

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM



TENANT INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE: MODELS AND PRACTICES

## INTERNATIONAL MODEL DESCRIPTIONS



**David Mullins with Richard Lang, Daniel Bosch, Nic Bliss, Paul Kelly,  
Veronica McLintock, David Yates, and Angela Ayres**

**October 2016**

## Contents

<b>Introduction and Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Austrian Model.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Dutch Model.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>English Model.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Welsh Model.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Assessment Criteria.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Find out more about the research.....</b>	<b>18</b>

## Introduction and Acknowledgements

These four model descriptions have been co-produced with country experts to promote discussion at workshops with tenants of the Housing Executive and housing associations, and other key stakeholders in Northern Ireland.

The models were selected following an international literature review and an assessment of the state of the art on tenant involvement in governance in Northern Ireland.

Despite their titles they are not intended to represent overall practice on tenant involvement in their respective countries. Instead they each capture the essence of one specific model which we believe could be adapted to address gaps in current practice in Northern Ireland.

The descriptions use a common framework to present information on these models,

- why they are relevant to Northern Ireland,
- how, where and when they originated,
- the key principles,
- key actors involved,
- enablers and barriers,
- how they work in practice with what success and at what scale and cost,
- and most important of all what are the advantages for tenants?

We would like to thank the four co-authors; Richard Lang of the University of Linz in Austria, Daniel Bosch of Amsterdam Tenants Organisation in the Netherlands, Paul Kelly with Veronica McLintock, David Yates, and Angela Ayres of Community Gateway in Preston, England and Nic Bliss of the Confederation of Cooperative Housing who has been working with the Welsh Cooperative Centre on new housing coops in Wales. They have all worked brilliantly to help compile this information in time for the workshops and we look forward to their presentations and discussion at the workshops on October 19-21.

**David Mullins**  
**Housing and Communities Research Group**  
**University of Birmingham**

## Austrian Model

<b>Name of Model:</b>	<b>Austrian Model: Building participation into the development process: Developer competitions and ‘community building’ in large-scale participatory projects</b>
<b>Relevance: Potential Gap Filled in Northern Ireland:</b>	<p>In Northern Ireland there are currently no opportunities for social housing tenants to form collaborative groups or to plan and design their housing before moving in. The Austrian model shows how this type of low level participation in governance can be built into the new housing development process by including social sustainability criteria in a developer competition and requiring developers to support tenants to form active groups to take responsibility for their new homes.</p>
<b>Context:</b> city, country in which this model operates and date introduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional province and City of Vienna, Austria</li> <li>• In terms of housing legislation, Vienna is independent from the national state and can design its own housing laws, incl. housing subsidy system</li> <li>• Participation Statute for Tenants established in 1989</li> <li>• In 1995, the social housing department started a new model for developer competitions to raise planning and ecological quality in large-volume housing construction but avoiding higher production costs and rents - 3 pillar model (architectural, economical and ecological concept)</li> <li>• In 2005, a fourth pillar was added - “social sustainability”.</li> <li>• One of the biggest challenges for social housing in Vienna at the moment is a population increase of about 20,000+ people per year predicted for the city region. The City thus needs to build about 5.000 new flats every year.</li> <li>• Example: The scheme “so.vie.so” is located in the Sonnwendviertel neighbourhood close to the new Hauptbahnhof in Vienna. This is an entirely new neighbourhood, mainly consisting of subsidised housing schemes (5,000 homes for about 13,000 residents between 2012 and 2019) but also including commercial and shopping areas as well as schools and nurseries.</li> </ul>
<b>Origins and background:</b> where did the model come from and how did it develop?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Austrian co-operative housing model originated in an internationally known self-help movement in the 1920s.</li> <li>• However, there has always been limited responsiveness by the national regulatory framework for social housing to collaborative housing.</li> <li>• Social and non-profit housing regulatory bodies in Austria have traditionally strengthened the role of top-down, large-scale cooperatives as dominant providers.</li> <li>• Traditional cooperative values and principles have been “buried” by paternalism and state regulation of welfare and housing.</li> <li>• Some architects, such as Ottokar Uhl, began to challenge the paternalistic culture with collaborative projects in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g. the council housing project Fesstgasse in Vienna).</li> <li>• More recently, some large housing cooperatives in Vienna have been reviving cooperative principles with pilot projects, such as “so.vie.so”.</li> <li>• The Vienna local authority has recently promoted collaborative housing by introducing social sustainability criteria in developer competitions from 2005. Non-profit developers must include participatory approaches in all new subsidised housing schemes.</li> </ul>
<b>Brief Description of the principles of the model</b>	<b>Developer Competitions in Vienna</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City’s strategy to meet housing demand is to purchase and</li> </ul>

	<p>redevelopment brown-field sites for affordable housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The “Wohnfonds Wien” owned by the city of Vienna buys and re-develops sites and sells them to non-profit housing developers via competitive tendering to maximise public benefits.</li> <li>• This strategic approach to land has in recent years focused on inner-city locations such as the area south of the new Hauptbahnhof, through mutually beneficial deals with the Austrian Federal Railways.</li> <li>• Vienna’s developer competition is a four-pillar scoring system that consists of planning, cost, ecology, and social sustainability.</li> <li>• Competitive bidding for land on City of Vienna development sites</li> <li>• “Social sustainability” means that developers need to consider criteria of ‘community building’, ‘social mixing’ and ‘tenant participation’. This refers to “software” (e.g. organisation and processes) as well as “hardware” (e.g. communal facilities in the house and neighbourhood). <b>“It’s about how people live together”.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Case study scheme at Sonnwendviertel neighbourhood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case project “so.vie.so” (an acronym for “Sonnwendviertel Solidarity”) represents an emerging type of large-scale resident participation in the non-profit/cooperative sector.</li> <li>• The scheme “so.vie.so” consists of 111 subsidised rented apartments, communal facilities of different size, shared greenspace with the neighbouring housing schemes as well as spaces for small businesses.</li> <li>• A large housing co-operative provides participation opportunities for the residents in the planning process as well as in the on-going management of the scheme that go well beyond what is offered in mainstream cooperative and non-profit housing in Vienna.</li> <li>• The future tenants engage in an externally facilitated process which kicks off well before the actual completion of the scheme.</li> <li>• The idea of this professional “community coaching” is to sharpen residents’ awareness for their immediate social environment through regular meetings and workshops where they get to know their neighbours’ needs and interests.</li> <li>• Therefore, they might want to engage in working groups on particular topics, such as (rooftop) gardening or fitness classes.</li> <li>• Residents work together to plan use of communal spaces.</li> <li>• Resident input to design and management of ground floor communal facilities such as gym, workshop, bicycle and buggy storage and library</li> <li>• Roof garden and communal meeting room on roof of block</li> <li>• As the participatory consultants gradually move away from the scheme, the group takes over tasks as maintaining the communication processes, organising and holding regular meetings to decide upon the allocation and use of funds or continuous activities.</li> <li>• In “so.vie.so”, the residents are organised within a tenant’s advisory board.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key actors:</b> who are the main people who make the model work? Who are the model’s main supporters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Vienna <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Wohnfonds Wien” (Housing Fund) acquires land and allocates sites in new developments</li> <li>• Professional expert Jury to decide on land allocations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Non-profit housing developers, including large housing co-operatives</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident Groups formed prior to occupancy of new estates</li> <li>• External consultancies specialised in 'community building' in housing</li> </ul>
<b>Enablers:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term political support for subsidised housing in Vienna</li> <li>• Land supply and funding from local government</li> <li>• Rules of development competition tie funding to social sustainability criteria</li> <li>• Capacity for tenant involvement has been built up through specialist community development advisers as part of the cost of the scheme Low level community involvement is now a 'normal' part of the system, opportunities for much higher involvement through 'Baugruppen' is also available</li> </ul>
<b>Barriers:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are entry barriers to housing cooperatives for new tenants.</li> <li>• It is normal to make an entry payment (so called "initial, one-off financial contribution to the land and construction costs") which is usually between 15.000 and 30.000 Euro for a medium sized to large flat. Higher initial contributions, lower the monthly rents.</li> <li>• At the end of the tenancy, this financial contribution is paid back (incl. 1% write off).</li> <li>• Some coop schemes offer buy-out options to tenants which is also the case in "so.vie.so".</li> <li>• The income for a single person must not exceed around 44.000 Euros per year after tax at the time of moving in. This income ceiling is fairly generous as it includes almost all working people living in Vienna since the average yearly income after tax in 2014 amounted for just over 21.000 Euros for employed people. This generous limit is to be met only at the moment of moving in since there is no control on how the household incomes develop further on.</li> <li>• There may also be some self-selection of tenants interested in participation, willing to get involved in work well in advance of moving in and able to wait for housing.</li> <li>• High standards in developer competitions require housing associations and large coops to invest a lot in social sustainability but there is no budget for a continual monitoring. This is problematic as there is no method of securing long-term responsibility for the spaces and services provided for and developed together with the inhabitants.</li> <li>• The co-operative has the right to nominate residents for the scheme from their own housing waiting list and after interviews. Also the municipality can claim the right to nominate in return for subsidies.</li> </ul>
<b>Brief Assessment of how the model works in practice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle, the developer competition model can be applied anywhere, regardless of financial scope of a local authority.</li> <li>• In practice, it requires a strategic partnership between the local authority and larger (non-profit) housing providers.</li> <li>• The "community building model" addresses the needs of individual residents and families looking for an affordable home in the city. Residents are interested in increased opportunities for communal living, resident participation and self-management of their scheme.</li> <li>• Many of the "So.Vie.So" residents can be considered as middle-class, and there is limited social and ethnic mix compared with the city as a whole.</li> <li>• Resident participation by the future tenants is regarded as a key to a</li> </ul>

	<p>democratic planning, such as the equipment and organisation of use of communal spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large-scale participatory projects represent top-down approaches to collaborative housing where tenants participate in a pre-designed structure, offered by architects and specialised consultants cooperating with large non-profit or cooperative developers.</li> <li>• The “So.Vie.So” scheme at Sonnwendviertel has to be seen in contrast to smaller scale, resident-led Baugruppen projects where residents take on much greater responsibility for scheme design and management (several new developments at Seestadt Aspern in Vienna). Experts say that the “So.Vie.So” model has a better chance to be mainstreamed than the “Baugruppen” model as facilitation and construction costs are cheaper.</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence of Success:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better design of communal facilities</li> <li>• Culture of cooperation among residents and stakeholders</li> <li>• Increased professionalisation of community development through external expertise in community building and resident participation.</li> <li>• Quality of participatory housing management and governance improved with specialised external consultancies entering this field</li> </ul>
<b>Scale and Costs:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer competition system applies to all new subsidised housing throughout Vienna which still has large new building programmes on large sites such as the Aspern urban extension and the urban regeneration site at Hauptbahnhof.</li> <li>• An analysis of 18 projects realised within the framework of the limited-profit housing associations competitions came to the conclusion, that “Social Sustainability” criteria was not a significant cost driver.</li> <li>• Financing for the “so.vie.so housing model” mainly comes from direct housing subsidies which are secured by the large housing co-operative in a developer competition for the specific site.</li> <li>• The City provides grants to the housing provider. In return the provider guarantees affordable rents below market level and high design quality.</li> <li>• Rents are fixed for 10 years and existing rent contracts can be extended beyond 10 years.</li> <li>• Residents pay an initial contribution to the building costs and have to buy cooperative shares. The costs for the communal facilities and basic equipment are covered through the overall construction sum, their maintenance through service charges and donations.</li> </ul>
<b>Advantages for tenants?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sense of community and knowing your neighbours from the start</li> <li>• Flexibility to decide how much you want to get involved</li> <li>• In general, affordable, high quality homes and rent security</li> </ul>

Sources:

Lang, R. (2016) The Co-operative Identity of Collaborative Housing Models in Austria. In F. Taisch, A. Jungmeister, H. Gernet (Eds), *Genossenschaftliche Identität und Wachstum – Cooperative Identity and Growth*, (pp. 84-93). St. Gallen, Switzerland: Verlag Raiffeisen Schweiz. ISBN 9783033057821

Lang, R. (2015) Participation vs self-determination in community-led housing in Austria. *Housing and Communities Research Group Newsletter*, Issue No. 5, Winter 2015, pp. 6-7.

Lang, R., Stoeger, H. (2015) The role of the local institutional context in understanding community-led housing models. European Network for Housing Research (ENHR) Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, 28.06.-01.07.

Wolfgang Forster et al (2008) Housing in Vienna, Innovative, Social and Ecological.

Visit to Sonnwendviertel neighbourhood, and interviews with tenants, City of Vienna, Wohnfund and with community development advisers

<http://www.gat.st/en/news/wohnbau-sovieso-mitbestimmt>

<http://aspern-baugruppen.at>

<https://www.wien.gv.at/bauen-wohnen/sonnwendviertel.html>

## Dutch Model

<b>Name of Model:</b>	<b>Dutch Polder model, Polder = ‘a talk between parties to overcome their differences’<sup>1</sup>.</b> <b>Local Area Performance Agreements 2015 Housing Act</b>
<b>Relevance: Potential Gap Filled in Northern Ireland:</b>	Local area focus for tenant involvement to respond to the new powers of Super Councils for planning and community strategies. The need for closer working between NIHE and HA landlords at a local level.
<b>Context:</b> city, country in which this model operates and date introduced	Netherlands Example Amsterdam 2015
<b>Origins and background:</b> where did the model come from and how did it develop?	<p>In the late 60s/early 70s there was a lot of squatting in Dutch cities (especially Amsterdam). People needed housing which was in short supply. To avoid squatting and public unrest talks with squatters and others were organised. These talks later developed into common practice to make political plans for social housing and urban development. There were talks between squatters and students, city councils and housing associations and later between tenants and landlords. These talks are now formalised in legislation:</p> <p>This Legislation is designed to improve local accountability of housing. (articles 42, 43 and 44 of the Dutch Housing Act 2015)  Law on ‘Consultation Tenants / Social Landlords’ (overlegwet) building on the application of the polder model to housing  These acts settle the rights and positions of the tenants and their organisations. They cover rights from the micro level (building/complex) to macro level (cities and the whole country) and define specific rights and possibilities for tenants’ organisations and housing associations.</p>
<b>Brief Description of the principles of the model</b>	<p>Tenants are involved in drafting, implementing and evaluating performance agreements with their landlords and the local authority. This entails 4 steps and form an annual cycle.</p> <p><a href="#">Step 1: Draft local housing policy</a>  Each local authority should draft a local housing policy. This is a concise document outlining the local authority’s main housing goals. It could take the form of a Housing Strategy or Housing Agenda for a specific time period.</p> <p><a href="#">Step 2: Housing association submits a local offer on how it will contribute to the local housing policy</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The Dutch polder model started in the late 70s /early 80s first as a means to avoid strikes and demonstrations from labour unions. When this was successful it was used in other fields in the 80s and 90s including social housing and in urbanisation and infrastructure (roads and bridges).



	<p>Once the local authority has published its housing policy each housing association with local stock is required to submit a local offer on how it will contribute to this policy. This may be part of a joint proposal of all housing associations working in the municipality. The offer should include a list of activities in which the housing association makes clear its contribution to the delivery of the housing policy.</p> <p>The housing association consults with its own tenant organisation on the details of the offer. The offer is considered part of the housing association's regular policy development cycle. Tenant organisations therefore should be involved in the drafting of this policy in compliance the Law on 'Consultation Tenants / Social Landlords'. The housing association's offer should be reasonable: investments should be in proportion to the assets of the housing association and the local housing challenges. To assess this, the Minister will make available information on the financial capabilities of the housing association to municipality and the tenant organisation. The housing association's offer should include an invitation to discuss the drafting of the performance agreements.</p> <p><b>Step 3 - Draft performance agreements</b></p> <p>Housing association, municipality and the tenants organisations discuss the proposal submitted by the housing association and use the municipal housing policy to assess whether the proposal is proportionate and adequate.</p> <p>If the three parties fail to agree on performance agreements, the municipality, tenants organisation and/or housing association may report disputes to the Minister. Parties need to do this within four weeks after the dispute has arisen. An advisory committee will assess the dispute. In this assessment, the committee will consider the municipal housing policy and the financial capabilities of the housing association. The committee advises the Minister, who then makes a binding decision.</p> <p><b>Step 4 – Evaluate implementation of performance agreements</b></p> <p>In May of each year, the local authority, housing association and tenants organisation discuss the progress made on the implementation of the performance agreements in the previous year. This concerns both the implementation of the annual and the five-yearly agreements. The housing association provides insight into implementation progress in its Annual Report.</p>
<p><b>Key actors:</b> who are the main people who make the model work? Who are the model's main supporters</p>	<p>The three local level parties (city/housing associations/tenants organisations) are described in the Act. The Act also sets out what each party has to do (giving tenants information, participation of tenants in making plans with renovation). Each year the parties have to negotiated a plan or vision for the following year.</p> <p>At national level the process is controlled by a Central Government Department and Ministerial Advisory Committee.</p>

<p><b>Enablers:</b></p>	<p>Legal compliance; Minister and Advisory Committee  Local authority drafting of a housing policy: without this policy housing associations cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a local offer.  Housing associations must draft their local offer after consultation with their tenants. The offer needs to be specific for the coming year and should be complemented with a more general overview of activities for the next four years. The housing association's offer is reviewed annually.</p> <p>Tenants' organisations must have the capacity and resources to participate effectively. The steps they have to take as group are.</p> <p>1 - come together  2 - stay together  3- work together</p>
<p><b>Barriers:</b></p>	<p>Existing consultation arrangements with tenants must be strong  Effective partnerships between associations to formulate a collective view at local authority level  Government must provide good information  Dispute resolution process  Tenant organisation capacity  Defining the goals is not easy as it is difficult within a group to have common goals.</p>
<p><b>Brief Assessment of how the model works in practice</b></p>	<p>The system has been in operation for only one year but builds on a much longer history in which tenants organisations have sought and achieved a degree of influence on housing policy.  The full cycle of the Housing Act 2015 provisions is not yet complete so it is early to judge.  From experience you need a leader who can build bridges between people (internal) and the other parties (external).</p>
<p><b>Evidence of Success:</b></p>	<p>The group needs a clear vision of the process and what the goals are and how to achieve them. You will never get everything you want so there should be no promises. The most important thing is that tenants never forget that the goals and that sticking together makes them strong. It is very important that tenants stick together to achieve their goals. 'Five fingers makes a fist that can punch and hits hard!'</p>
<p><b>Scale and Costs:</b></p>	<p>The legislation has made this into a national system operating in every Dutch city. Amsterdam had a similar non-statutory scheme for a longer period. Housing associations are expected to absorb this into their costs, which are now strictly controlled. It will be important that the scheme is adequately resourced.</p>

<b>Advantages for tenants?</b>	<p>The 2015 Act is the latest stage in a long history of legislation regulating tenants' rights and talks to a certain level. In Amsterdam tenants negotiated a higher level of participation and rights using different Acts.</p> <p>Although these Acts have improved the position of the tenants and their organisations, this is only one step in the participation of the tenants of determining their living environment and conditions.</p> <p>This is a brief and short version of the model and history but I think that it is too short and can explain more about it at the workshop.</p>
--------------------------------	--

## English Model

<p><b>Name of Model:</b></p>	<p><b>English Model:</b> Community Gateway - tenant representation on the board and through involvement in governance structures centrally, community links &amp; innovative ways of involving &amp; engaging tenants locally</p>
<p><b>Relevance: Potential Gap Filled in Northern Ireland:</b></p>	<p>There were currently no tenants on the main boards of social landlords in our Northern Ireland case studies. Community Gateway provides a longstanding example of tenant representation on the board of a large stock transfer landlords and of well developed links to local communities</p>
<p><b>Context:</b> city, country in which this model operates and date introduced</p>	<p>Preston council transferred its stock of 7700 homes to Community Gateway in 2005. It used a new model then being piloted with the Chartered Institute of Housing and Confederation for Co-operative Housing and others. 6 other gateways were established across the UK.</p>
<p><b>Origins and background:</b> where did the model come from and how did it develop?</p>	<p>It was one of several pilots of the gateway model promoted by the Chartered Institute of Housing and Confederation of Cooperative Housing. In the report promoting the Gateway model in 2003 the main elements were specified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community empowerment strategy</li> <li>• Local community areas</li> <li>• Community options studies</li> <li>• Consulting the wider community</li> <li>• Giving every local community a range of options for involvement</li> </ul> <p>The project also provided model rules for community gateway associations, process maps for set up, menus of options for local involvement and control (including options for devolved management and community ownership).</p> <p>The 2003 guidance proposed that Gateway associations should have tenants as <b>‘the largest single group on the board, holding one less than the majority of board places’</b> (p. 39) -compared to a third of places common in stock transfer models at the time.</p> <p>In 2002 Preston council held a series of workshops with tenants, councillors and staff on the Gateway model and it was agreed that this met the needs of Preston better than other transfer models. The council took two years to develop robust proposals on an area basis for a place on the 2004/5 transfer programme.</p> <p>12 years after transfer Community Gateway provides a well-documented and sustainable model that might be capable of adoption by the Housing Community Network.</p>
<p><b>Brief Description of the principles of the model</b></p>	<p><b>Governance Structures</b> There are currently 4 tenants on the main board of management of the Community Gateway Association, and the organisation is chaired by a tenant. The organisation also supports a Gateway Tenant Committee from where tenant board members are selected, and through which all policies and procedures of the organisation are approved and developed prior to Board approval.</p> <p><b>Developing leadership capacity</b> CGA operates a qualities framework for tenant involvement that supports</p>

	<p>the development of tenants to become more involved with the organisation. CGA funds accredited training packages and delivers a capacity building programme to support engagement and involvement.</p> <p><b>Membership and voting</b> CGA is a membership organisation currently with 4310 members. This is made up of 2579 full members, 1438 associate members, 67 leaseholders and 236 under 16 members. Membership is open not just to tenants but to people in living and working in CGA communities. Tenants are not automatically members, they opt in to membership.</p> <p><b>Sustaining resident and community involvement</b> CGA has a community empowerment strategy that supports and sustains resident and community involvement. We deliver a range of programmes to support this around digital inclusion, environment, young people, equality and diversity, employment and skills, community facilities, health and well-being.</p> <p><b>Involving tenants locally</b> As well as supporting tenants to become involved centrally, we support local tenants and residents associations, community centre management committees, local social enterprises, local PACT meetings, neighbourhood forums and develop neighbourhood action plans.</p>
<b>Key actors:</b> who are the main people who make the model work? Who are the model's main supporters	<p>Council Government approved the transfer in 2005 New Landlord Tenant Board members Tenant membership Wider membership Mentors and advisers Stakeholder partners Staff External agencies such as Tenant Participation Advisory Service (TPAS)</p>
<b>Enablers:</b>	<p>National promotion and expert advice e.g. CHH, TPAS Political support at local level Preston Council buy in Involved tenants and members New tenants CGA staff Leadership of Chief Executive</p>
<b>Barriers:</b>	<p>Sustaining early commitment and enthusiasm – once homes have been improved how do we keep people involved. Leadership Succession – both staff and tenants Challenge of new technology and willingness to be really open Wider issues around local authority cuts</p>
<b>Brief Assessment of how the model works in practice</b>	<p>Link to the annual Community Empowerment Strategy for 15/16 presented at the 2016 AGM in September. <a href="https://youtu.be/rxbc2jPWDlg">https://youtu.be/rxbc2jPWDlg</a></p>
<b>Evidence of Success:</b>	<p>Lasted over 11 years since transfer Levels of participation are maintained. Membership is the highest it</p>

	<p>has ever been. Attendance at the September 2016 AGM was also the highest. Tenant satisfaction at our services is the highest it has ever been. TPAS accreditation for tenant involvement secured for the first time in February 2016.</p>
<p><b>Scale and Costs:</b></p>	<p>Annual involvement budget of circa £350k from a £26m annual budget – includes just the community empowerment team staff and project costs</p> <p>Hard to measure in some sense as staff across the organisation are expected to embrace the purple culture approach to involving tenants.</p> <p>Link to our Investing in Involvement statement for 2015/16 <a href="https://youtu.be/oB2ihBpTUiY">https://youtu.be/oB2ihBpTUiY</a></p>
<p><b>Advantages for tenants?</b></p>	<p><b>Views of Veronica, Angela and David.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tenants know what tenants need in terms of their housing, neighbourhoods and community. By being involved we can ensure that service delivery meets our needs more effectively and efficiently.</li> <li>• <b>By being involved we are ensuring that continuous improvement is at the heart of the housing service, and that it doesn't become a remote and unresponsive service as larger housing associations appear to be</b></li> <li>• Involvement has a personal impact on those involved. It has an impact on our sense of belonging and worth</li> <li>• Personal development and personal empowerment comes from our involvement</li> <li>• <b>“We work with staff as partners, and we have created a joint working culture...’the purple Gateway culture”</b></li> <li>• Wider neighbourhood issues become as important as the physical housing issues.</li> <li>• <b>“We bring a wide range of lifeskills and experience to involvement that makes for better decisions”</b></li> <li>• Tenant experience on board and through the governance structures means we can share what's best for our community at the heart of the organisation. We compliment, for example, independent board members by bringing the real and personal tenant experience to strategic decision making.</li> </ul>

Sources: CIH and CCCH(2003) Empowering Communities. The Community Gateway Model.

## Welsh Model

<b>Name of Model:</b>	<b>Welsh Model</b> - new start up coops in Wales
<b>Relevance: Potential Gap Filled in Northern Ireland:</b>	There are currently no opportunities for people in Northern Ireland to develop community-led models of new build housing. The Welsh model provides a way in which housing applicants and tenants can be supported to set up tenant and community controlled housing organisations by involving local authorities, housing providers and potential co-operators in a structured process.
<b>Context:</b> city, country in which this model operates and date introduced	<p>In 2011, the Programme for Government committed Welsh Government to ‘develop and promote new ways of providing land and funding for housing such as Community Land Trusts and co-operatives’. In 2012 a White Paper ‘Housing for Wales’ set a target of 7,500 new affordable homes of which 500 would be co-operative homes.</p> <p>In 2012 the Welsh Government developed the Co-operative Housing in Wales project to achieve this target, working with experts from the co-operative and housing sectors. There are now 25 co-operative housing projects at various stages of development across Wales, covering a variety of tenures, urban and rural locations, aimed at people of different income levels, and using co-operative and community land trust approaches to fit the needs of local people.</p> <p>There were three initial “pioneer” projects:</p> <p>Cardiff: Home Farm Village Housing Co-op - 41 homes rented to tenants from Cardiff Council’s waiting list, developed by Cadwyn Housing Association and leased to the housing co-op</p> <p>Carmarthenshire: Old Oak Housing Co-operative - where the co-op will manage their 27 rented homes developed by Grwp Gwalia Housing Association</p> <p>Newport: Loftus Village Association – where 20 reduced cost shared ownership homes (with one market sale and one rented home) are managed by a co-operative, part of a mixed tenure urban village developed with Seren Housing Group.</p> <p>In each case, the people who became residents of these schemes did not know anything about co-operative housing at the outset, but they were helped to understand the model and develop their skills to govern their co-operatives as their homes were being built.</p> <p>A commitment has been made to build a further 20,000 new homes 2016-21 under the new Welsh Programme for Government, and there is an ongoing commitment that some of these will be co-operatives.</p>
<b>Origins and background:</b> where	The Welsh Government established a co-operative housing

<p>did the model come from and how did it develop?</p>	<p>stakeholder group in 2012 to explore ways to develop new schemes. This led to further work to encourage local authorities, housing associations and community organisations to develop community-led housing models. The Wales Co-operative Centre were commissioned and grant funded by the Welsh Government to provide a call off support service to organisations and groups to provide technical support to develop schemes. The Confederation of Co-operative Housing has been the principal organisation providing these support services.</p>
<p><b>Brief Description of the principles of the model</b></p>	<p><b>Basic criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A set of basic criteria was developed that identified the type of housing being developed</li> <li>• Key criteria included that a democratic community membership structure would be set up that would control some or all aspects of the homes developed</li> <li>• A key principle from the outset has been that schemes would be developed in bespoke ways to suit the needs of local people</li> </ul> <p><b>Encouraging organisations to establish community-led schemes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With very limited background in community-led housing schemes in Wales, three pioneer organisations were recruited to the programme – Cadwyn Housing Association, Carmarthenshire County Council and Seren Housing Group.</li> <li>• Each organisation was keen to support co-operative housing, and this was facilitated through access to the Welsh Government’s capital grant funding programme</li> <li>• Ongoing work is encouraging more local authorities and housing associations to develop co-operative housing schemes</li> <li>• Occasionally community groups have also been supported to develop schemes themselves</li> </ul> <p><b>Recruiting founder members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Founder members/residents of schemes were identified in a variety of ways, but mainly through local authority or housing association waiting lists/registers</li> <li>• Founder members/residents were usually recruited about a year in advance of the homes being developed</li> <li>• Founder members/residents wanted a nice home and neighbourhood to live in – but were also attracted by the community aspect of the schemes</li> <li>• Each scheme was subsidised to make them affordable for people on low incomes,</li> <li>• Those participating were required to attend a training and development programme before they could access to the homes</li> </ul> <p><b>Training and Support for pioneer projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Founder members/residents met about twice a month over a period of a year to plan and develop their co-operative schemes</li> <li>• They were supported by expert facilitators and by housing associations developing the schemes</li> <li>• In each case, the developing groups have built up their skills and levels of responsibility and have made choices about how they want to manage their homes.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have also developed bonds and become ‘communities in waiting’.</li> </ul>
<b>Key actors:</b> who are the main people who make the model work? Who are the model’s main supporters	<p>Welsh Government (both at a policy level and through officers)</p> <p>Wales Co-operative Centre and Confederation of Co-operative Housing</p> <p>Housing Associations and Local Authorities</p> <p>Members of the public</p> <p>Potential and actual Co-operators</p>
<b>Enablers:</b>	<p>Strong political support</p> <p>The quality and commitment of Welsh civil servants driving the programme</p> <p>Access to the Welsh Government capital funding programme (on the same terms as other housing developments)</p> <p>Access to high quality support, advice and information through the Welsh Government, Wales Co-operative Centre and Confederation of Co-operative Housing to enable development of the co-operative groups</p> <p>Land for the schemes</p> <p>Willingness and enthusiasm of local people to participate in co-op development in order to get access to a nice home within a community</p> <p>Willingness of local authorities to enable co-operative housing and include the necessary flexibility in nominations systems for advance allocations at the community building stage</p> <p>Willingness and enthusiasm of housing associations (at governance level and amongst staff) to take a different and flexible approach to providing community-led housing; keenness amongst housing association staff to learn</p>
<b>Barriers:</b>	<p>Lack of existence of any co-operative or community-led housing schemes in Wales at the outset</p> <p>Consequent lack of local know how</p> <p>The length of time it takes to develop new housing schemes</p> <p>The general barriers that face new housing schemes – obtaining land, finance, planning permission etc.</p> <p>Unwillingness of some local authorities and housing associations to try out different and innovative approaches</p> <p>Some concerns about how models including democratic control would be applied in practice and whether this would conflict with housing association good governance</p>
<b>Brief Assessment of how the model works in practice</b>	<p>The Welsh Government has commissioned a research report and plans to produce lessons learnt documentation. There has been ongoing assessment in each housing association.</p> <p>Longer term success will need to be assessed by comparison between the co-operative housing projects and comparable housing schemes - are they delivering good value for money; are they leading to more satisfied residents; are services effective; are the communities developed functioning well; have the individual members been able</p>

	to use the skills they have developed in other ways.
<b>Evidence of Success:</b>	<p>Initial measures of success include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The enthusiasm with which founder members have participated</li> <li>• The transformation of housing staff to champions of the cause of co-operative housing and their enthusiasm to make successful schemes happen</li> <li>• The snowball effect where gradually more local authorities and housing associations and communities are picking up on the idea (it's not a fast moving snowball though yet)</li> <li>• Gradual networking between co-operative members – still early days</li> <li>• The impact of the Welsh programme in England – demonstrating how a community-led housing programme can be developed</li> <li>• The Wales Co-operative Centre has now attracted private sector funding to augment funding provided by the Welsh Government</li> <li>• General ongoing enthusiasm in the Welsh Government Stakeholder Group to the cause of co-operative housing over several years with the group now taking the lead to develop its own strategy moving forward; new ideas emerging in Wales about how to develop further.</li> </ul>
<b>Scale and Costs:</b>	<p>Scale: Around 25 cooperative and community led schemes are now at various stages of development in Wales. These are general smallish scale new build schemes that are dependent on land and finance availability. Most of the schemes are between 20 and 40 homes – although there are some schemes of several hundred homes.</p> <p>Costs: are dependent on prevailing costs for scheme development generally. The capital costs of each co-operative housing scheme development has been comparable to equivalent non-co-operative schemes. If there is a need for new build homes (or to renovate existing buildings) then their capital costs are largely the same whether they are co-operative or not.</p> <p>Developing co-operative housing schemes does require some revenue support for the development of the co-operative groups.</p>
<b>Advantages for tenant and shared owners?</b>	<p>The first completed scheme in Wales has only been in existence for less than 6 months, but there is evidence of the success of community-led schemes in England. Potential advantages include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of strong supportive communities</li> <li>• As good, if not better, housing management</li> <li>• High resident satisfaction</li> <li>• Development of skills amongst co-operative members</li> </ul>

## Key Sources:

**Wales Co-operative Centre and Welsh Government (2013) Research into potential demand for housing co-operatives in Wales**

**Wales Co-operative Centre & Confederation of Co-operative Housing (2015) Co-operative housing for any community in Wales**

**Bliss and Lambert - New co-operative and community led homes (2014) – CCH**

**Commission for Co-operative and Mutual Housing (2009) – Bringing Democracy Home**

## Assessment Criteria

We would like all workshop participants to consider how relevant these models might be to future practice on tenant involvement in governance in Northern Ireland.

At the workshops there will be an opportunity to ask questions to clarify how the models work in practice. There will also be a variety of ways in which participants can provide feedback including a 'post it wall', voting and discussion after the event via social media and email.

Please use the following criteria to check out the models and use this to think of questions you would like to ask the speaker at the workshop.

- **Could this work here?**
- **Would tenants want to take part?**
- **What are the key similarities and differences in context**
- **Who is likely to be interested/support in Northern Ireland?**
- **What changes would it take to make it work here?**
- **What would be needed to sustain involvement?**
- **What might make this model attractive to tenants?**

We look forward to the discussion.

## Find out more about the research

You can get full access to all of this research project which is being undertaken by the University of Birmingham for the Northern Ireland Housing Executive. Reports completed so far can be found at the following webpage. This page will be updated with the results of the workshops.

<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/social-policy/departments/social-policy-social-work/research/projects/2015/tenant-engagement-in-governance.aspx>