

Programme Workshop

Towards a cost-effective housing policy

Leuven, 11-12 May 2015

Monday 11 May 2015

● ● ● CHAIR: SIEN WINTERS

12:00 | **Lunch**

13:00 | **Introduction (project, workshop) and presentation round**

13:30 | **Presentation 1: Demand versus Supply Side Housing Policies: the choice of policy instruments**
Michael Oxley

14:20 | **Presentation 2: The role of private renting in housing low-income households**
Peter Kemp

15:10 | **Break**

15:30 | **Presentation 3: Why Social Housing?**
Christine Whitehead

16:20 | **Presentation 4: Linkages of homelessness and housing policy tools with a view of their cost effectiveness - options to draw on lessons from cost-effectiveness analysis from homeless-research**
Nóra Teller

17:10 | **Presentation 5: The distributional aspect of housing policies**
Kristof Heylen

18:00 | **End**

18:00 | **Optional: Walking tour Groot Begijnhof**

19:00 | **Dinner Faculty Club**

Tuesday 12 May 2015

● ● ● CHAIR: MARJA ELSINGA

08:45 | **Coffee**

09:00 | **Presentation 6: Cost effective housing policy, a glimpse at housing policy in France**

Jean-Pierre Schaefer

09:40 | **Opinions by Feantsa, Housing Europe, Wonen-Vlaanderen en Vlaamse Woonraad (each 5')**

Why do cost-effective housing policies matter?

What do we expect from the framework developed in this project?

What should we be able to learn from this research project?

Discussion (20')

10:20 | **Break**

10:40 | **Discussion Paper**

Katleen Van den Broeck

11:00 | Discussion of the draft report on for example:

- Participants' thoughts on the framework: is framework useful to structure instrument choices and make them more transparent?
- Does something similar exist in participants' countries?
- Suggestions for making the framework useful for policy makers?
- Suggestions for stakeholder discussion?

Leading to answers on:

- Where do experts agree/disagree?
- What are the dilemma's in the issue of cost-effective housing policy?
- How to improve the conceptual framework?
- How to move forward to create a tool for the appraisal of housing policy instruments

12:00 | **Lunch**

13:00 | **End**

Participants

Julien DIJOL • Housing Europe

Marja ELSINGA • OTB TU Delft

Veerle GEURTS • Agentschap Wonen-Vlaanderen

Marietta HAFFNER • OTB TU Delft

Kristof HEYLEN • HIVA-KU Leuven

Peter KEMP • Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford

Ruth OWEN • FEANTSA

Michael OXLEY • Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, University of Cambridge

Alice PITTINI • Housing Europe

Jean-Pierre SCHAEFER • Commissariat Général à l'Égalité des Territoires, Conseil national des villes

Freek SPINNEWIJN • FEANTSA

Nóra TELLER • Metropolitan Research Institute Budapest

Katleen VAN Den BROECK • HIVA-KU Leuven

David VAN VOOREN • Vlaamse Woonraad

Christine WHITEHEAD • London School of Economics

Sien WINTERS • HIVA-KU Leuven

Abstracts

Presentation 1: Demand versus Supply Side Housing Policies: the choice of policy instruments

Michael Oxley

This presentation will concentrate on the pros and cons of demand and supply side housing policy instruments. It will consider the criteria which might be used in making a relative judgment. It will also make a distinction between “pure” and “conditional” forms of each subsidy and argue that the conditions are of great importance in understanding the purpose and outcomes of the intervention. The choice of instruments will be linked to objectives including affordability and production goals. The presentation will argue against the stance taken by Barr, and quoted in the discussion paper: “while the choice of the aims (for example defining what is a socially just outcome and how much weight do efficiency and equity aims receive) is an ideological one, the choice of the methods will be a technical one” (Barr, 1993). More broadly there will be an attempt to link the demand v supply side approaches to two issues that might usefully attract more importance than they are given in the discussion paper. These are (1) the role of ideology (including the distinction between normative and positive prepositions and the distinction between individual and collective well being) and (2) the importance of the incidence of subsidies (and formal versus effective incidence).

Presentation 2: The role of private renting in housing low-income households

Peter Kemp

This presentation will draw on the conceptual framework to look at the role of private renting in the provision of housing for low-income households. It will particularly focus on this role in relation to what the conceptual paper referred to as the three core goals of housing policy: accessibility, affordability and adequacy. In doing so, it will examine whether private renting exhibits market failure (imperfect competition, imperfect information, negative externalities), inequity or government failure in relation to housing provision for low-income households; and, if it does, whether that inhibits the ability of private renting to provide accessible, affordable and adequate housing for this group of households.

Presentation 3: Why Social Housing?

Christine Whitehead

What do we mean by social housing? Different definitions and their implications

Does it always involve supply? rental? –European v world context

Varying foci– housing investment overall; housing for particular groups of people; housing standards; additional services, alleviation of housing poverty etc

Relationship to more fundamental objectives of efficiency, distribution, but also political attitudes; government's own objectives;

Changing emphasis over time and under different housing conditions;

Different models within the European system - are they converging?

The conditions under which there might be a continuing role for social housing.

Presentation 4: Linkages of homelessness and housing policy tools with a view of their cost effectiveness - options to draw on lessons from cost-effectiveness analysis from homeless-research

Nóra Teller

Housing policies largely fail to address issues of households facing homelessness, this most extreme form of housing exclusion, and in many member states dealing with homelessness falls under the realm of social service delivery rather than being addressed in the framework of housing policies. One of the explanations is that many times homelessness is intersected with issues that would fall under the competence of other policy fields like health, welfare and labour market, etc..

Therefore, comparing effectiveness of selected housing policy tools in terms of tackling homelessness should be complemented by drawing on further tools' cost effectiveness analysis in order to more comprehensively address the preconditions of successful tackling of homelessness.

In the discussion I intend to present (1) some bottlenecks housing policy may face when it addresses homelessness, i.e. by (theoretically) offering access to social housing or other tenures, (2) lessons drawn from recent research on actual costs of homelessness in the framework of long-term solutions vs. short-term policies, and (3) selected adverse effects that may be created by housing policies contributing to an increase of homelessness.

Presentation 5: Cost effective housing policy, a glimpse at housing policy in France

Jean-Pierre Schaefer

Demand side and supply side subsidies have been used in France for enhancing quality and quantity of housing supply, covering the three main sectors of the market: owner occupation, social rental and private rental. Fiscal rebates have been more and more used, especially for developing private Buy to rent schemes, notwithstanding (for a while) aid for owner occupier while social rental sector was by and large a permanent concern whatever the various political parties at power. Altogether, this brought new production of housing to a rather high level, compared with other members of the Union. Nevertheless, the specific situation of the capital region (one fifth of the country population) still encounters a strong housing crisis, while other territories enjoy more balanced housing markets. The question of homelessness and the way it is tackled by State and local authorities could be described with its advances and its setbacks.