / RSL housing. Over a ten year period, 2 billion pounds will be invested in these communities. NDC works through neighbourhood partnerships, who have tailored their strategies to suit local conditions. They share the five key NDC themes of increasing the number of people in work, raising educational standards, reducing crime and fear of crime, improving people's health, housing and physical environment (ODPM 2003a).

The National Strategy for Neighborhood Renewal (SEU 2001) was launched in 2001 and focuses on social exclusion and a joined up policy approach to dealing with it. The emphasis has shifted from time limited area based initiatives towards using mainstream service budgets to tackle the problems of deprived neighbourhoods (ODPM 2005a). It has signaled the downgrading of physical urban renewal, with housing and the physical environment just one of five priority areas to be addressed (Ball and Maginn 2005).

## Overall Policy Frameworks that Drive Community Renewal in England

The following describes the current framework and context within which renewal operates in England.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) was established in May 2002 in England and is responsible for local and regional government, housing, planning, regeneration, neighbourhood renewal, and social exclusion, making it the key strategic overseer of social housing urban renewal initiatives. The ODPM's aim is 'to create sustainable communities – places where people want to live – that promote opportunity and a better quality of life for all' (ODPM 2004b).

The ODPM has five strategic priorities, three of which are relevant to social housing urban renewal, including:

- Delivering a better balance between housing supply and demand by supporting sustainable growth, reviving markets and tackling abandonment;
- Ensuring people have decent places to live by improving the quality and sustainability of local environments and neighbourhoods, reviving brownfield land and improving the quality of housing; and
- Tackling disadvantage by reviving the most deprived neighbourhoods, reducing social exclusion and supporting society's most vulnerable groups.

The **Social Exclusion Unit**, set up in 1997, became part of the ODPM on its establishment in 2002. The Social Exclusion Unit led thinking and policy setting on addressing disadvantage at a neighbourhood level in England, e.g. *'Bringing Britain Together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal'* (SEU 1998), *'National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: a framework*

for consultation' (SEU 2000), and 'Breaking the Cycle: Taking stock of progress and priorities for the future' (SEU 2004) .

The following are the key ODPM strategies, plans and initiatives that currently drive renewal (including social housing urban renewal) in England.

The **National Strategy for Neighborhood Renewal** is set out in the '*A New Commitment to Neighborhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan*' (NSNR) document (SEU 2001). This document was written by the Social Exclusion Unit but is now being implemented by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit of the ODPM.

It describes the vision, goals, strategies and actions to be followed in the delivery of neighbourhood renewal in England as well as providing examples of good practice, including in the area of social housing.

The vision is that 'no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live. People on low incomes should not have to suffer conditions and services that are failing, and so different to what the rest of the population receives' (SEU 2001).

The three key dimensions to the strategy include:

- national leadership and support;
- new policies, funding and targets to tackle problems at a local level; and
- better local co-ordination and community empowerment.

And the focus is on five main areas:

- employment and economies;
- crime;
- education and skills;
- health; and
- poor housing and physical environment.

Each department with an impact on the key problems of deprived neighbourhoods (outlined above) has a number of targets, which form part of their public service agreements. In this way neighbourhood renewal is being placed at the heart of the agenda for each department (SEU 2001).

Eleven of the one hundred and five new policies and funding commitments outlined in the NSNR relate specifically to housing and cover such areas as funding for meeting the decent homes standard, more funding for; new social homes; for choice based lettings; for housing management; for increasing tenant participation in local authorities, expanding the transfer of local authority homes to RSLs (for more detail see pages 40 and 41 of the NSNR (SEU 2001)). A factsheet (ODPM 2003b) summarizes the housing component of neighbourhood renewal.

A key feature of the NSNR is the development of '**Local Strategic Partnerships**' (LSPs); a response to the acknowledgment that a lack of joining up at the local level had been one of the key reasons for lack of progress in tackling neighbourhood deprivation (SEU 2001). The government's vision for LSPs is that they be a single coalition of public, private, voluntary and community sector organizations to provide strategic direction for local renewal initiatives.

While the aim is to have effective LSPs in all areas, funding has been provided to the 88 most deprived regions of the country to develop and implement a Local Neighborhood Renewal Strategy (LNRS). This involves identifying priority neighbourhoods and understanding their problems, mapping resources going into priority neighbourhoods, agreeing on what more needs to be done and implementing and monitoring agreed actions. The focus is on utilizing mainstream resources more effectively rather than on specific area based funding for a particular project or initiative.

A '2002/03 Progress Report on Local Strategic Partnerships in Neighbourhood Renewal Fund areas' (ODPM 2004a) examines the activities undertaken and evidence of progress made by the 87 LSPs in areas in receipt of Neighbourhood Renewal Fund allocations.

A 2004 report *LSP Evaluation and Action Research Programme Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies Document Analysis and Review* (ODPM 2004c) sets out information on four areas of evaluation and action research on LNRSs:

- the strategic drivers and links and the balance of targeting in relation to areas, groups and policy areas;
- how far the strategy is contextualized and evidence based;
- steps taken to turn the strategy into overall action places and ones for targeted areas, the role of mainstreaming, the identification of lead agencies, the extent to which progress will be measurable and the priorities for and sources of spend; and
- structures and processes for decision making, joint delivery, community and stakeholder engagement, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, accountability, and skills and knowledge.

Another key component of the NSNR is **Neighbourhood Management**. 35 Neighbourhood Management Scheme pathfinders have been set up to trial this approach which focuses on placing a single person, team or organization in charge of coordinating the needs of a small neighbourhood.

In 2003 a **Sustainable Communities Plan** was developed by the Office for the Deputy Prime Minister entitled '*Sustainable communities: building for the future*' (SCP 2003). It sets out a long term vision for delivering sustainable communities and aims to tackle the problems in communities in England; unaffordable homes in some regions due to high growth, low demand in other parts of the country, providing decent homes and a good quality local environment in all regions.

This plan was updated in 2005 with two companion 5 year strategic plans '*Sustainable Communities: Homes for All*' (ODPM 2005d) which aims to offer everyone the opportunity of a decent home at a price they can afford and '*Sustainable communities: People, Places and Prosperity*' (ODPM 2005f) which describes how the government will work at every level to improve the communities that people live in. '*Sustainable Communities: Homes for all*' describes in detail the overall strategies for the housing sector for the coming 5 years, including issues of access to new homes where they are needed most, helping people buy their homes, delivering quality and choice for those who rent, reviving communities and housing markets, tackling issues of homelessness and enhancing the environment.

The work of the NSNR is incorporated into these plans and LSPs are at the heart of the strategies, especially for deprived areas.

The 2003 plan also outlined the development of new renewal structures, known as **Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders**. Nine partnerships are being set up in Northern England to work across local

authority boundaries and with private sector involvement to tackle the issues of low housing demand in a cross sectoral manner.

Most of the pathfinder areas have been subject to a series of interventions over the last 30 years (including NDC, SRB initiatives), aiming to address structural economic failures, skills gaps, unfit housing, poor environment and deprivation (AC 2005). While there has been success in some places, these initiatives largely failed to anticipate or halt the decline of some residential areas. Housing Market Renewal pathfinders aim to understand and address the causes of low demand (including housing stock obsolescence, surplus housing stock and unpopular neighbourhoods) instead of only dealing with the symptoms (AC 2005). The programme is non-prescriptive, long-term and intended to be coordinated with other regeneration activities. (AC 2005) The Chair's Report 2005 (Pathfinders 2005) outlines the overall context of the HMR pathfinder initiative, presents key challenges that will be faced and describes each of nine areas undergoing renewal. An example of what one renewal area is aiming to achieve and how they plan to achieve this can be found in their prospectus (Prospectus 2004).

## Role of Social Housing Providers within this Context

The NSNR outlines possible roles that the social housing sector (both local authorities and RSLs) may take in neighbourhood renewal and the Housing Corporation, the regulator and funder of RSLs has developed a policy for their involvement in regeneration and market renewal, entitled *'Adding value to what we have'* (UKHC 2004).

In essence, these documents describe the role of social housing providers as:

- being one of a number of partners in a LSP and/or housing market renewal pathfinder;
- playing an active role in encouraging tenant and resident involvement in regeneration;
- taking a lead role in housing related regeneration practices such as improving houses to the decent homes standard, providing good neighbourhood management; and
- leading on or involvement in wider community projects (the Housing Corporation provides funding to RSLs for this purpose).

Since 1997 the number of sub-standard social homes has been cut by 1 million but as at January 2005, there were still 1.4 million social tenants with non-decent homes. By 2010 local authorities and housing associations will have spent 42 billion pounds (incl. 10 billion from private sector) on bringing homes up to the decent homes standard (ODPM 2005d).

As an indication of the extent of new building and demolition work being undertaken in the social housing sector, 10,000 new social homes will be built a year between 2005 and 2008 (ODPM 2005d) and by 2006 10,000 homes will have been demolished as part of the early Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder projects (ODPM 2005d).

## Timelines and Budget

Previous area based initiatives in England, such as the SRB and NDC, had fixed timeframes and funding associated with them. Most were set up for 7-10 years with the assumption that the policy would operate as a series of specific measures that would turn around an area (ODPM 2005a).

However, more recent renewal policy, such as NSNR, has shifted the focus to on-going sustainable partnerships with no fixed timeframes and the use of mainstream funding to achieve renewal. The basic idea is that policy towards neighbourhoods should move away from time-limited initiatives, delivered by specially established processes and structures. Instead it is intended that mainstream public spending programmes should themselves address more closely the needs of difficult neighbourhoods, either by taking on area initiatives as a normal part of their activity, or by 'bending the mainstream' in favour of places that most need it (ODPM 2005a).

## Partnerships

Partnerships between agencies and the joined-up approach is a key feature of the renewal environment in England (and the rest of the UK). This is mandated through the requirement for development of LSPs, as outlined in the NSNR.

A '2002/03 Progress Report on Local Strategic Partnerships in Neighborhood Renewal Fund Areas' (ODPM 2004a) outlines, among other things, who is involved and how these partnerships work in practice. Most LSPs have representation from the voluntary sector, health, police and business (as well as from the local authority) with representation on some LSPs from (in decreasing order) employment service, learning and skills council, faith community, education, ethnic minority community, fire, benefits agency. Housing providers are not specially mentioned, although in many cases the local authority will be the owner of the social housing in the area.

LSPs are set up in very different ways across the renewal fund areas, depending on the current arrangements in the area and the needs of the community and have both core and non-core members. Links have been made with other partnerships, most often crime / community safety partnerships (80%), local learning partnerships (65%) and health improvement partnerships (50%). (ODPM 2004a).

## Community Participation

An Australian report on resident participation includes a section on the UK experience (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002). It states that UK regeneration programmes, beginning in the early 1990s, have been subject to considerable analysis. Community participation is now an accepted orthodoxy in UK regeneration initiatives. It is claimed for example that:

- Communities have a fresh perspective, and can often see the problems in new ways;
- Community involvement helps to deliver programmes which more accurately target local needs;
- The resulting projects are more acceptable to the local community;
- Programme outputs which have been designed with input from local residents are likely to last longer because communities feel ownership of them; and
- The constructive involvement of communities in urban regeneration helps to build local organizational skills, making it easier to develop strong successor organizations (JRF, 1999, p.2 in (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

Community participation in decision making is central to recent renewal strategies, including both the NSNR and the Sustainable Communities strategies.

The NSNR expresses a commitment to ensuring that communities' needs and priorities are to the fore in neighbourhood renewal. In order to achieve this, a number of funds have been set up in the 88 targeted areas to support community and voluntary sector involvement in LSPs and help set up community projects (ODPM 2005b). These schemes (which have now been amalgamated into one overall fund) include:

- Community Chests – provide small and easily accessible grants to stimulate and support community activity, so that more people can become involved in regeneration in their neighbourhoods;
- Community Learning Chests – help residents gain the skills and knowledge they need to play an active role in renewal in their neighbourhoods; and
- Community Empowerment Fund – supports the voluntary and community sectors to engage as an equal partner in LSPs.

In addition, a number of RSLs are piloting an 'Investors in Communities' recognition scheme for residents, RSLs and local authorities working together to build safe and sustainable communities (JRF 2005a).

## **Exit Strategies**

Exit planning does not appear to enter into the current renewal agenda in England, given the shift to mainstream partnerships for the long term rather than time-focused area based initiatives.

The approach used in the past in developing exit strategies in the UK is summarized in an AHURI report on exit strategies; the report also provides some UK case study examples of how exit strategies have been developed (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

## **Evaluations**

Many of the earlier community renewal initiatives in England have been evaluated, including the SRB and Estate Action schemes. The evaluation of Estate Action showed that the scheme had generally been effective in achieving physical regeneration but that there were considerable difficulties in achieving wider social and economic regeneration purely through housing spending. The main evaluation of the SRB reported numerous methodological problems, however there were some mildly positive indications of improved quality of life, although the evaluators concluded that SRB had not turned around the underlying problems of weak economies and high levels of deprivation in the areas that were targeted (ODPM 2005a).

Many of the more recent strategies and initiatives (e.g. NDC, NSNR, LSPs, Community participation funding, housing management pathfinders, Housing Market Renewal pathfinders) are still relatively new and are in the process of being evaluated. Having said this, there is some literature outlining best practice guidance and early action research findings as they relate to these initiatives. This includes:

- *Housing and Physical Environment Domain: A Review of the Evidence Base* (Cole and Reeve 2001) – as part of early NDC evaluation work, this report was produced to summarise the evidence for interventions relating to housing (similar evidence bases were produced for education, health, crime and worklessness). The report covers the issues of tackling low demand and empty houses, tackling anti-social behavior, housing investment and housing management.
- *New Deal for Communities: The Programme Wide Annual Report 2003/04 (CRESR 2004)* describes progress in the 39 NDC areas as part of the overall NDC evaluation with a focus on the systems and structures required to implement change.
- *Local Neighborhood Renewal Strategies: Document Analysis and Review* (ODPM 2004c) – reviews progress in developing local neighbourhood renewal strategies in each of the 88 deprived areas.
- *2002/3 Progress Report on Local Strategic Partnerships in Neighborhood Renewal Fund areas* (ODPM 2004a) – reviews progress in the setting up of LSPs and outlines how they are functioning.
- *Neighborhood Management and the future of urban areas* (Power 2004) – describes the concept of neighbourhood management, illustrates this with 7 case studies, provides an analysis of what works in practice, and includes an assessment of costs and benefits of neighbourhood management.
- *Making connections: An evaluation of the Community Participation Programmes* (ODPM 2005b) – an evaluation of the three initiatives set up as part of the NSNR to encourage community participation in decision making .
- *Housing market renewal* (AC 2005) – an Audit Commission report reviewing early progress on the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder initiative.
- *Early development of the Housing Market Renewal programme* (JRF 2004) – a Joseph Rowntree Foundation report reviewing progress on the Housing Market Renewal pathfinders.

In addition, to these reports there are a large number of reports focusing on the other targets in the NSNR (i.e. health, education, crime, employment) on the NDC evaluation website and neighbourhood renewal website.

A report reviewing progress towards the NSNR (ODPM 2005c) shows that progress has been made in the 88 neighbourhood renewal fund areas in closing the gaps between their performance and the national average across a wide range of criteria. Best practice examples are also provided which show how renewal is working in action on the ground in selected areas.

The same report reports that the NDC programme is leading to improved and often unprecedented levels of partnership building, community engagement and inter-agency working. Findings from recent household surveys in NDC areas shows people saying their areas are improving (from 60-66% fairly or very satisfied), they are less worried about crime and social and community cohesion is growing.



## Community Renewal in the Rest of the United Kingdom

Housing and urban regeneration policy were areas that devolved in 1998 to the new decision making bodies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (Muir 2004a). Prior to devolution, Wales at least, had experienced only a limited degree of administrative independence from England (WAG 2004). Muir (2004) suggests that the period of devolution since 1998 has seen a convergence in urban regeneration policy with all four jurisdictions having a similar policy framework (based on the England's National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal) (Muir 2004a).

A review of the relevant documentation shows that each region has a context very similar to that in England, i.e. a similar proportion of social housing (18-22%) to England and a similar mix of RSLs and local authority providers of social housing.

In Scotland there are a growing number of RSLs (in the hundreds) but local authorities still provide more than half of social housing, although there are moves to transfer stock to social landlords as in England.

In Wales, the majority of social housing stock is still held by local authorities with RSLs owning 25% of social housing stock. There is consideration being given at present as to which model of ownership (other than local authorities who are financially constrained from upgrading their stock) would work best for Wales social housing stock (WAG 2004).

In Northern Ireland the majority of social housing stock is owned and managed by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive with a small number of RSLs managing 17% of the social housing stock.

In Scotland the '*Better Communities in Scotland. Closing the Gap*' is the Scottish executive's community regeneration statement (SE 2002). It outlines the role of new community planning partnerships (taking over from existing social exclusion partnerships) in delivering joined up solutions, the importance of making core public services as effective as possible in deprived areas as well as targeted regeneration funding, and building up social capital through community learning and development.

In Wales the '*Communities First Guidance*' document issued by the Communities Directorate, National Assembly for Wales in 2001 (CDNAW 2001) outlines similar advice.

In Northern Ireland the Department of Social Development issued '*People and Place: A Strategy for Neighborhood Renewal*' in 2003. The strategy is designed to promote joined-up working across government via local strategy partnerships and includes targets covering community involvement, work and worklessness, qualifications, skills and training, health, educational attainment, crime and safety, income and benefit dependency and physical development and satisfaction with area and housing. This policy has built on past learning and includes:

- because physical development, community and social regeneration schemes have not always been integrated, a lot of urban regeneration activity has been short-term project focused, and has not always had the desired impact in terms of promoting social inclusion;
- effective regeneration requires joined-up delivery by the public sector;
- schemes and projects that have the greatest impact on the quality of life address a range of economic, social, physical and community issues and actively involve target communities; and

- the short-term project-led approach must be replaced over time by a long-term needs and programme-based approach (DSD 2004/5).

Each of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland also have their version of a Decent Homes standard which social housing providers are focused on working towards, as their part in the overall renewal agenda (WAG 2004), (Scotland 2003), (NIHE 2005). In Scotland this extends to ensuring that all social homes have central heating systems and good standards of insulation (Scotland 2003).

A national evaluation was carried out of nine former regeneration programmes in Scotland in 2001 (SECRU 2001). It concluded that:

- The programmes were funded to a level of 65 pounds per annum per resident in the areas for each of 5 years.
- The activities of the individual projects generated a significant range of different types of outputs or benefits which can be expected to have helped reduce the extent of social exclusion.
- Partnership working has brought considerable benefits that would not otherwise have been obtained. While co-ordination in an information-sharing sense was realized, there was less evidence of co-ordination in terms of holistic or integrated regeneration (due to the fragmentation of the areas to be covered by the regeneration and the desire to see something happening in each area).
- There was active involvement of the voluntary sector, however the level of community involvement varied considerably.

## Appendix II - Community Renewal in Ireland and Canada

### Overview of the literature

The literature review revealed some references to community renewal initiatives and related housing issues in Ireland and Canada. However, this information was not relevant enough to New Zealand, or complete enough to add up to a comprehensive understanding of community renewal in those countries. There were no reported comprehensive evaluations of community renewal initiatives that contributed further insights into what works or lessons learnt towards the aims of this study.

### Canada

The small amount of Canadian literature relating to community renewal relates to collaboration; '*Inclusive Cities: A Cross-Canada civic collaborative initiative*' to strengthen the capacity of cities and to create and sustain inclusive communities for the mutual benefit of all people (Maxwell, Edward and Salole 2005; Panel 2005a; Panel 2005b; Panel 2005c) and descriptions of particular initiatives (GHKI 2002; Sousa and Quarter 2005). This literature did not provide a comprehensive enough picture of how the housing market works at a national or province level, or relevant detailed evaluative information on community renewal type initiatives to be able to draw useful comparisons with the New Zealand Community Renewal programme.

Two interesting articles on aspects of Toronto, Ontario based initiatives are briefly mentioned here. Canadian Government owned and operated public housing was the main form of non-market housing until the 1970s. But these became increasingly expensive to maintain and build, and developed into urban ghettos with social dysfunction problems related to the concentration of low income families. As a result, the federal government redefined its role, establishing the formation of community-government partnerships, which led to the development of the social housing models, based on smaller housing communities with mixed income. The development of various non-market models of social housing in Canada is discussed in the introductory section of a recent article focusing on tenant-managed housing co-operatives in Toronto, Ontario (Sousa and Quarter 2005).

Resident relocation strategies are covered in a report on the Regent Park Revitalization Study (GHKI 2002). Issues discussed include: resident involvement; consultation; staged approaches for effective relocation; ongoing social impact assessment; ways of facilitating effective relocation; special consideration needed for elderly and disabled residents; the importance of having a relocation team on site; and noting the unlikelihood of the private rental market to provide many relocation possibilities in the context described.

### Ireland

Two Irish papers emerged specifically relating to public participation and the representation of local interests in area-based urban regeneration programmes (Muir 2004b; Muir 2004c).

## Appendix IV – Synthesis of international literature evaluating Community Renewal

### Overview of the International Literature Evaluating Community Renewal

This appendix provides an overview of each of the references evaluating social housing urban renewal initiatives internationally, both in terms of what works and constraints to success. The focus is on research and evaluation from Australia and England, which are the most applicable to the New Zealand context.

#### Contextualising the evaluative findings

The relevance and weighting of the information from the various sources in this section needs some introduction. We have attempted to assist readers' ability to assess the usefulness and validity of the information to the New Zealand situation by including the date, author, research method, and original purpose for which each document was written with the key findings.

The date of the evaluation is relevant in terms of what the focus of community renewal initiative was in that country at that time, and how far through implementation they were. Who commissioned the report and who conducted the research (e.g. community themselves, specialist housing research centre, government department housing or other, commercial organization, local government agency) indicates the independence or particular perspective the report comes from (e.g. economic from government or private funder perspectives, community or residents' point of view, housing associations, research case studies on particular components of CR). The political context at the time is also relevant, but is not described in detail here. What a CR programme was 'facing' in terms of potential future policies / funding options (e.g. private/public partnerships) and pending decisions could have contributed to emphasis on particular issues surrounding or within community renewal.

#### Overall lessons learnt

##### NZ lessons learnt to date

Overall lessons learnt from the NZ situation are set out in the *Community Renewal Project Evaluations: Synthesis and Discussion of Findings* (HNZC 2004c) and the *Transition Plan for Community Renewal Projects draft document* (HNZC 2005k).

Themes from the process evaluations of the individual projects were:

- Impact of community dynamics – require strong relationship management skills in order to successfully “manoeuvre” through different community interests and maintain effective relationships with all parties;
- Building trust and credibility in the community – assisted by undertaking activities that make a visible difference in communities;

- Implications of community process – flexible processes and timeframes are required in order to encourage and be responsive to community participation;
- Participation of other agencies and organizations - all of government approach at the operational “coal face” in the community , and at management and policy levels, It also relies heavily on Project Teams’ skills in networking, facilitation, and collaboration; and
- Achievement of community renewal objectives – the need to take into account : HNZC’s ability to directly influence achievement; the length of time required; the intent of collaboration with other agencies required; and the incremental nature associated with the achievement of some of the objectives.

The former manager of the Community Renewal programme (Parsons) has noted that the partnership lessons learnt to date are:

- Agencies cannot expect to dictate the timeframe for change in the community;
- Nothing changes until mutual trust is established;
- Progress is built on the one-to-one relationships established and maintained;
- Actions speak louder than words – delivery must match expectations;
- Communities are very complex;
- Consultation is a dynamic process;
- Take small steps rather than giant leaps;
- Be prepared to account for your actions; and
- Be accessible – place the project team and office in the heart of the community (HNZC 2005k).

### Lessons from UK policies over 25 years

#### Perspective: Public Agency (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)

Evaluation of English initiatives is discussed in a 2005 report from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister entitled '*Evaluation of English Housing Policy 1975-2000: Theme three: Housing Quality and Neighbourhood Quality*'. Key findings are summarized below.

'Most commentators agree that the main problems in poor quality council-built neighbourhoods derive from two sources – most importantly labour market employment levels, secondly the 'role of the housing system in translating labour market derived inequalities into spatial concentrations of poverty'. Poor quality neighbourhoods are invariably those where poverty is high and where people have suffered the 'sharp end' of social and economic change. Public services have typically not been able to cope adequately with the consequences of concentrated poverty' (ODPM 2005a).

'Evaluating the impacts of housing policy on neighbourhood quality raises significant problems. A review of the evidence base for regeneration showed that much of it is partial, lacked rigour, was unable to tell who benefited from interventions, and usually did not indicate what works and why'. 'Most of the evaluations of individual programmes'.... 'are positive at least in the short term, however, evidence falls short that they have had a positive effect in the long run or have done anything permanent to improve the conjoined social, economic and housing problems they have tried to address' (ODPM 2005a).

On the evidence base relating specifically to housing and the physical environment:

- '[A]lthough there is virtually universal agreement that localized housing management can bring a wide range of benefits, there is little concrete evidence to demonstrate this'.

- '[W]ith respect to physical improvements to the housing stock'... 'although many programmes have been evaluated as successful at the basic level (i.e. spending money led to better houses and more satisfied tenants) there is little evidence of the impacts of investment in the longer term, or on the impacts of investment in the wider urban context' (Cole and Reeves in ODPM 2005a).

Endorsement is given in this report to Evans' critical pointers towards successful regeneration:

- Housing improvement as part of a well considered, multifaceted strategy involving a range of agencies;
- Implementation of physical improvements along with high standards of housing management;
- Effective partnership between agencies, and a willingness of social landlords to look beyond the traditional housing role; and
- Strategies which look beyond the present, and consider how regeneration is to be made sustainable in the face of withdrawal of special regeneration funding and possible changes in the housing market (Evans in ODPM 2005a).

More than 20 years of UK policy initiatives 'have not resolved the complex problems that exist in these neighbourhoods', associated with high levels of poverty, social and economic deprivation and low levels of satisfaction. Also, 'it seems probable (but there is no evidence) that, without the initiatives, the neighbourhoods would be in a worse state now'. The problems of low demand, poor housing, a poor environment and multiple social problems are exactly the same as they were. At best what has been achieved is 'perhaps adequate management of the worst problems rather than a 'turn around'. Reasons given for this were:

- Regeneration efforts had to struggle in context of adverse economic change in UK through most of 1980s and 1990s;
- Most initiatives were partial in their coverage or designed as experiments whose lessons were intended to filter down to policy makers at a local level; and
- 'The budgets for most of them ...were small in relation to the overall scale of public spending within the neighbourhood they were aimed at.'
- 'Programmes and policies were usually 'initiatives' which had little substantial foundation in theory or from good evaluation' (ODPM 2005a).

However a lot has been learned about regeneration and joining neighbourhood renewal with housing policy is welcomed; joined up solutions to what have been diagnosed as joined up problems. Also, improved evaluation and collection and collation of routine information will provide better evidence of what is being achieved (ODPM 2005a).

### **Perspectives from UK from over sixty research projects**

#### **Perspective: Social Policy Research Charity (Joseph Rowntree Foundation)**

A Joseph Rowntree Foundation report, which summarized over 60 JRF research projects into area regeneration programme, was produced in 2000. Key conclusions are summarized in 'steps which could lead towards the elusive goal of sustainable regeneration' (JRF 2000):

- Understand urban disadvantage – 'Housing allocations and the standard of other services, particularly education, cement into place processes of social exclusion. These are worst in industrial cities but exist even in prosperous ones'.

- Developing innovative partnerships – ‘These should be driven by productive, honest relationships among stakeholders, including local residents. Strong leadership is vital. But there are problems of ‘partnership proliferation’ . It is time to rationalize partnerships so that joined – up policies are delivered by joined-up organisations. Local Strategic Partnerships / Social Inclusion Partnerships could play this role, backed by a harmonized funding system. Regeneration should be driven by long-term strategy: this requires new skills in building up participation and consensus’.
- Empowering neighbourhoods – ‘Area regeneration requires continued local government modernization, linked to neighbourhood management. The building blocks are: new local governance structures, community development, experimentation, joined-up service delivery, flexible work practices, and a supportive local authority. Community planning presents the possibility of both improved social inclusion and better local democracy, linking councillors and communities in a common agenda’.
- Enabling city-wide and regional strategies – urban development and regeneration are the same task in many cities – regions. ‘A single strategic partnership working for effective governance is the way forward. This might mean partnerships of a number of local authorities, requiring additional organizational resources. The emerging pattern of regional governance needs more clarity of purpose between different agencies, and more sophisticated development strategies, geared to the requirements of each region’.
- A national plan for cities and regions – this should set out the ‘vision for quality of life’ in urban areas. It would ‘enable the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal to have maximum impact’.

### **Sustainable neighbourhoods study**

**Perspective: United Kingdom Social Policy Research Charity Academic Researchers (Joseph Rowntree Foundation)**

A large scale UK study (JRF 2005b) (Green, Grimsley and Stafford 2005) drawing on household surveys in 2000 and 2002/03, supplementary surveys, qualitative research, and economic activity tables over a 20 year period, focused on what characteristics of neighbourhoods are key to sustainability and how sustainability is affected by population movements. Findings included:

- There is a strong relationship between neighbourhood assets and neighbourhood wellbeing. Social assets – trust, safety, reciprocity – are the most important, followed by the quality of the housing stock and that of the neighbourhood environment.
- Sustainable regeneration requires investment which strengthens social capital and improves the environment, along with housing investment for owner occupation. Neighbourhood regeneration also requires a consistent sub-regional housing policy.

### **Evaluation of Australian State-Level Community Renewal Programme**

**Perspective: Queensland Government Evaluation (Cross Governmental Research Team led by Department of the Premier and Cabinet)**

An evaluation of the Queensland Community Renewal activities for the period from its commencement in September 1998 to June 2001 is summarized in a December 2001 report

(QGDoh 2001b). This report aimed to balance adopting both formative and summative approaches; so providing future direction and assessing achievements to date. A very brief overview of some key findings on programme effectiveness from this highly relevant report are summarized below.

Program Objective	Key Evaluation Findings on Program Effectiveness
Improve the safety and security of people and property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, the contribution of community renewal to community safety and crime prevention has been limited</li> </ul>
Better integrate socially and economically disadvantaged residents into broader community and economic networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult to determine contribution of community renewal to social integration</li> <li>'Some communities are better integrated into surrounding areas than others' on integrating infrastructure' (presumably component of economic integration)</li> </ul>
Ensure accessibility of residents to community services and facilities they require	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to services varies considerably in the 12 renewal areas.</li> <li>Issues about adequacy and quality of services raised</li> <li>Difficult to determine community renewal effects due to lack of systematic monitoring</li> <li>Observations made on contribution of community renewal to provision and access to some services, although approach has been ad hoc</li> </ul>
Strengthen and expand opportunities for young people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively low levels of engagement of young people</li> <li>Overall CR is failing to develop a sufficiently integrated response to the needs of young people, especially those most at risk</li> </ul>
Improve neighbourhood amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Varies between areas, especially in relation to access to services and facilities - 50% of CR project funds (AUD \$17.4m) spent on neighbourhood amenity projects</li> <li>A number of positive impacts including improved use of and access to local parks and facilities, boosting local pride and morale, signaling govt interest, providing a catalyst for partnerships and lifting employment</li> </ul>
Ensure public expenditure is directed to projects and activities which will have lasting and positive impacts on the communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability (of service delivery initiatives, of capital works and facilities, of community capacity) raised as a major issue by stakeholders</li> <li>'The single most challenging issue in achieving sustainability in CR is that of integrating with other agencies across government in relation to budget and funding arrangements.' Some degree of integration was achieved.</li> </ul>
Make the communities central to achieving program objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key mechanisms are Community Reference Groups (CRGs) and these are 'generally not reflective of the broader community' and are 'drawing on those who are already 'engaged' through their involvement in other groups and activities.'</li> <li>Issues that need to be addressed include: knowledge and leadership development, skills development, information and communication, and practical assistance to participate.</li> </ul>

### Article exploring Australian State-Level Regeneration with Public-Private Mix

In a 2002 report exploring implications for Victoria in building community sustainability within the context of a public-private mix, Australian and international research on community regeneration within public housing development was reviewed. Requirements for successful redevelopment were identified as being 'similar to those for sustainable communities, with a need to attend simultaneously to economic, social and environmental development. Public housing redevelopment presents particular challenges requiring careful attention to design and surroundings, services and facilities, management and safety. Equally important are the tasks of confronting social exclusion and poverty. Building community empowerment, cohesiveness and problem-solving capacity require both initial effort and ongoing investment because of the impacts of disadvantage and resident mobility (Hoatson and Grace 2002).



## **Learning from Australian Community Renewal Initiative in NSW Perspective: Government Agency and Housing Trust Research (led by academic housing researchers)**

Issues for consideration based on working on (but not fully evaluating) the NSW Waterloo project were identified in a 2000 report as:

- 'Successful place management requires a more substantial 'whole of government' approach, with more equal commitment from key government agencies and local service providers and pooling of resources if it is to address the complex needs of a highly disadvantaged community.
- Successful community participation requires not only appropriate structures, but also a relationship of trust, development of skills tangible outcomes for residents, and good communication and continuity throughout the planning and implementation phases of projects. This suggests that priority should be given to training both housing management personnel and tenants to improve skills.
- Good integration between physical, management and social strategies for neighbourhood renewal is important to improve outcomes for tenants, but not always easy to achieve, given the demands of funding and the differing management structures and cultures of the various stakeholders.
- Universities can play a useful role in the development of asset and non-asset regeneration initiatives as 'neutral players' and 'honest brokers' between tenants, the department and other agencies. Cross-disciplinary collaboration, research and exploration of ideas can inform regeneration practice and policy development, to the mutual benefit of tenants and the department.
- The issue of breaking up the large estates through asset disposal, stock trading and transfers to the community housing sector remains controversial amongst residents and community workers. There is concern that this will not result in a reduction of inner city low income housing stock, but will reduce the potential for developing cohesive communities through regeneration, community development and improved housing management strategies – exacerbated by increasing concentrations of tenants with high support needs' (Randolph and Judd 2000a).

## **Perspectives on an Australian Community Renewal Initiative Perspective: Social Services Agency opinion**

Lessons learnt from Villawood included:

- Urban renewal requires a focus on current as well as future residents;
- Perseverance – urban renewal takes time;
- People are easily disheartened by the delay between consultation(s) and change therefore: good communication strategy, break down change into bite size pieces, plan and deliver some early successes, keep pressure on for improvements;
- Genuine community participation requires commitment and creativity;
- Social sustainability is often still the poor cousin to environmental and economic outcomes – strong champions are essential;
- "Place making" requires more than good town planning and traffic management;

- Social sustainability requires more than facilities and human services – building social capital; and
- Effective partnerships: start with good relationships between people, built on trust and common goals, need to be resilient and therefore require good relationships between organizations (SSURHS 2004).

### **Research by NSW Federation of Housing Associations**

#### **Perspective: NSW Dept of Housing funded research with CR practitioners and social housing providers**

Overall community renewal success factors, identified in *The Role of Community Housing in Strengthening Communities* (Corporation 2001) include: 'dedicated funding, sufficient timeframes, good communication with partners, vision of what is to be achieved, meaningful community involvement, commitment from "higher up", skills and resources, responsiveness to local needs. Three were identified as most important (to the extent that it was stated that 'without these, factors, community renewal initiatives are likely to fail'):

- Dedicated funding;
- Meaningful community involvement; and
- Commitment from "higher up".

### **Participation from tenants and community groups**

#### **Perspective: Government funded academic housing specialist researchers**

*Resident Participation – framing the vision* examines courses of action taken that aim to increase residents' access to decision-making processes in two Australian regeneration projects: Manoorra and The Parks. 'The lessons of the international research are that without active involvement of residents in regeneration, policy measure are likely to fail and in doing so reinforce any existing sense of powerlessness in disadvantaged communities. Hence, in order to develop successful projects, collaborative approaches with respect for the ideas of the communities should be encouraged. The challenge for housing authorities and other implementing community regeneration projects is to find out how best to facilitate and support resident participation (Arthurson 2003).'

Conclusions in terms of implications in practical terms on involving local communities in the processes of estate / community regeneration efforts include:

- Housing authorities have an important role to play in facilitating resident participant in regeneration. 'Greater benefit comes from a mixture of top down from government and bottom-up from community approaches to regeneration. The success of bottom-up processes relies on government provision of positions, structures and sufficient time to support residents to participate and develop confidence'.
- Creation of an 'environment where residents can observe their suggestions being put into practice'.
- Emerging public-private sector partnership approaches to regeneration make housing authorities attempts to involve residents in regeneration 'more difficult'. 'Commercial-in-confidence and other clauses necessitates by such partnerships increase the complexity of facilitating resident involvement.' 'The preoccupation with efficiency defined in economic

terms is in conflict with the social goal of participation, in terms of being too delaying and unpredictable and at odds with achieving increasingly more efficient public administration.'

- There is a need to 'rethink the level of private sector involvement and control over projects in estate regeneration and further moves to privatize the public sector. Advancing these directions will make it even more difficult for governments to achieve social justice goals such as community participant in regeneration.'
- Housing authorities and other agencies need to be 'clearer about defining the principles they are supporting' such as 'sustainability', and 'rights and obligations' (Arthurson 2003).

A 2002 AHURI report *Resident participation in urban and community renewal* describes a qualitative study of six community renewal initiatives in three states; NSW, Queensland, and SA and identifies implications for good practice including (p vii-ix):

- Community development – promoting the development of individuals and groups as a means of enabling them to have more control over their collective situation, skilled community workers working with members of the community towards meeting their needs;
- Starting with the people – involving local people from the outset, before any significant action taken;
- Building on local activism – identifying and working with the most representative and open groups, facilitating and encouraging democratic practices and the widest possible involvement of local residents;
- Reaching other groups – go beyond previous / existing groups and make specific efforts to include ethnic minority groups;
- Early visible success – 'getting things done' is an important way of keeping people involved and preventing the development of skepticism;
- Local resources – local presence for renewal professionals, resourcing community development through local community centres and neighbourhood houses;
- Training – early and adequate training of community representatives and renewal professionals;
- Congenial structures – ensuring structures and processes are congenial to residents , e.g. use of small group techniques;
- Devolving power – giving residents choice over their level of involvement, opportunities for decision making;
- Actual influence – acting on the views expressed by local people, 'getting results';
- Regular and clear communication – maintaining adequate levels of communication once structures and processes put in place, and ensuring any materials (e.g. letters, newsletters) accessible to local population;
- Change in culture – bureaucrats need to get used to involving clients in decision making processes – not resist this (change from 'command and control' culture);
- Need for monitoring and evaluation – community involvement in monitoring and evaluation – formal mechanisms for ongoing feedback on the success of otherwise of initiatives; and
- Time and resources - long term, adequate resourcing (Wood 2002b).

## Perspective: Government funded academic housing specialist researchers

*Resident Participation, Social Cohesion and Sustainability in Neighbourhood Renewal: Developing Best Practice Models* includes lessons learnt, based on detailed case studies in three states (NSW, Qld, and SA) which are:

- the importance of goodwill among agencies;
- councils and communities to engage in the renewal processes;
- the importance of recognizing and building upon existing community strengths and achievements; and
- the significance of good planning of local area plans and community action plans for 'Community Renewal' (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

Despite the universal endorsement, however, most independent critiques of the regeneration process have questioned the extent to which local people have genuinely been involved. It was consistently asserted that involvement was inadequately funded and that unrealistic time-scales militated against local participation (Stewart and Taylor, 1995; Hastings et al, 1996; Geddes, 1997 in (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002)).

Furthermore, Wood (2000) has argued that programmes often fail to recognise the previous life experiences that cause disaffection, on the one hand, and a range of practical barriers that 'prevent local people from getting involved or obfuscate those that do', on the other (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

It is the consensus of a growing body of UK research that considerable amounts of time and resources are needed to allow participants to develop skills and gain the confidence that they require to participate in renewal initiatives. There is also considerable stress on the importance of involving local people at the outset: at the planning rather than the implementation stage. If communities are excluded at the beginning of regeneration programmes, then, it is argued, there is a serious danger that the wrong issues will be prioritized and resources misdirected or wasted (Duncan and Thomas, 2000). This has prompted commentators to point back to the lessons learned by earlier community development approaches, which started by working with people to identify what they believe to be the problems or issues that need tackling (Wood, 2000). It is also suggested that a lack of attention to principles of equal opportunities may further alienate many. In particular, this can lead to the exclusion of women and non-white residents (Brownill and Darke, 1988). It has also been demonstrated that the short-term nature of many regeneration initiatives has significantly restricted opportunities for participation (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

Community development emerges as the most significant factor in ensuring the genuine involvement of the community in regeneration, with the primary tasks for workers in the regeneration process described as working with the community to identify priorities, develop a community vision or plan, establish consultative and participatory structures and implement a comprehensive programme of support and resources for community-based activity and projects through a capacity building plan (Duncan and Thomas, 2000). This is a long-term process that requires:

- Considerable experience of facilitating group development;
- A strong commitment to equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory practice;
- High levels of inter-personal skills;
- An ability to support and encourage learning;
- A good understanding of local government policy and practice;

- A keen political awareness (Wood, 2000); and
- Training is also identified as central to the process of involving communities in regeneration (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

### **Perspective: Government agency evaluation by academic housing researchers**

The evaluation of the NSW Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) 1995-1999 conducted by Randolph et al (2001) considered the role of tenants participation in urban renewal and concluded that 'consultation was considered critical to the success of the NIP by both stakeholders and tenants, and was one of the major innovations in housing management approach that the NIP help introduce in NSW. In practice the participation strategies on the NIP estates were often criticized:

- only involving tenants in limited decisions;
- tenants played little or no role in planning or determining priorities or the initial planning phases;
- the level of consultation declined after an initial high profile phase had passed; and
- the level of involvement of tenants on the NIP process was highly variable, with a relatively small core of active tenants (Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002).

### **Perspective: Government agency policy**

*Building Partnerships: Transforming Estates Into Communities* is a NSW State Government document (NSWDoH 1999) describes how 'the department has found a range of strategies work in different estates', but two common elements which community renewal approaches must include are:

- 'involving residents in decision making' - can take various forms including Neighbourhood Advisory Boards as an ongoing link between service providers and tenants, workshops as a way to explore specific issues, and recognized points of liaison between tenants and staff, such as regular meetings; and
- 'improving tenancy management and allocation practices' such as the development of local allocation policies and tenant involvement in managing estate issues. Client service staff need to be visible and active on estates, responding quickly to problems and communicating regularly with tenants (NSWDoH 1999).

## **Linkages between central and local government agencies**

### **Perspective: Government Evaluation (Cross Governmental Research Team led by State Department of the Premier and Cabinet)**

Key findings in the 2001 Queensland Community Renewal Evaluation (QGDoH 2001b) on governance and management arrangements included:

- A complex and overlapping set of governance and management arrangements has evolved to support the implementation of the programme.
- The most serious impediment to the effective governance of CR is the absence of a central mechanism to coordinate the involvement of other state government agencies. A senior-level planning and resource allocation group is needed to support the implementation and to foster a broader base of accountability within government.

- A key challenge for governance is to get communities to work cohesively, departments to operate collaboratively, and both sectors to cooperate as partners in implementation.
- Governance issues relate to: no mechanism at central or head office level, no mechanisms for shared accountability across state and local government agencies, unclear mandates of managers, stakeholders' and networks' roles and responsibilities unclear, weak connections with other sectors, skills and capacities for working in partnership have varied.

## Other structural issues

### Perspective: Australian academic housing specialist researcher

In a 2004 article *Urban Renewal : A New Role for Social Housing Providers in Creating Sustainable Communities* (Randolph 2004) Randolph refers to a clear need for social housing, but suggests that the 'vehicles to generate the changes are unlikely to be state housing authorities'. He cites overseas experience which shows that 'with judicious intervention and targeted subsidies, community renewal in disadvantaged private housing markets can be assisted through properly funded and planned affordable housing investment programs'. And he refers to 'clear lessons' from US Community Development Corporations and UK Housing Associations, namely:

- locally based and independent non-profit agencies work best at addressing housing problems in a complex and fragmented housing market; and
- the case for a properly supported non-profit and independent affordable housing sector is compelling, on ground of diversity, innovation and good practice, and to provide a vehicle to assist in the renewal of communities where social disadvantage is piling up.

He suggests that policy options for a framework for renewing most disadvantaged urban communities would involve:

- housing, planning, and integrated social interventions all coming together;
- need to stimulate reinvestment in lower value areas;
- share risk so that private sector participation can be achieved;
- aim for a local middle income market to help bind the community, slow turnover of population, and improve housing stock at the same time; and
- develop new market priced and affordable housing options (Randolph 2004)

To effectively launch such solutions, the following would need to occur:

- integrated renewal strategy as part of local planning process – link land use and social/economic interventions;
- renewal area master plan developed by councils, local government more proactive in determining the kinds of communities it wants in its area;
- new form of local agency to bring resources and actors together – e.g. Urban Renewal Corporation or Trusts;
- resources – public investment in partnership with private sector, with funding/grants coordinated to support and add value to each other;
- affordable housing strategies – appropriate funding mechanisms to intervene in housing markets and provide at least some support for new affordable housing supply (Randolph 2004).

### **Perspective: Australian Housing Case Study Research including International Literature Review by Urban Economics & Planning Consultants**

Lessons for Australia from the UK experience. A 2000 Australian Housing Research Fund report (AHRF 2000) includes a literature review of public housing estate renewal in the United Kingdom, and applies these to the Australian context, suggesting that Australian policy should reflect an awareness of the issues which Britain had highlighted as having been learned from their past practice in public housing provision. (At that time, (AHRF 2000) the report notes that the UK had highlighted a need for a cross-sectoral approach to housing problems that are associated with areas of concentrated social disadvantage, but that there had been insufficient time to evaluate the effectiveness of the models talked about.) The United Kingdom's 'lesson's learnt' included:

- 'mainstream housing policy has failed to make any lasting, positive impacts on social disadvantage;
- public spending is aimed at addressing symptoms and not causes; verticality of government is restrictive creating a lack of joint, cross-sectoral approaches to funding and policy;
- local co-operation at government level is limited, and the success of vertical government partnerships is questionable;
- fragmentation and disunity of a broad range of programs;
- too many rules create inflexibility;
- emphasis placed too heavily on physical and not social policy; and
- area – specific approaches are not integrated with each other' (AHRF 2000).

### **Perspective: Australian academic / planner / government specialist in land and housing development**

A business case approach to decision making around neighbourhood renewal is set out in a 2004 article *Prioritising Public Housing Estate Renewal Projects: A Business Case Approach*. It discusses the 'range of financial beneficiaries within government, beyond the public housing authority itself' who need to know the commercial viability implications of the project, and wider social, economic and environmental implications'. Steps in decision making for such an approach are given, which are :

- define the project area and the reasons for the estate improvement proposal;
- specify the financial business case;
- describe the estate improvement plan (vision, implementation, budget);
- financial projection assuming full implementation of the improvement plan;
- appraisal of external or non-commercial costs and benefits; and
- evaluation of financial economic performance of the estate improvement proposal (Spiller 2004).

### **Perspective: State government housing agency funded Federation of Housing Associations case study research**

*The Role of Community Housing in Strengthening Communities* (NSWLHC 2001) aims to identify the inherent strengths of community housing organisations to meet some of the challenges that community renewal brings and to contribute to the Department of Housing's community renewal goals' includes sections on community renewal ownership and management models and potential funding mechanisms for funding community renewal projects.

## Tenure mix and public housing levels and stock concentrations

### Perspective: Australian academic housing specialist researcher

In *A Balancing Act: Tenure Diversification in Australia and Britain* the claim that tenure diversification on public housing estates helps to create a healthy social mix and leads to the establishment of balanced communities is discussed. The strategy is described as reinforcing 'the strategy of sale and transfer of stock in neighbourhood regeneration over the last decade in both Australia and the UK' (initially based on asset management rationale, more recently justified on the basis that they assist in the prevention of a range of socio-economic problems at the level of the neighbourhood). 'However, early evidence in both contexts questions the effectiveness of the strategy'. 'There is a lack of empirical evidence in support of the practice and a series of conceptual problems for those within to test its validity' (Wood 2002a).

### Perspective: Australian academic housing specialist researcher

In *Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix* describes two major ideas emerging from South Australia and Queensland. These are, firstly, that lowering concentrations of public housing and developing more mixed income communities offers a means to reconnect socially excluded public housing tenants to mainstream society. Secondly, that a balanced social mix is a prerequisite for the development of 'inclusive', 'sustainable' and 'cohesive' communities. 'However there is no evidence that a balanced social mix is a necessary condition for building inclusive communities. Coupled with the findings in projects of inadvertent negative consequences of implementing social mix policies, the question of whether there is an over-emphasis by policy makers on the extent to which social mix assists regeneration is raised' (Arthurson 2002b).

From a series of case studies, the report (Arthurson 2002b) concludes: empirical findings question whether in some States too much emphasis is being placed on large-scale changes to social mix as a means to assist regeneration and address inequality. Case study analysis finds no evidence that a varied social mix is a prerequisite for the development of cohesive communities.

'The Waterloo project illustrates an alternative to regeneration that targets all aspects of regeneration, whether it is employment, physical changes to the housing and resident participation strategies to existing residents in situ. Waterloo shows how regeneration can proceed without substantial social disruption. The supply of public housing is maintained, tenants not permanently relocated or dispersed to other areas and negative impacts on existing communities and public housing waiting lists are avoided. For these reasons, it seems more satisfactory, wherever possible, to address socioeconomic deprivation in situ (Arthurson 2002b).

### Perspective: academic housing specialist researchers

The issue of there being less public housing as a result of renewal is addressed in *Conceptualising social inclusion in estate regeneration policy: what part does public housing play?* (Arthurson 2004b) 'Continuing current directions in regeneration will confine more socio-economically disadvantaged people to private rental for longer periods of time or prevent them from ever gaining access to public housing and the greater benefits it offers. It is difficult to reconcile these actions with social inclusion and regenerating communities when the end result will be poverty for more individuals and greater exclusion in the economic spheres of society. '[C]ommunity regeneration activities, at least in NSW,



Qld, SA are assisting in the demise of public housing'. '[E]very 3 to 3.5 public housing sales provides only enough funding to purchase one new replacement dwelling'(Arthurson 2004b).

### **Perspective: academic housing specialist researchers**

In *Social Inclusion and Community Regeneration: Is the role of public housing excluded?* Arthurson had discussed this same issue. 'Research findings which show that the aspirations of housing authorities and their regeneration partners to increase social inclusion through regeneration are at odds with ongoing reductions in public housing numbers. Clearly, individuals become socially excluded through not having access to secure, affordable, low cost housing and in this respect public housing is a fundamental need '(with low cost housing in the private rental market in decline) (Arthurson 2002a).

### **Perspective: Australian Housing Case Study Research including International Literature Review by Urban Economics & Planning Consultants**

A 1999 consultant's report with an economic focus, with the aims of: improving the collective knowledge of the Australian experience of public housing estate renewal; developing a cost benefit evaluation methodology for assessing the social and economic impact of projects; and identifying other areas of useful further research noted the following themes:

- Obsolescence and unsuitability of housing for current needs is more often the trigger for renewal. Closely related to this is the perception of social dysfunction. Most cases look at asset renewal, but there are examples of combined community renewal approaches. In some instances there is a desire to reduce the presence of public rental in an area.
- There is an emerging concern that while the reductions of the public rental presence have resulted in a better outcome for the public rental tenants who remain, there may be costs imposed on relocated tenants and on those waiting for accommodation in the area. The social costs of accommodating fewer households in the area where this occurs are not always fully recognized in evaluations.
- 'Anecdotal evidence suggests that most projects are highly successful where significant improvements in housing standards and neighbourhood amenity occur and where the public rental presence is considered to be at an appropriate level'.
- 'The literature tends to focus on the concept of social disadvantage and the need for a more holistic approach to addressing these problems, the fostering of partnerships and the need for monitoring and evaluation. The case studies have confirmed that these aspects are addressed unevenly across the nation and there are no examples of a single exemplary model' (AHRF 2000).

## **Anti-social behaviour and crime prevention**

### **Anti-social behaviour and crime prevention**

#### **Perspective: Government funded academic housing specialist researchers**

A best practice model and policy implications for crime prevention in areas of public housing concentration is set out in a 2004 AHURI report *Linkages Between Housing, Policing and Other Interventions for Crime and Harassment Reduction in Areas with Public Housing Concentrations*

(Samuels et al. 2004). This research is based on research in three states NSW, QLD, SA (although specific CR initiatives are not named). Best practices is described as:

- 'A broad whole-of-government, place management approach involving housing, police, local government and a wide range of other government agencies.
- Extensive community consultation and participant in problem identification, development and implementation of strategies.
- Integrated initiatives targeting: early intervention, drug and alcohol abuse, training and employment, social enterprise development, domestic violence and family /community conferencing for offenders.
- A locally based, empathetic housing management team with community development training.
- A strong community policing approach .
- Organisation of community and cultural events to build community spirit and break down stigma.
- Replenishment of social capital; aiming to enhance individual well-being and self-esteem, increase social cohesion and augment sense of responsibility and natural policing' (2 p vi).

Policy implications include:

- 'Support for whole-of government, integrated, multi-agency approaches to community renewal and crime reduction;
- Preference for social over physical/spatial strategies in renewal programs;
- Recognition of the endemic and recurrent nature of crime in areas of public housing concentration, warranting a high priority being placed on crime reduction as a strategy in community renewal policy;
- Review of allocation policies that result in the concentration of socio-spatial disadvantage;
- The importance of community-oriented policing;
- The importance of locally-based housing management teams, and empathetic partnerships with housing communities;
- The need for systematic monitoring of crime profiles; and
- Evaluation methodologies could be widely applied' (Samuels et al. 2004).

### **Perspective: academic housing specialist researchers**

*Developing effective housing management policies to address problems of anti-social behaviour.* *Housing* is a 2003 AHURI report on management policies to address problems of anti-social behaviour. It includes discussion of the interface between housing management and tenant behaviour, a literature review, audit of existing Australian practices, and case study investigations (but not in NSW, Qld, or SA), explores the concept of antisocial behaviour and the significance of its usage in policy and housing management practices (Jacobs and Arthurson 2003) .

### **Lessons learnt from Evaluation from an Australian State-Level Study Programme**

#### **Perspective: Consultants to Australian State Premier Department**

A 2002 NSW Premier's Department Strengthening Communities Unit *Assessment of evaluation strategies and tools for place management and community renewal projects (ACG 2002)* concluded the following with regard to evaluating community renewal initiatives:

- Good evaluation is crucial to ensure that place or renewal interventions are not wasting money, creating unintended adverse consequences or missing out on better ways to achieve intended outcomes.
- Many of the projects are difficult or impossible to evaluate because there is no framework of objectives or assumptions to anchor the evaluation process.
- Doing that kind of evaluation well, especially where the focus is on initiatives designed to have complex, systemic and linked results within a community, is difficult and expensive. An added dilemma is that many of the projects are designed to be short term, but are dealing with long-term systemic problems.
- The projects should reflect an underlying “theory of change” or assumed logic and linkages to guide what to evaluate, when, where and how.
- It needs to be much clearer why the evaluation is happening and what will happen as a result. What difference will the evaluation itself make?
- The “invisibles” of place and renewal projects – trust, confidence, connection etc – are as important as targets for evaluation as the more obvious, and more easily measurable, results that touch on physical changes, service delivery improvements and better coordination between government agencies.
- There are significant methodological difficulties in conducting rigorous and credible evaluations of the more complex, interconnected types of place or community renewal projects.
- Part of the problem is that we don’t know much about how communities work, normally, let alone when there are major interventions added to the mix.
- Part of the difficulty for evaluating place or renewal projects is a failure to resolve fundamental questions about the nature of place management. For some, it is a form of issues management, a product to obtain a relatively quick fix. For others, it is a process, a distinctive way to approach governance and public management.
- Evaluation strategies that will be seen as credible and reliable are likely to adopt the “inclusion principle” (always involve the community in all stages and processes), be built on a strong theory of change and use a variety of evaluation and monitoring tools and techniques to collect, analyse and report evaluation data and findings. Crucially, crafting the evaluation strategy will form an integral part of the development of the project from the outset (ACG 2002).

Evidence suggests that the evaluation activity surrounding place management or community renewal projects in NSW, Australia and around the world is patchy and sometimes non-existent. The work that has been done reinforces the conclusion that it is hard and riddled with methodological, political, institutional and resource challenges that will not be resolved without a long-term investment of time and money (ACG 2002).

This difficulty is not unrelated to the fact that many projects do not have a clear logic that explains the assumed links between the initial problem or need, the type of intervention that is planned and the results it is supposed to produce (ACG 2002).

That somewhat daunting conclusion notwithstanding, the need to do evaluation more effectively is pressing. The danger is that, without good evaluation, the laudable policy objectives of place or community renewal may be subverted by spending too much money, spending money on projects that are actually making things worse or failing to back alternative projects that may be more effective (ACG 2002).

## Level of funding and timescales

### Perspective: academic housing specialist researcher

Very few of the documents provided information on funding which could be interpreted in the context of the objectives of this study. Two Australian articles discuss the 'modest' scale of resourcing committed by State governments in New South Wales and Queensland when compared with Britain (Arthurson 2004b). '[T]he level of resources committed to regeneration is one of the major defining features of the Blair Government's model of regeneration compared to the Australian case study projects that are attempting to implement similar 'whole of government' models.' '[S]carce resources due to ever-increasing budget constraints were raised as an issue that limits the achievement of regeneration' in Australian research. Arthurson says '[i]t is difficult to make comparisons between Britain and Australia' referring to Australian average funding per area for England 1998/9 (\$121m equivalent) and Australia (Queensland Manooora (\$1.2m) Inala (\$1.3m) , SA (no separate funding), and NSW Waterloo (\$4.9m) for the same period. Approved funding for Community renewal, total 1998-99 to 2000-01 and by area is given in the Qld CR evaluation summary (OGDoH 2001b).

## Exit or transition planning

### Perspective: academic housing specialist research based on detailed analysis of all Australian CR programmes as well as overseas evidence base, innovations and practices

Australian practice and developments in exit strategies are reviewed, models for housing regeneration programmes are described, and literature on innovations and practices from overseas is reviewed (Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004). The conclusions of the literature review included:

- Explicit exit strategies are a recent innovation and so there is little literature on them. What is published seeks to promote the deployment of exit strategies rather than question its efficacy.
- A question remains about whether the sustainability claims made by the proponents of exit strategies are feasible in the current context of declining budget outlays for public housing investment.
- However significant gaps in knowledge remain about the utility of exit strategies. More critically oriented research is required.
- Short term injection of resources cannot, on its own, be an effective catalyst for sustainable housing development.
- However, carefully planned exit strategies can play a mitigating role in helping to ensure that resources that are available are spent judiciously.
- UK evidence suggests that the most effective strategies entail careful project management and adequate resources are essential if the benefits from regeneration projects are not to dissipate quickly (Packwood in Jacobs, Arthurson and Randolph 2004).

## References

- AC. 2005. "Housing Market Renewal." Audit Commission.
- ACG. 2002. "NSW Premier's Department Strengthening Communities Unit Assessment of evaluation strategies and tools for place management and community renewal projects: Final Report." Sydney: The Albany Consulting Group.
- AHI. 2005. "Renew, Rebuild, Regenerate: A Review of Urban Renewal and Regeneration Programs In Australia and New Zealand." *Housing Works* 3.
- AHRF. 2000. "Public Housing Estate Renewal in Australia." Spiller Gibbons Swan Pty Ltd. Urban Economics and Planning for Australian Housing Research Fund.
- Arthurson, K. 2002a. "Social Inclusion and Community Regeneration: Is the role of public housing excluded?" in *ACOSS Congress*. Hobart, 28-29 November 2002: ACOSS.
- . 2004a. "From stigma to demolition: Australian debates about housing and social exclusion." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 19:255-270.
- Arthurson, Kathy. 2002b. "Creating inclusive communities through balancing social mix: a critical relationship or tenuous link?" *Urban Policy and Research* 20:245-261.
- . 2003. "Resident Participation: framing the vision for community regeneration." in *National Planning Congress*. Adelaide, 31 March - 2 April 2003.
- . 2004b. "Conceptualising social inclusion in estate regeneration policy: what part does public housing play?" *Just Policy* 34:3-13.
- Badcock, Blair. 2000a. "Identification of Current Issues and Gaps in Housing Provision in New Zealand: Draft discussion paper prepared for Housing New Zealand." Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- . 2000b. "Strategic Initiatives for Social Housing in New Zealand: A Ten Year Outlook: Draft Discussion Paper prepared for Housing New Zealand." Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- Badcock, Blair, and Arati Waldegrave. 2004. "The Future of Public Housing in New Zealand." *HousingWorks* 2.
- Ball, Michael, and Paul Maginn. 2005. "Urban Change and Conflict: Evaluating the Role of Partnerships in Urban Regeneration in the UK." *Housing Studies* 20:9-28.
- Cameron, Catriona. 2000. "Redevelopment of Public Housing Estates." Shelter WA.
- CDNAW. 2001. "Communities First Guidance." Communities Directorate National Assembly for Wales.

- CEDAR. 2004. "Government - community engagement." in *CEDAR Thematic paper series 01/04: Community Economic Development Action Research Project* Department of Labour 2002-2003.
- Cole, Ian, and Kesia Reeve. 2001. "New Deal for Communities: National Evaluation Scoping Phase - Housing and Physical Environment Domain: A Review of the Evidence Base." Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Corporation, Housing New Zealand. 2004. "RFP."
- . 2005. "Evaluation of Community Renewal Request For Proposal."
- Corporation, New South Wales Land and Housing. 2001. "The Role of Community Housing in Strengthening Communities." NSW Federation of Housing Associations.
- CRESR. 2004. "New Deal for Communities: The National Evaluation The Programme Wide Annual Report 2003/04." Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research Sheffield Hallam University.
- DIA. 2002. "A Framework for Developing Sustainable Communities - Discussion Paper developed in discussion with officials of the Departments of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Social Development, Child, Youth, and Family, and the Community Employment Group." Department of Internal Affairs.
- . 2003. "Community Development Resource Kit." Department of Internal Affairs.
- DPMC. 2003. "Sustainable Development For New Zealand Programme of Action." Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.
- DSD. 2004/5. "People and Place: Neighbourhood Renewal in Belfast. Implementation Plan." Department for Social Development.
- Eringa, Karel. 2003. "New Living - Urban Renewal in Public Housing in Perth." Shelter WA Occasional Paper 2003-3.
- Fulcher, Helen. 1999. "Determining Priorities for Urban / Community Renewal." South Australia Housing Trust.
- Gaster, Lucy, and Richard Crossley. 2000. "Community development: making a difference in social housing." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- GHKI. 2002. "Regent Park Revitalisation Study." Regent Park Collaboration Team GHK International.
- Green, G, M Grimsley, and B Stafford. 2005. "The dynamics of neighbourhood sustainability." York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- HNZC. 2000. "Community Renewal Strategic Framework." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2001. "Community Renewal Programmes: Protocols between GM Assets and Development Services and GM Housing Services." Housing New Zealand Corporation.

- . 2002a. "Community Renewal Programme Development 2001/2002." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2002b. "Intensive Tenancy Management Framework." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2002c. "Outcomes Realisation Charts - Community Renewal." in *rbz Denzo 1997*: Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2003a. "Community Development: What is it and what does it mean for Community Renewal, Draft HNZC Discussion paper." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2003b. "The Decent Homes Standard." Housing Corporation.
- . 2003c. "Discussion Paper: Community Development: What is it and what does it mean for Community Renewal? Draft." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2003d. "Draft Document: Employment and Training Opportunities Framework, A Guide for the Community Renewal Team." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2003e. "Outcome Realisation Chart and MxP User Guide." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2003f. "Selection Criteria and Process for Community Renewal and Neighbourhood Improvement Projects Version 1." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2004a. "Community Renewal Guidelines Version 3 Draft Only." Housing New Zealand Corporation: Community Renewal Asset Development Services.
- . 2004b. "Community Renewal Programme Factsheet." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2004c. "Community Renewal Project Evaluations: Synthesis and Discussion of Findings." edited by Heather Nunns: Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2004d. "Community Renewal Intervention Logic." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2004e. "Housing New Zealand Corporation 2004/7 Statement of Intent." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005a. "Asset Management Strategy 2005-2009 V 5.0."
- . 2005b. "Building the Future: The New Zealand Housing Strategy." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005c. "Community Renewal programme Strategic Social Policy Senior Officials Group Presentation."
- . 2005d. "Community Renewal: A Strategic Overview." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005e. "Draft Document Study of Community Renewal Programme Developments." edited by Heather Nunns: Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005f. "Evaluation of Community Renewal Request For Proposal." Housing New Zealand Corporation.

- . 2005g. "Housing New Zealand Corporation Statement of Intent 2005-2008." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005h. "Interventions 2001-2005." Housing New Zealand Corporation Internal Document.
- . 2005i. "Preparing Transition Plans for Community Renewal Projects." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005j. "Transition Framework for Community Renewal Projects." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- . 2005k. "Transition Plan for Community Renewal Projects." Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- Hoatson, L, and M Grace. 2002. "Public Housing Redevelopment: Opportunity for Community Regeneration." *Urban Policy and Research* 20:429-441.
- Jacobs, Keith, and Kathy Arthurson. 2003. "Developing effective housing management policies to address problems of anti-social behaviour." Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Jacobs, Keith, Kathy Arthurson, and Bill Randolph. 2004. "Developing Appropriate Exit Strategies for Housing Regeneration Programmes." Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- JRF. 2000. "Key Steps to sustainable area regeneration." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- . 2001. "The future of community investment by housing associations." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- . 2004. "Early development of the Housing Market renewal programme." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- . 2005a. "An evaluation of the pilot phase of Investors in Communities." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- . 2005b. "Sustainable neighbourhoods: the role of housing markets and community assets." Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Maxwell, Glynis, Joey Edward, and Abigail Salole. 2005. "Inclusive Cities: Canada - Burlington, Community Voices, Perspectives and Priorities Executive Summary and Recommendations." Community Development Halton: The Burlington Civic Panel.
- MSP. 2001. "The Social Development Approach." Ministry of Social Policy.
- Muir, Jenny. 2004a. "The limits of participation - the management of community conflict in urban regeneration." in *Housing Studies Association Conference 'Planning and Housing: Policy and Practice'*. Belfast.
- . 2004b. "Public Participation in area-based urban regeneration programmes." *Housing Studies* 19:947-966.



- . 2004c. "The state and civil society in urban regeneration: Negotiating sustainable participation in Belfast and Dublin." in *Adequate and Affordable Housing for All: Research, Policy, Practice*. Centre for Urban Studies, University of Toronto.
- NIHE. 2005. "Northern Ireland Housing Market Review and Perspectives." Northern Ireland Housing Executive.
- NSWDoH. 1999. "Building partnerships: transforming estates into communities." Pp. 12. Sydney: New South Wales Department of Housing.
- . 2005. "New South Wales Department of Housing Website."
- NSWLHC. 2001. "The Role of Community Housing in Strengthening Communities." NSW Federation of Housing Associations for New South Wales Land and Housing Corporation.
- ODPM. 2003a. "Factsheet 9: New Deal for Communities." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2003b. "Factsheet 14: Housing and Neighbourhood Renewal." West Yorkshire: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2004a. "2002/03 Progress Report on Local Strategic Partnerships in Neighbourhood Renewal Fund Areas." York Consulting Ltd for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2004b. "Annual Report 2004." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2004c. "LSP Evaluation and Action Research Programme, Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies: Document Analysis and Review." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005a. "Evaluation of English Housing Policy 1975-2000 Theme 3: Housing Quality and Neighborhood Quality." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005b. "Making Connections: An evaluation of the community participation programmes." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005c. "Making it happen in the neighbourhoods: The National Strategy for neighbourhood renewal 4 years on." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005d. "Sustainable Communities: Homes for All, A Five Year Plan from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005e. "Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity - A five year plan from the ODPM." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- . 2005f. "Sustainable Communities: People, Places, and Prosperity A Five Year Plan from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Panel, Inclusive Cities: The Saint John Civic. 2005a. "Inclusive Cities: Canada - St John Community Voices, Perspectives and Priorities." Inclusive Cities Canada.
- Panel, Inclusive Cities: The Toronto Civic. 2005b. "Inclusive Cities: Canada-Toronto, Community Voices, Perspectives and Priorities: Executive Summary." Inclusive Cities Canada.

- Panel, Vancouver/North Vancouver Civic. 2005c. "Inclusive Cities: Canada - Vancouver / North Vancouver City A Preliminary Report from Community Voices, Perspectives and Priorities." Inclusive Cities Canada.
- Pathfinders, Housing Renewal. 2005. "Chair's Report Housing Market Housing Renewal Pathfinders."
- Power, Anne. 2004. "Neighbourhood Management and the Future of Urban Areas: Case Paper 77." London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Prospectus, NewcastleGateshead Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder. 2004. "Creating places where more people want to live."
- QGDoh. 2001a. "Community Renewal Information Paper." Queensland Government Department of Housing.
- . 2001b. "Summary Report Community Renewal Evaluation: Transforming Places and Engaging People." Queensland Government Department of Housing.
- . 2005. "Queensland Government Department of Housing Website."
- Randolph, Bill. 2002. "A Review of Public Housing Estate Renewal in Australia: Presentation to the Queensland Department of Housing Community Renewal Seminar 18 April 2002." Urban Frontiers Programme UWS.
- . 2004. "Urban Renewal : A New Role for Social Housing Providers in Creating Sustainable Communities?" *HousingWorks 2*.
- Randolph, Bill, and B Judd. 2000a. "Community Renewal and large public housing estates." *Urban Policy and Research* 18:91-104.
- Randolph, Bill, and Bruce Judd. 2000b. "Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project: Draft Implementation Report."
- SAHT. 2005. "South Australian Housing Trust Website."
- Samuels, R, B Judd, B O'Brien, and J Barton. 2004. "Linkages Between Housing, Policing and Other Interventions for Crime and Harassment Reduction in Areas with Public Housing Concentrations:." Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Scotland, Communities. 2003. "Communities Scotland Corporate Plan 2003-2006." Communities Scotland.
- SCP. 2003. "Sustainable communities: building for the future." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- SE. 2002. "Better Communities in Scotland Closing the Gap." The Scottish Executive's Community Regeneration Statement.
- SECRU. 2001. "National Evaluation of the Former Regeneration Programmes." Cambridge Economic Associates for Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.

- SEU. 1998. "Bringing Britain together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal." Social Exclusion Unit.
- . 1999. "Opportunity for All" Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion, summary of the UK Labour Government's First Report on Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion." London: Social Exclusion Unit.
- . 2000. "National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: a framework for consultation." Social Exclusion Unit.
- . 2001. "'A New Commitment to Neighborhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan' Report by the Social Exclusion Unit." Cabinet Office.
- . 2004. "Breaking the Cycle: Taking Stock of progress and priorities for the future: A report by the Social Exclusion Unit Summary." Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Social Exclusion Unit.
- Sousa, J, and J Quarter. 2005. "Atkinson Housing Co-operative: A Leading Edge Conversion from Public Housing." *Housing Studies* 20:423-439.
- Spiller, Marcus. 2004. "Prioritising Public Housing Estate Renewal Projects: A Business Case Approach." *HousingWorks* 2.
- SSURHS. 2004. "Social Sustainability in Urban Renewal Human Services: Villawood Case Study." in *Presentation to NCOSS Shelter 'Bursting at the seams?'*
- UKHC. 2004. "Adding Value to What We Have." United Kingdom Housing Corporation.
- . 2005. "United Kingdom Housing Corporation Website." United Kingdom Housing Corporation.
- VGDOHS. 2002. "Neighbourhood Renewal: Growing Victoria Together." Victoria Government Department of Human Services.
- WAG. 2004. "Housing Research Report HRR 4/04 Housing, Mutuality, and Community Renewal: a review of the evidence and its relevance to stock transfer in Wales." Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- Walsh, Peter, and Ken Butler. 2002. "Evaluating Complex Whole of Government Initiatives: Lessons from the Evaluation of the Community Renewal Programme in Queensland." Department of Housing Queensland.
- WAMOH. 2001. "New Living Western Australia's world-class urban renewal program." Ministry of Housing.
- Wood, Martin. 2002a. "A balancing Act? Tenure diversification in Australia and the UK." in *Housing Studies Association Conference Spring 2002*.
- . 2002b. "Resident participation in urban and community renewal." Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Wood, Martin, Bill Randolph, and Bruce Judd. 2002. "Resident Participation, Social Cohesion and Sustainability in Neighbourhood Renewal: Developing Best Practice Models: Positioning Paper." Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.