

WP1.3 Housing and Neighbourhood – Lisbon, Monday 28th January

Present: Stuart Cameron (Chair), Serena Vicari, Marisol Garcia (am? pm?), Jan Walsh, John Ploger, Karin Schmalriede, Matteo Scaramella, Rodrigo Cina, Hartmut Haeussermann, Luis Andre Carmo, Pavlos Delladitsima, Dina Vaiou, Maria Mantouvalou, Andreas Novy, Jean Hillier.

Presentations and responses:

Stuart Cameron: Presentation of WP1.3 Report
See Stuart Cameron's presentation [here](#).

Karen Schmalriede: Response and input on youth Homeless projects in Hamburg
See Karen Schmalriede's presentation [here](#).

Pavlos Delladitsima: Response and input on mortgage crisis
See Pavlos Delladitsima's presentation [here](#).

Hartmut Haeussermann: Response to paper:

Agreed with point made in the report that in housing and neighbourhood social innovation can be seen both in the end or outcome of providing affordable housing and in means or process of self-help

Exclusion from housing is not always a question of housing shortage. In some parts of Germany there is a housing surplus. The question is to have housing of the right type and standard in the right place. Suggested that in the report more mention could have been made of factors leading to exclusion from housing through processes of discrimination.

At neighbourhood level, the report does not explicitly use the word 'empowerment' – this is the basis of most socially-innovative actions. However, there could be said to be two alternative objectives for socially-creative strategies: to bring people into the mainstream or to construct alternative ways of living. Area-based initiatives could be said to provide a means of challenging binding capital to provide bridging capital linking to the mainstream.

Raised the issue of whether social democratic welfare states limited the space for socially-creative strategies. This raises the issue of the role of 'third way' approaches like NGOs, and the promotion of self-help, but also of how the state supports self-help. Concludes that it is in the interaction of top-down and bottom-up where innovation and social creativity can be found.

Jan Walsh: Response to paper

Based on the experience of Groundwork which works on local environmental projects in Wales, UK, suggested that the state was being restructured rather than rolled back. Increasingly NGOs such as Groundwork work in partnership with government and their activities are shaped by government norms and agenda, including the Lisbon agenda.

Andreas Novy, response to paper and comment on links to WP1.5

Warned against the assumption that ‘small is beautiful’ and that socially-creativity can only come from bottom-up action. Suggested it is important to look at scale rather than level – what happens in neighbourhood also has global and national dimension. Scale is a more comprehensive concept than level. It is important to consider the significance of the national level, the neo-liberal v social democratic context for local policy is decided at the national level. Also suggested that we need to be more straightforward in making normative statements about the superiority of social democratic over neo-liberal contexts for social creativity. In general, there is a need to upscale policy levels with regulatory and governance support schemes at European level.

Noted that there is no discussion in the paper of ‘winners’. Proposed importance of socio-ecological perspective and its use of a minimax model of sustainability.
Questioned

Development of contributions to WP2-4

WP2

Emphasis on the importance of wider perspectives and not simply looking at local action. Importance at looking at interaction top-down and bottom-up and the balance between the opportunity space for bottom-up creativity and the provision of top-down support. Concluded that there was a need for support and redistribution but organised in a democratic not monolithic form.

One focus of discussion was arts and culture. The question was raised of what are the actual effects of arts and culture and scepticism was expressed regarding their real importance. The link between arts and culture strategies and gentrification and knowledge-based economy strategies was noted. Conversely, it was argued that arts and culture have a potential for empowerment – the development of local distinctiveness, self-esteem and identity of communities. In developing such approaches the importance of the mediating role of professionals was emphasised, along with the importance of emphasising processes not projects.

WP3

Central local of democratic negotiation and open discussion was emphasised as a counter to privatisation and the rolling back of the state. Social creativity needs money as well as collective energy.

It was noted that current bottom-up organisations have little connection with social movements.

Housing has always been a focus of 'governance' but the shift of public sector role from housing provision to management of neighbourhoods has strengthened this element. It was suggested that strategies of community empowerment to address problems had become a necessity because traditional strategies have failed. Social innovation can be seen in the expansion of the social role of housing organisations

It was noted that in reality governance at the neighbourhood level is complex, and that local interests and organisations may fight each other.

The question was also raised as to whether support should be national or European

WP4

Question of how to reach a common ground of support and openness coming from different contexts in terms of national welfare regimes. This is particularly important because it was suggested that the main focus of social innovation in this field is on the context of support and its interaction with local action, The question of the role of home ownership within this was raised.