



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Estate Regeneration National Strategy

Better Social Outcomes

Introduction

Government wants to help local partners better understand opportunities to re-shape public services, or initiate new interventions, to improve residents' life chances. We are working with estates to map the delivery of public services and spending, with the aim to reform service delivery and improve social outcomes.

Contents

BETTER SOCIAL OUTCOMES

Understanding public spend and outcomes in deprived housing estates	04
New analysis	04
Challenges	05
Next steps	05

Better Social Outcomes

We know that poor quality housing can have a negative impact on health and educational attainment and that badly designed and maintained public realm can increase crime and reduce social cohesion. We also know that regeneration activity can increase skills, enterprise and innovation at a local level and help attract investment. Government research has shown that significant savings to out of work benefits, health and crime spending have resulted from regeneration interventions.

To succeed in transforming social outcomes for local people, estate regeneration schemes should form part of a broader place-based approach to improve the life chances of residents, particularly those with the most complex needs. This requires a focus on the design and delivery of local services.

Understanding public spend and outcomes in deprived housing estates

Streamlining the way services are delivered as a result of regeneration can help generate better outcomes for users and savings to the public purse.

Since the 1980s successive governments have launched programmes to tackle the social and economic issues associated with poor housing estates. From Estate Action in the mid 1980s, to City Challenge in the early 1990s and New Deal for Communities in the late 1990s and early 2000s, many regeneration initiatives have aimed to transform specific run down areas and improve quality of life.

More recently government has piloted more placed-based, person-centred approaches to public services, through schemes such as total place and whole place community budgets, with the goal of improving outcomes and providing better value.

The recent ResPublica report, *Great Estates*, suggests that delivering “people-related outcomes” on estates could bring significant financial benefits.¹ For example, if it were possible to reduce unemployment to local authority averages this could, on the 12 estates considered, generate revenue and savings for the government of £140m to 2030.

New analysis

We are undertaking research and analysis to help understand patterns of public service delivery in deprived estates. This will help local partners better understand the opportunities to re-shape public services, or initiate new interventions, to improve the life chances of residents. We are working with local partners in four areas to help develop the evidence base.

LA area	Local lead body
Westminster	Westminster City Council
Liverpool	Cobalt Housing Association
Durham	Livin Housing Association
Rochdale	Rochdale Boroughwide Housing

We are focussing on spend in the following key public service areas:

- Crime and policing
- Education and skills
- Welfare benefits
- Housing
- Health
- Social services (adult and children related)
- Fire
- Other services

The purpose is to identify the overall value of public sector spend, from all major areas of public services, at the local authority level. Then, based on the demographics of estates in these four areas, or the patterns of demand for services, we have estimated where the use of particular services, such as health, social services and welfare, are particularly high. Finally, we have sought to understand what the drivers of these costs are.

¹ *Great Estates: Putting communities at the heart of regeneration*. ResPublica, November 2016.

Challenges

For some areas of spend, this is reasonably straightforward, because we can use published local authority out-turn data and make assumptions about pro rata apportionment of service use. For areas such as health and social care, this can be more difficult because of the complexity of needs and service provision. In all cases it is important to have input from and dialogue with local service providers. It is also important to have clarity about the exact boundary of the estate, which often does not match formal statistical or administrative geographies.

The information about users of services is not always captured in a way that allows it to be readily aggregated up to an estimate of neighbourhood demand. For example, health and social care providers may have postcode data for service users and hospital admissions, but to turn this into a neighbourhood-level estimate, requires geographic information system analysis to convert postcode-level identifiers to a new bespoke geography that matches the boundary of the estate. Other issues arise where costs are available by provider but not by the location of service users, for example with post-16 education. The success of this exercise is, therefore, dependent on partnership working with the local bodies that hold, or have access to, key data sources in order to make proportionate estimates.

Next steps

We are currently completing the spend exercise and drawing conclusions from this on the implications on public service provision for residents on estates. We will continue to map what funding and support local areas are receiving to tackle poor life chances so that we can help estate regeneration schemes in those areas become better integrated and access more support. In the four estates we are also identifying in which policy areas there might be opportunities for public spending to be better focused, or where funding could be targeted on prevention.

Our hypothesis is that existing funding could sometimes be better co-ordinated locally – or new funding targeted at specific social outcomes. We will continue to work with each of the four local areas to explore options and will consider how these might be scaled to work alongside estate regeneration more widely. We will work with partners to explore the role that social investment can play in facilitating new approaches.

We will continue to work with Greater Manchester to develop its trailblazing Life Chances Investment Fund, which brings together funding from several budgets including the Troubled Families Programme and Working Well pilot to enable Greater Manchester to increase investment in innovative approaches to delivering public services. The fund will allow Greater Manchester leaders to use public money more effectively to deliver better services and improve the lives of residents. We will also work with the West Midlands to co-design and implement approaches to improving the life chances of troubled individuals.

This all forms part of government's place-based approach to social justice, improving the life chances of those living in deprived communities. The Estate Regeneration National Strategy, through its work with specific estates, will join up with other place-based interventions to help local authorities and their partners tackle issues such as parental ill-health and low qualifications that can contribute to worklessness and the risk of worklessness. DCLG will also continue to support other community led interventions to transform public services and improve local well-being.
