



Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 10 JULY 2014
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Virginia Rounding (Chairman)
Revd Dr Martin Dudley (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Billy Dove
Alderman David Graves
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines
Ann Holmes
Deputy Henry Jones
Gareth Moore
Dhruv Patel
Adam Richardson
Elizabeth Rogula

Enquiries: Philippa Sewell
tel. no.: 020 7332 1426
philippa.sewell@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in the Guildhall Club at 1pm

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Reports

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To approve the public minutes and summary of the meeting on 22 May 2014.
For Decision
(Pages 1 - 6)
4. **HRA - OUTTURN 2013/14**
Report of the Chamberlain and the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 7 - 12)
5. **RESIDENT COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT REVIEW & DRAFT STRATEGY**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 13 - 28)
6. **HORACE JONES HOUSE - LOCAL LETTINGS POLICY**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 29 - 48)
7. **GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL - DOOR ENTRY SYSTEMS AT THE GOLDEN LANE (PARTIAL), HOLLOWAY AND YORK WAY ESTATES**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 49 - 58)
8. **DECENT HOMES WORKS TO PROPERTIES PREVIOUSLY OMITTED FROM PROGRAMMES - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 59 - 68)
9. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

11. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non-Public Reports

12. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2014.

For Decision
(Pages 69 - 70)

13. **HOLLOWAY ESTATE REWIRING OR LANDLORDS; AND TENANTS SERVICES - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 71 - 90)

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

HOUSING MANAGEMENT AND ALMSHOUSES SUB (COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES) COMMITTEE
Thursday, 22 May 2014

Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 22 May 2014 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Billy Dove
Revd Dr Martin Dudley
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines
Gareth Moore
Dhruv Patel
Adam Richardson
Elizabeth Rogula
Virginia Rounding
Alderman David Graves

Officers:

Ade Adetosoye	-	Director of Community and Children's Services
Eddie Stevens	-	Community and Children's Services
Jacquie Campbell	-	Community and Children's Services
Karen Tarbox	-	Community and Children's Services
Paul Jackson	-	Community and Children's Services
Simon Cribbens	-	Community and Children's Services
Elizabeth Donnelly	-	Community and Children's Services
Mark Jarvis	-	Chamberlain's Department
Jacqui Daniels	-	Town Clerk's Department
Philippa Sewell	-	Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Ann Holmes and Deputy Henry Jones.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Mr Gareth Moore declared an interest in housing matters as a tenant of Golden Lane Estate.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Members proceeded to elect a Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 29. A list of Members eligible to serve was read out and Virginia Rounding, being the only Member indicating her willingness to serve, was declared to have been elected for the ensuing year.

4. ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Members proceeded to elect a Deputy Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 30. A list of Members eligible to serve was read out and the Revd Dr

Martin Dudley, being the only Member indicating his willingness to serve, was declared to have been elected for the ensuing year.

The Chairman welcomed new Members, Ann Holmes (in her absence) and Dhruv Patel, and thanked the outgoing Member Angela Starling.

5. **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Members discussed the terms of reference which currently prevented the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Community & Children's Services Committee from standing as either Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Sub Committee, which did not follow the wishes of Members.

RESOLVED – That the Town Clerk be asked to consider the mechanism through which the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee's Terms of Reference could be reviewed and, where possible, amended to allow the Deputy Chairman of the Community & Children's Services Committee (Ex-Officio) to stand as Chairman of the Sub Committee.

6. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 30 January 2014 be approved as a correct record.

Matters Arising

Emergency Access to Tower Blocks

Officers reported that detailed work was underway concerning fire safety. External consultants had been employed to produce risk assessments and officers were now working through their various recommendations. Members noted that a report on this issue would be brought to the next Sub Committee meeting.

7. **HORACE JONES HOUSE PRESENTATION**

The Sub Committee received a presentation of the Director of Community & Children's Services concerning the mixed use scheme at the One Tower Bridge development and asking Members for their thoughts regarding rent setting, allocations and tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Grand Committee.

Members discussed the options at length, querying details including the following:

- Expected level of service charges: this is not yet determined but expected to be higher than other City stock due to the level of amenity and quality of the building;
- Demand from existing tenants: can we identify those who might be interested or whose income would meet higher rents should they be charged? A marketing campaign will be undertaken when the level of rent is agreed. The City does hold details of tenants' income, other than for those who are claiming housing benefit;
- Lack of signage promoting the Corporation's involvement in the development: the developer-only signage was part of the agreement negotiated by the City Surveyor;

- Right to buy: tenants of Horace Jones House would acquire the right to buy, but it is anticipated that such purchases are unlikely given the market value of the properties;
- Rent increases: it is proposed that these are in line with the government-set regime for the City's other social housing (CPI + 1%);
- Provision of disabled facilities: one property in the block has been specifically adapted to meet the needs of those with disabilities; and
- Fixed term tenancy length: if such tenancies are used, they would be fixed for 5 years, in line with the recommendation of the Localism Act and best practice.

Members agreed that there was a need for mixed developments providing affordable housing to ensure a mix of people could live in the centre of the City. They also agreed this development offered an opportunity to fund improvements to the City's existing housing assets or to support further new development.

RESOLVED – That a recommendation be made to the Community and Children's Services Committee based on the following:

- (a) Rent: set at 40% of market rents;
- (b) Allocations: existing social housing tenants should be prioritised (with greatest priority given to those overcrowded or under-occupying); and
- (c) Tenancy: like-for-like for existing social housing tenants (predominantly lifetime tenancies) and five-year fixed term tenancies for new applicants.

8. AMENDMENT TO THE ALLOCATION POLICY

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services which sought approval for an amendment to the Allocations Policy making provision for the use of local lettings policies. Each individual policy would be brought before the Sub Committee for approval, and Members noted that any such policies would be time-limited for 3- to 5-year periods to address specific needs or circumstances.

RESOLVED – That the proposed amendment to the City's allocations scheme be approved.

9. CITY OF LONDON ALMSHOUSES - UPDATE

Members received an update report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the City of London Almshouses. The Head of Housing Management reported that the planning application to the London Borough of Lambeth to convert the Deputy Matron's flat to an office and community meeting place had been approved, and builders were in place to begin the work within the next few weeks. With regard to the damp problems at the Roger's Cottages, a pilot property had been identified and the resident had vacated her home for the duration of the repairs (approximately 2 weeks). Members discussed the need to review the contents of the hamper, noting its value of approximately £50.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

10. **HOUSING ESTATES - ALLOCATED MEMBERS' REPORT**

Members received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services on the events and activities on the City of London social housing estates. Officers reported that the 2013/14 Estate Satisfaction Survey had been completed by a total of 932 households representing a 33.46% return rate. This was a significant improvement on previous years and offered a robust basis for analysis.

Members noted that Estate meetings were held four times a year on larger estates and twice a year on smaller estates. Members also considered the Allocated Members for each estate.

RESOLVED – that:

(a) The Allocated Members be assigned as follows:

Avondale Square (Southwark)	-	Virginia Rounding
Small Estates	-	Elizabeth Rogula
Golden Lane (City)	-	Gareth Moore and Deputy John Barker (Ward Members)
Holloway & York Way (Islington)	-	Deputy Catherine McGuinness, Barbara Newman and Deputy Michael Welbank
Middlesex Street (City)	-	Deputy Henry Jones (Ward Member)
South Bank Estates	-	Adam Richardson
Sheltered Schemes &	-	Deputy Billy Dove and Mark Almshouses Wheatley
Sydenham Hill	-	Deputy Billy Dove and Mark Wheatley
Lammas Green/Otto Close	-	Deputy Billy Dove and Mark (Lewisham) Wheatley

(b) Allocated Members be added to the distribution list for the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee; and

(c) An open invitation to Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee meetings be extended to the Allocated Members.

11. **HOUSING UPDATE**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which gave Members a general update on Housing Service performance from 1 October 2013 to 31 March 2014. The Head of Housing Management highlighted the breakdown of the 2013/14 Estate Satisfaction Survey responses which had highlighted some areas for work; e.g. 69.39% of residents responded that they feel safe on estates; officers were therefore unpicking the perception of why 30.61% did not feel safe.

Members noted that the number of people on the housing waiting list had reduced as people with no connection with the City, and therefore ineligible, had been removed. Officers reported that 98.5% of rent had been collected, giving a year-end figure of 98.6%; Members agreed this was a very impressive achievement and formally expressed their thanks to the officers involved.

In response to Members' questions, the Head of Housing Management reported that more resources were put into rent collection, but that some evictions took place in the case of long-standing non-payment.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

12. **REMEMBERING YESTERDAY, CELEBRATING TODAY**

Members received an information report on the programme of community development work being done to mark the 100th anniversary of the start of the First World War. Members noted that the name of the project had been changed from 'The Poppy Project'.

The project will run for four years; extending the work beyond the first year allowed more activities to be run and would develop the capacity of residents and local staff to manage community programmes so they are sustainable in the longer term.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

In response to a question from the Chairman, it was:

RESOLVED – That a report and presentation come to a future meeting regarding health and wellbeing events on estates.

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

15. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item	Paragraph
16-18	3
19-20	-

16. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 30 January 2014 be approved as a correct record.

17. **ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services presenting the draft Asset Management Strategy.

18. **HOUSING PROJECTS PORTFOLIO UPDATE**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which gave an update on the Housing Projects.

19. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

20. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 12.47 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Philippa Sewell
tel. no.: 020 7332 1426
philippa.sewell@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

Agenda Item 4

Committees:	Dates:
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee	10 July 2014
Community and Children's Services Committee	11 July 2014
Subject:	Public
HRA - Outturn 2013/14	
Report of:	For Information
The Chamberlain and the Director of Community and Children's Services	

Summary

1. This report compares the outturn for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) in 2013/14 with the final agreed budget for the year. Overall the total net transfer to reserves for the year was £0.910m, whereas the final agreed budget assumed £0.541m, representing a reduced requirement of £0.369m. This is summarised in table A below:-

	Final Agreed Budget £000	Outturn £000	Variations (Underspend) / Overspend £000
HRA Revenue (see Table B)			
Expenditure	10,881	10,961	80
Income	(14,089)	(14,575)	(486)
Other	<u>2,667</u>	<u>2,704</u>	<u>37</u>
(Surplus) for year	(541)	(910)	(369)
Opening Reserves	<u>(6,004)</u>	<u>(6,004)</u>	-
Closing Reserves	<u>(6,545)</u>	<u>(6,914)</u>	<u>(369)</u>
Major Repairs Reserve (see Table C)			
Opening reserve	(2,823)	(2,823)	-
Movement in year	<u>(1,857)</u>	<u>(2,040)</u>	<u>(183)</u>
Closing Reserves	<u>(4,680)</u>	<u>(4,863)</u>	<u>(183)</u>

The main reason for the reduced requirement on revenue was better than expected performance on rent collection.

The £0.183m reduction in the requirement from the Major Repairs Reserve is mainly attributable to the re-phasing of capital projects.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that this outturn report for 2013/14 is noted.

Main Report

Housing Revenue Account

3. The HRA is ringfenced by legislation which means that the account is financially self-supporting. Although the "Capital" Account is not ringfenced by law, the respective financial positions of the HRA and the City Fund has meant that capital expenditure is financed without placing a burden on the use of City Fund resources. All HRA related capital expenditure continues to be funded from the HRA, including the Major Repairs Reserve and certain capital receipts from sales of HRA assets, with homeowners making their appropriate contributions. In practice, therefore, the capital account is also ringfenced.

Budget for 2013/14

4. The 2013/14 latest approved budget for the HRA was agreed by the Community and Children's Services Committee in November 2012 and endorsed by the Court of Common Council in March 2013. The budget expected a net revenue surplus of £0.541m to be transferred to the General HRA Reserve.
5. There were no subsequent changes to the overall level of the budget.

HRA Revenue Outturn for 2013/14

6. The HRA revenue outturn was a net revenue surplus of £0.910m, £0.369m higher than expected in the budget. Comparison of 2013/14 Outturn with Latest Revenue Budget – Table B below. Income and underspend are indicated by brackets.

<u>Table B</u>	Latest Budget	Revenue	Variation	Paragraph
	£000	Outturn	(Underspend)/ Overspend	number
	£000	£000	£000	
<u>Expenditure</u>				
Repairs, Maintenance & Improvement				
Breakdown and Emergency Repairs	1,920	1,958	38	
Contract Servicing	888	945	57	
Cyclical and Minor Improvements	2,172	2,187	15	
Technical Services and City Surveyor's Costs	804	676	(128)	
Total Repairs, Maintenance & Improvement	5,784	5,766	(18)	8
Supervision and Management	2,958	2,965	7	
Specialised Support Services				
Central Heating	304	384	80	9
Estate Lighting	238	237	(1)	
Caretaking and Cleaning	1,161	1,188	27	
Community Facilities	107	118	11	
Welfare Services	122	104	(18)	
Garden Maintenance	207	199	(8)	
Total Expenditure	10,881	10,961	80	
<u>Income</u>				
Rent				
Dwellings	(10,142)	(10,551)	(409)	7
Car Parking	(508)	(487)	21	
Baggage Stores	(113)	(105)	8	
Commercial	(1,085)	(1,173)	(88)	7
Charges for Services and Facilities				
Community Facilities	(36)	(60)	(24)	
Service Charges	(2,157)	(2,053)	104	10
Other	(48)	(146)	(98)	11
Total Income	(14,089)	(14,575)	(486)	
Loan Charges - Interest	170	194	24	
Interest Receivable	(118)	(104)	14	
Net Operating Income	(3,156)	(3,524)	(368)	
Loan Charges - Principal	298	297	(1)	
Transfer to Major Repairs Reserve	2,317	2,317	0	12
Surplus for year transferred to General Reserve	(541)	(910)	(369)	
Opening Reserves	(6,004)	(6,004)	0	
Closing Reserves	(6,545)	(6,914)	(369)	

7. The main reasons for the reduced requirement of £0.369m from the general reserve relate mainly to improved rent collection from residential and commercial properties. This was due to a management initiative to tackle rent arrears.
8. Repairs and Maintenance was close to budget overall. Savings in staffing costs were due to a longer than anticipated recruitment process which resulted in a delay in filling several vacant posts. This was offset by increased spending on other repairs and maintenance expenditure.
9. There was an overspend of £80k on heating which was mostly due to increased spending on gas at Middlesex Street and a number of other smaller variances.
10. Income from service charges was less than expected as the balance between recoverable and unrecoverable costs did not reflect the assumptions made in the budget.
11. The favourable variance on Other income is due to an unbudgeted grant payment and repairs costs recouped from tenants.
12. Comparison of 2013/14 Major Repairs Reserves Outturn with Agreed Budget is set out in Table C below.

Table C	Latest Budget	Revenue Outturn	Variation (Underspend)/Overspend	Notes
	£000	£000	£000	
HRA Reserves				
Major Repairs Reserve				
Balance Brought Forward	(2,823)	(2,823)	0	
Transfer from HRA	(2,317)	(2,317)	0	Table B
Capital Expenditure	2,843	2,513	(330)	Annex A
Section 106 funding	(2,179)	(2,152)	27	
Reimbursements from Homeowners	(204)	(84)	120	
Major Repairs Reserve Balance				
Carried Forward	(4,680)	(4,863)	(183)	

13. The net reduction of £0.183m in the funding required from the Major Repairs Reserve was mainly attributable to the re-phasing of capital projects of £0.330m, details of which are set out in Annex A, partially offset by a reduction in contributions from homeowners and S106 monies.
14. Members note the reasons for the underspend set out in the report above.

Dr P Kane

Ade Adetosoye

Chamberlain

Director of Community & Children's Services

Contact officers:

Community & Children's Services: Edwin Stevens, Director of Housing Services

0207 332 3015 edwin.stevens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Chamberlain's: Mark Jarvis, Head of Finance

0207 332 1221 mark.jarvis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

CAPITAL PROJECTS Responsible officer is the Director of Community and Children's Services	Final Agreed Budget 2013/14 £000	Actual 2013/14 £000	Variance Overspend/ (Underspend) £000	Comments on variations exceeding £50,000
Avondale Square Lift Refurbishment	93	72	(21)	Expenditure deferred due to design changes
Avondale Square Estate - George Elliston & Eric Wilkins Houses - New Flats, Roofs & Windows	62	112	50	
Avondale Square Estate - Redevelopment of the Community Centre	400	23	(377)	
	555	207	(348)	
Golden Lane Gt Arthur Windows & Cladding	174	169	(5)	
	174	169	(5)	
Affordable Housing Infill on Holloway Estate		3	3	
	0	3	3	
Isleden House Kitchen Conversion		(4)	(4)	
	0	(4)	(4)	
Middlesex Street New Affordable Housing Units	1,066	975	(91)	Delay due to unforeseen problems in connecting existing heating and hot water systems
	1,066	975	(91)	
Door Entry Sumner Buildings	80	8	(72)	Lead in period longer than anticipated
Door Entry Pakeman House	132	10	(122)	Lead in period longer than anticipated
	212	18	(194)	
Bridge Master's Car Park	713	1,043	330	Mirrors payments made to developer under the development agreement
	713	1,043	330	
Decent Homes Kitchen/Bathroom Contingency	28	21	(7)	
Decent Homes CHIP 2	49	37	(12)	
Decent Homes: Kitchen & Bathroom Contingency	46	44	(2)	
	123	102	(21)	
Total 2013/14	2,843	2,513	(330)	

Committee:	Date:
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	10 July 2014
Subject: Resident Communications & Engagement Review & draft Strategy	Public
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services	For Decision

Summary

This report outlines a review of Resident Communications & Engagement which has taken place and the changes which have been implemented as a result. These include:

- The introduction of open meetings for all residents on each estate;
- The publication of new quarterly estate-based newsletters;
- The implementation of a revised process for introductory meetings with new tenants;
- The development of a Housing Users Board (HUB) for more detailed consultation on housing-wide matters.

The report includes a draft Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy for Members to agree in principle.

It also sets out plans for work which will take place during the next year. These mainly focus on developing the use of electronic communication channels, including social media. Instead of having a separate Resident Involvement Plan, these actions have been built into the Housing Service Plan for 2014-15 and new Estate Plans, and will be monitored accordingly.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- note the report;
- agree, in principle, the draft Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy which forms Appendix 1 to the report.

Main Report

Background

1. In 2009 the Housing Service appointed a Head of Resident Involvement & Policy to develop and deliver a Resident Involvement (RI) Strategy, covering our communications and engagement with residents. At this time, the City's RI was minimal, and participation was very limited. The RI Team was established, and,

over the following three years, frameworks, policies and guidance were put in place from the centre. The Resident Involvement Strategy and Plan introduced at this time expired in 2013.

2. Whilst some elements of RI will always need to remain centralised, the most effective way of involving residents is to do so on a local level, as most of their interests are related to their own homes and estates. Therefore, our intention in the longer-term was always to move the responsibility for working with residents to estate level.
3. An Estate Management Restructure, implemented in April 2013, laid the foundation for this by increasing the number of Estate Manager posts and building responsibility for RI into their job descriptions. Two senior RI posts were deleted to resource this change, leaving a small central team of one Resident Participation Officer and a Communications Apprentice. This team has been managed by the Strategic Communications Manager as part of a one year secondment.
4. Once the structure had been embedded, the review of Communications & Engagement commenced, with a view to creating a replacement for the Resident Involvement Strategy & Plan. The focus of the review has been to ensure that communication and engagement is done as locally as possible and with the whole community of residents on each estate, rather than through smaller groups.

The Review & Findings

5. A working group of officers was set up to review the existing communications and RI mechanisms used, and to identify improvements needed. The scope of the review was to look only at work with tenants and homeowners of our 11 social housing estates that related to their homes and estates. Work with Barbican residents and consultation on non-housing issues was outside this scope.
6. We mapped the current position using a simplified version of the existing RI pyramid, and divided activity into five headings:
 - **Information**– activities which provide information to residents and do not necessarily require them to respond;
 - **Feedback**– activities which require a response from residents but do not necessarily involve a dialogue, so they can be largely passive;
 - **Engagement**– activities which involve an active dialogue between officers and one or more residents;
 - **Formal Consultation** - activities which we are obliged by law or consider good practice to carry out with residents affected directly by a major project;
 - **Participation**– activities which residents can be heavily involved with and lead themselves, and which contribute in some way to the wellbeing of the estate community.

7. Having mapped the mechanisms currently used, the review concluded that there were many activities in place and some were working well, but also that there were a number of challenges.
8. Work was not well co-ordinated. There was no clear programme, other than for estate walkabouts, and different teams had been sending out information, surveys etc independently. Good work had been done both in the central team and on the estates, but attempts to bring these together had failed.
9. Feedback from residents highlighted that they were overloaded with central information and surveys, but perceived a lack of information on the progress on local matters such as communal repairs, which they found frustrating.
10. There was a lack of skills and capacity at local level to deliver high quality communications and engagement. This meant that the standard of work varied from estate to estate, depending on the skills of individuals. Where there was a skills gap, there also tended to be a lack of awareness and understanding of the value of communicating well and engaging with residents.
11. Enormous effort had been made to improve the engagement with Residents' Associations (RAs), but, though they did valuable work and tried to be representative, most struggled to engage with the wider community. A great deal of consultation work focused on the committees of the five RAs and the bulk of grants were made to them. This meant that a disproportionate amount of time and resources were concentrated on a relatively small number of residents and only some of our estates.
12. There was little use made of social media or electronic communications methods.
13. There were no effective mechanisms for consulting with residents on strategic issues or for them to participate in decision-making. Surveys attracted a very low response rate.
14. Community development work had started in the year before, but was focused on four estates.
15. Having identified these challenges, we then began a detailed review of each of the existing RI mechanisms. In order to make immediate improvements for residents, we decided that we would not wait until the end of the review to implement an action plan, but would make the changes as we went along, implementing, reviewing and improving all the time.
16. The work of the group is dynamic and ongoing, but significant progress has been made.

Achievements to date

17. We have already introduced many measures to address the challenges identified. A detailed list of changes made to date and future plans has been developed and can be provided to Members on request.

18. A regular programme has been introduced for each estate, planned a year ahead and publicised in advance. Calendars have been designed to give residents an 'at a glance' view of the activity for their estates and these will be ready to send to residents as fridge magnets at Christmas. Everything is now co-ordinated, both at estate level and centrally.
19. The programme for each estate includes:
- A quarterly newsletter, produced to a high standard and containing two pages of general items and two local pages;
 - A weekly one-page bulletin update on current estate issues;
 - Quarterly walkabouts, one during the evening, with actions published;
 - Regular estate meetings (4pa on large estates, 2pa on small), open to all residents;
 - An annual Estate Plan, developed using feedback from surveys, estate meetings, complaints and walkabouts is published each year so that residents have a clear and simple way of knowing what improvements are planned for their estate in the coming year.
20. Staff have had training in community development and engagement and in the use of publishing tools. Managers have been trained in facilitation to give them more confidence in their work with residents. Each estate has been provided with equipment needed for running meetings and workshops.
21. Whilst we value residents' associations, and continue to recognise them and to offer support, we no longer rely solely on them to gather views of residents or to pass information to the whole estate. Estate meetings now allow us to communicate with a wider number of residents and consultation is either estate wide, or focuses on residents affected by a particular project, rather than being channelled through any one groups.
22. The grants budget has been devolved to each Estate Manager and a simple application process put in place so that any group or individual on each estate can apply for support for an event or activity to benefit residents. Fairness and transparency is ensured by publishing details of grants in the estate newsletter.
23. We have trialled the use of Facebook and Twitter on two estates and Facebook is now being rolled out across all estates. A project to use the Orchard system to send out group emails and texts has been initiated and we have gathered email addresses and mobile numbers from about 50% of households.
24. Changes to the annual satisfaction survey resulted in a 33% return this year compared to less than 5% in previous years, and has given us extensive data on the views of residents which will inform our improvement work.
25. A database of 100 residents expressing an interest in being more involved is being used to form a consultation network called the HUB (Housing Users Board) for strategic consultation exercises. These might involve detailed questionnaires, one-off forums or time-limited, project specific working groups.

26. Residents are involved in making decisions on estate-improvement budgets.
27. With our new Community Development Officer, we are developing a 4 year programme of activities on all our estates, under the banner 'Remembering Yesterday, Celebrating Today' which will aim to build the capacity of staff and residents to sustain this in the longer term.

Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy & Protocols

28. It is important that our intention and commitments regarding communications and engagement are open and transparent, and that residents have access to these so that they understand the channels open to them. To this end we have drafted a Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy, which is Appendix 1 to this report.
29. The draft strategy includes a protocol for the running of estate meetings and another for working with resident groups. This is to ensure that the approach is clear and applied equally and consistently on all estates. Further protocols will be added for other engagement mechanisms such as the HUB as these are developed.
30. If Members agree the draft strategy in principle, we will apply it immediately, but will publish it as a draft and seek feedback from residents. The final version of the strategy will be brought back to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee for signing off once feedback has been considered and incorporated.
31. The strategy will be made available on the City's website and in all Estate Offices. A leaflet explaining how we communicate and engage with residents has been drafted and will be sent to all households and provided to all new tenants in due course.

Next steps

32. Work for the remaining period of the review and improvement programme will include a number of projects.
33. Moving to the increased use of e-mail, texting and social media to communicate with and pass information on to the majority of residents, with provision made for people with no access to these tools.
34. Developing the HUB to be truly representative of our estate communities, using demographic profiling to identify gaps and active recruitment to fill these and then providing training and support to the Board.
35. Publishing the Tenancy Handbook and separate leaflets in a new format.
36. Rolling out the 'Remembering Yesterday, Celebrating Today' programme, developing this and building capacity as we go.

37. Exploring the possibility of a second annual resident forum to supplement the Residents' Celebration Day.
38. Introducing a new complaints policy and procedure.
39. Identifying useful methods for measuring the success of communications and engagement.
40. Reviewing all changes and making improvements as needed.
41. All these measures have been incorporated into the Housing Service Plan for 2014-15. This is an internal plan for the use of officers. The measures will also be incorporated into Estate Plans so that residents can see what is planned. We do not propose to have a separate Resident Involvement Plan as the work is now integrated into the every day work of the Service.

Staffing changes

42. The secondment of the Strategic Communications Manager ends in July and the Projects and Improvements Manager takes over the management of the team and function.
43. The team currently comprises a Resident Participation Officer, whose role is mainly to work with Residents' Associations; a temporary Communications Officer, currently seconded from the Admin team; and a Communications Apprentice.
44. The Resident Participation Officer is taking early retirement. The post will be replaced with a permanent appointment to the Communications Officer post of someone with up to date IT skills so that we can implement the next steps. We also expect to appoint a new apprentice to support this and other work in September.

Consultation

45. Many of the changes made as part of this review have been made in response to feedback from residents. This feedback has been gathered from:
 - The annual satisfaction survey;
 - The STAR survey of tenants and some follow up work with a focus group;
 - Comments made during meetings, walkabouts and one to one meetings with residents;
 - Comments made as part of complaints.
46. Other changes have been made for practical reasons to reflect the move of staffing resources from the central team to the estates. We have not consulted on these changes as they are operational matters.
47. Some Residents' Associations have expressed concern that we will be engaging directly with the wider community rather than through them. We have reassured them that they will continue to be able to submit group responses to consultation.

48. There have also been some concerns about community funding being open to all resident groups and individuals rather than just Residents' Associations. We have reassured the RAs that they can still submit applications for grants to help with their activities and that we will work with them to help reduce their costs so that more funding is available for the rest of the estate. We are particularly grateful to the committee of Golden Lane Estate Residents' Association, who have helped us design the forms and process for grant applications.
49. The Comptroller and the Public Relations Office have been consulted on the contents of this report.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Draft Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy & Protocols
Appendix 2 Detailed review and actions (available on request)

Jacquie Campbell

Head of Housing Management

T: 020 7332 3785

E: Jacquie.campbell@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Draft Resident Communications & Engagement Strategy

1. Introduction

The City of London believes that high quality and consistent communication and engagement with residents is vital to a landlord/resident relationship and helps to improve services on a continuous basis. This strategy sets out our approach to resident communications and engagement on our 11 social housing estates and identifies the key mechanisms used to deliver it.

2. Aim of strategy

The aim of this strategy is to ensure that residents:

- receive timely, accessible and accurate information on matters affecting them, their homes and their estates;
- have ways of giving feedback about services provided to them;
- are fully consulted on any significant changes affecting them, such as major projects on their estates;
- can engage in a dialogue with officers about landlord services provided by the City of London;
- have opportunities to participate in activities which benefit the estate and in making decisions on matters which directly affect them.

3. Legislative and policy framework

The only legislative requirement for landlords to consult with residents is the obligation under the Landlord & Tenants Act of 1985 (revised by the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act of 2002) to consult with leaseholders on works and services which will result in direct financial charges to them over specified limits.

This strategy has, therefore, been developed with regard to good practice amongst social landlords and the user engagement work of other departments in the City.

4. Equal opportunities

The City of London operates an Equality & Diversity policy and this applies to all aspects of its services. When communicating and engaging with residents, we will ensure that no resident is treated less favourably on the grounds of age, race, religion or belief, disability, sex, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership

This strategy and all related information can be made available in different formats and languages on request.

5. Scope of the strategy

The strategy covers the City of London Housing Service's work with tenants and leaseholders of its eleven social housing estates. It also applies to work with other residents on the estates, such as freeholders and the tenants of private landlords. Parts of it may also be applicable to leaseholders and freeholders who are not

resident on our estates but let their properties privately. We have used the term 'residents' as a broad descriptor to cover all these groups.

The strategy does not cover our work with tenants of commercial properties on our estates, and we propose to add a section covering communication and engagement with these stakeholders at a later date.

6. Delivering the aims

To meet the aims set out in Section 2, our strategy is to deliver a range of activities and opportunities for residents. These are divided into five categories:

- Information
- Feedback
- Engagement
- Formal Consultation
- Participation.

6.1 Information

We undertake to ensure that the information we provide is:

- made available at the appropriate time;
- available in paper form, via email, on the City's website and on any estate Facebook pages;
- clear and easy to understand;
- available in alternative formats and languages;
- accurate and up to date.

We strive to ensure that all our information meets the above needs. We will use a range of methods to provide regular information to residents, including, but not limited to:

- an Estate Newsletter, published four times a year and made available to all households;
- a one-page Estate Bulletin, published weekly;
- an Annual Report of our performance;
- a Welcome Pack for all new tenants and homeowners;
- leaflets on a range of services and subjects;
- Estate Plans, produced annually to publish the results of feedback and the actions staff will take to address issues on the estate.

6.2 Feedback

We believe that feedback is vital in helping us to understand any concerns residents have about their estates so that we can make improvements to address these. We also need to know which aspects of our services are satisfactory, so that we do not make unnecessary changes.

We will seek feedback from residents through:

- Annual surveys of satisfaction with estate services;

- voluntary participation in the national Survey of Tenants & Residents (STAR) held every 3 years;
- conducting occasional surveys of all households on specific topics affecting the estate;
- a simple and effective complaints process.

Residents will be informed of the results and outcome of feedback through the information mechanisms listed above, in particular Estate Plans and Newsletters.

6.3 Engagement

We believe that an ongoing dialogue with residents can help foster a positive relationship. This ensures that issues can be raised in a constructive manner and appropriate solutions found in a way that involves residents and officers.

In order to encourage engagement, we will:

- advertise the dates and times of meetings, events and walkabouts at least four weeks in advance and via various information channels;
- hold some events out of normal working hours so that residents who are not available during the day can attend;
- provide feedback on issues raised and actions promised to all residents via Estate Newsletters and other mechanisms listed above.

Opportunities for residents to engage with us include:

- regular Estate Meetings open to all residents and held at least twice a year (see Section 7 - Housing Meetings Protocol);
- Estate Walkabouts, attended by estate management and Property Services staff, held quarterly;
- Residents' Celebration Day, held annually;
- The Housing Users Board (HUB), a panel of residents who have expressed an interest in having greater involvement and can be invited to attend one-off events or to complete detailed questionnaires on specific matters affecting all estates.

6.4 Formal Consultation

We have a statutory obligation under the Landlord & Tenants Act of 1985 and the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 to consult with our leaseholders on any works or services provided to them which will result in direct charges that are over specified limits per household. This obligation is commonly known as Section 20 consultation.

We also believe that we have an obligation to our residents to consult with them formally on any major works proposed for their homes or their estate, including the implementation of planned maintenance programmes and the possible development of new homes.

We will carry out formal consultation with residents by:

- following statutory guidance on Section 20 consultation;

- using the corporate model for majors works consultation, which prescribes a programme of letters, notices and meetings on any major project.

6.5 Participation

We are committed to providing and supporting opportunities for residents to be more involved in their estate in order to develop and maintain a strong sense of community and collective responsibility. We believe that such voluntary participation not only benefits the community by, for example, reducing anti-social behaviour, but also benefits the individual, by helping them to develop a range of skills and experiences which will combat social isolation and may enhance their employment opportunities.

In order to encourage participation, we will:

- offer small grants to individuals and groups to help with the cost of running community activities and events, through a simple and transparent application process;
- provide legal indemnity insurance to cover any events run on estates by staff and/or residents;
- offer, in response to demand, training to groups and individuals on topics such as chairing meetings, equalities and diversity, running events, carrying out risk assessments (see Section 8.3 – Support available to all groups);
- offer Time Credits as an incentive and reward for volunteering and participation;
- provide support from a Community Development Officer and local staff to help groups or individuals develop proposals for activities and events to benefit the estate and to implement these.

We will offer residents opportunities to participate through:

- Supporting a range of resident associations and groups (see Protocol for working with Resident Groups);
- Offering opportunities to volunteer in the Good Neighbour Scheme or in estate community projects;
- Developing and leading the Remembering Yesterday, Celebrating Today four-year programme of community development activities;
- Inviting residents to submit and vote on proposals for spending a small Estate Improvements Budget on each estate;
- Taking part in working groups to consider specific issues, either through the HUB, or as part of consultation on major projects.

7. Protocol on Estate Meetings

7.1 Introduction

- The City of London Housing Service believes that holding regular meetings, open to all residents on an estate can be an effective means of building relationships, sharing information and answering resident questions.

- Estate Meetings are organised by the Housing Service four times a year on our larger estates and at least twice a year on our smaller estates. The meetings are held in the evening and are open to all residents to attend.

7.2 Purpose of meetings

- The purpose of the meetings is to discuss matters which relate specifically to the City of London's function as landlord. The meetings allow officers to share information with residents and to enable residents to raise issues with and ask questions of their landlord.
- Other matters may be discussed if they relate directly to residents on the estate. Officers from other departments or agencies may be invited to discuss these matters. Examples would be; the local police attending to discuss crime or security on an estate; inviting a contractor to tell residents about some work they are carrying out; asking someone to come and talk about changes in welfare benefits which might affect the ability of residents to pay rent or service charges.
- The meetings are not to be used for the discussion of matters which are not Housing-related or to discuss political issues.

7.3 Organising and publicising meetings

- Meetings are organised by the Estate Manager, who advertises the time, date, venue and main agenda items at least four weeks in advance. Allocated Members and Ward Members are notified of the meeting as early as possible to allow them to attend if they wish.
- Residents will be invited to suggest agenda items and to submit questions in writing in advance of the meeting. Residents submitting questions may ask to remain anonymous if they wish.

7.4 Management of meetings

- Meetings are chaired by a senior Housing Manager or, on occasions, by an Allocated Member.
- The Chair will manage the meeting, ensuring that any agreed ground rules are observed, that speakers are kept to time and that residents are given a fair chance to ask questions and make comments, as appropriate.
- If any attendee behaves in a way which is disruptive or disregards the agreed ground rules, the Chair may ask them to leave the meeting. If they refuse to do so, it is the Chair's right to close the meeting.
- The meetings are not minuted, but the Estate Manager takes notes of issues raised and any actions agreed. These are then published in the newsletter which follows each meeting.
- The City of London, as landlord, has no obligation to hold open meetings on its estates, but does so because we wish to build positive, ongoing relationships with residents. If at any stage officers feel that the meetings on any estate are being consistently disrupted and/or are being used to generate conflict, the Housing Service Director has the right to cancel one or more meetings or discontinue them for the foreseeable future.

7.5 Recording of meetings

- The City can arrange for a meeting to be either filmed or audio recorded if residents express a wish for this to take place.
- Requests for recording to take place should be made to the Estate Manager at least one week before the meeting to allow equipment and staff to be organised.
- Any camera used will be focused on the speakers only. Any member of staff not wishing to be filmed can speak from the side of the room.
- The Chair will draw to residents' attention that recording is taking place at the start of the meeting. If a majority of residents object to the filming, it will not take place.
- If at any stage the view of the Chair is that recording is, in some way proving detrimental to the good conduct of the meeting, it is his/her right to discontinue it.
- A link to the recording will be placed on the estate pages of the City's website within one week of the meeting so that residents not able to attend can view it.

8. Protocol for working with resident groups

8.1 Introduction

- The City of London Housing Service believes that the existence of resident groups and associations enhances the richness of life on our social housing estates by encouraging residents to meet each other and to be part of the community.
- We support the right of any group, which is non-political and exists for the benefit of residents, to form on an estate. We are committed to treating all groups equally.

8.2 Registering group details

- We have a simple form which groups must complete and return to the Estate Manager if they wish to benefit from the support available to them. The form should be renewed annually so that the Estate Office has up to date contact details.
- A group should comprise only residents of the estate and non-residential homeowners.
- A list of current groups on the estate and a contact for each will be printed in each Estate Newsletter.

8.3 Support available for all groups

- Groups can apply for a small grant by completing a simple application form and submitting this to the Estate Manager. The form, and guidelines, are available separately. Applications may be made for help with ongoing running costs, or the cost of running an event or activity for residents. Grants are also available to individuals.
- Training for groups and individuals may be arranged if requested. Examples of the type of training which can be provided are:
 - Charing and running meetings;
 - Note taking;

- Running events;
- Carrying out risk assessments;
- Equalities and diversity;
- First aid.
- The Housing Service pays for indemnity insurance to cover events run by staff and/or residents on its estates.
- Facilities such as printing, copying, use of meeting space etc may be available from the estate office, depending on the number of groups requesting this and what availability there is. Materials such as printer paper may also be available.
- Model constitutions and equalities policies are available for groups to use if they wish.
- The Estate Office may allow access to estate noticeboards for displaying A4 posters and may also be able to arrange for information to be sent out to residents via email or social media. The Estate Manager has the right to refuse to display or distribute any material which he/she considers to be misleading, inappropriate or offensive.

8.4 Consultation and issues raised

- The Housing Service believes that we should communicate and directly engage with the entire estate community. We do so via newsletters, Estate Meetings, bulletins, walkabouts and other means of communications.
- The focus of Estate Managers' time must be on working with the wider estate community rather than any one group. Therefore, there is no obligation for the Estate Manager to attend the meetings of any group unless he/she considers on occasion, that this is an appropriate use of time. Members of any group have the right to attend all open meetings, walkabouts and other events as residents of the estate.
- All consultation will be with the whole population of the estate or, in the case of major works, the residents affected. However, we welcome the views of resident groups, so they may submit a collective response to any consultation exercise, in addition to their individual responses as private residents. Any group views will be taken into consideration when the consultation feedback is analysed.
- A group, through its Chair or other nominated individual, may raise any issue or question with the Estate Manager. The Estate Manager will look into the issue raised and will send a response to all residents on the estate, through the Estate Newsletter or other channels. The response will record that the issue was raised by a specific group.

8.5 Unacceptable behaviour from resident groups

- We understand that there will be times when a group will give negative feedback or criticism to the Housing Service and we welcome this being done in a constructive way so that we can address areas of concern. However, if any person representing a group behaves in a way which is unacceptable and becomes vexatious, then we would need to take action. Examples would be abusive, or intimidating behaviour during meetings or excessive and/or inappropriate correspondence.

- In such cases, our first action would be to draw the issue to the attention of the Chair or another officer of the group, asking for it to cease. If the unacceptable behaviour continues, it may be necessary to withdraw from communicating with or recognising the group.
- This will only take place with the agreement of the Director of Community & Children's Services. If approval to such a request is given, the group will cease to be eligible to apply for grants or to receive other support from officers.

9. Monitoring the strategy

The Projects & Improvements Manager is responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy. A report will be brought to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee annually to update Members on resident communications and engagement. The efficacy of the strategy will be monitored through the following key performance indicators:

- % of residents satisfied or very satisfied with communications and customer service on their estate
- % of residents who feel their views are taken into account.

These will be measured by the annual satisfaction survey and the STAR survey held every three years.

Further Information

For further advice or information regarding the contents of this strategy please contact the Projects & Improvements Manager, Kate Bowen at katherine.bowen@cityoflondon.gov.uk.

Committee:	Date:
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee	10 July 2014
Subject:	Public
Horace Jones House – Local Lettings Policy	
Report of:	For Decision
Director of Community and Children’s Services	
Summary	
<p>This report seeks approval from Members for a Local Lettings Policy for the allocation of homes at Horace Jones House - formalising the approach agreed by Community and Children’s Services Grand Committee on 13 June 2014. The policy sets out the priorities and qualifying criteria for applicants seeking one of the 43 affordable homes offered at the scheme. It sets out the City’s intention to prioritise existing social tenants in the Square Mile and living in the City’s housing estates elsewhere, the intention to exclude applicants who have breached their tenancy, and criteria for new applicants.</p>	
Recommendation(s)	
Members are asked to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve the Local Lettings Policy of Horace Jones House • delegate authority to the Director of Community and Children’s Services in consultation with Chairman to approve minor changes that may be required. 	

Main Report

Background

1. Horace Jones House is a development of 43 new affordable homes provided by the City of London Corporation (the City). This unique development is delivered on a site within the London Borough of Southwark next to Tower Bridge and close to the Mayor of London’s City Hall.
2. It was agreed by Community and Children’s Services Grand Committee on 13 June 2014 to set intermediate rents for these homes, and set priorities for their allocation that differ from the City’s agreed Allocations Policy through the development and agreement of a ‘Local Lettings Policy’ (LLP).

Current Position

3. The City of London’s Housing Allocations Policy allows for the use of local lettings policies. These policies will normally be time limited and may seek to achieve a wide variety of housing management and policy objectives. They are subject to approval by Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee, and expected to be time limited.

Proposals

4. The draft 'Horace Jones House LLP' is set out Appendix 1.
5. The LLP governs the allocation of the 29 homes that the City of London will nominate tenants for, and the 14 units for which the London Borough of Southwark have agreed nomination rights.
6. Prospective tenants must meet the qualifying criteria for the housing waiting list of the City of London or LB Southwark (depending on the nominating authority). For City nominees they must live in the City of London (or one of the City's estates outside of the Square Mile) and have done so for a minimum of twelve months, or have been employed in the City of London for a minimum of twelve months.
7. Priority will be given to existing social tenants. Within this group, those who are overcrowded, under occupying or who have a severe medical need will be prioritised in line with the approach and definitions of the City's Housing Allocations Scheme.
8. Applicants will have to demonstrate their ability to meet the intermediate rent levels charged for these homes. Such rents are greater than traditional social rents, but significantly below market rents. At Horace Jones House rents will be set at 40 per cent of the market rent.
9. No maximum income level will be set for existing social tenants. However, new applicants will be subject to maximum income levels to ensure allocation is to those who are unable to meet the housing needs in the local market (in line with the definition of affordable housing).
10. It is proposed the LLP is put in place for a period of three years, after which it will require review and/or renewed agreement.
11. The proposed policy will apply solely to the 43 units at Horace Jones house. As such its adoption will not dominate the allocations scheme at the expense of the statutory reasonable preference categories (such as homeless households) who will be continue to afforded reasonable preference by City's Allocations Policy.
12. Officers consider that the Horace Jones LLP is consistent with our general allocations policy.
13. Its adoption will diversify the City's affordable housing offer through the provision of homes at an intermediate rent – increasing the choice available to, and opportunities for, those on medium incomes. In giving priority to existing social tenants it will provide opportunities for transfer, and generate additional lettings within our stock for others in housing need. The prioritisation of those who are overcrowded or under occupying will support better management of our stock.
14. As a public body the City of London is required by the Public Sector Equalities Duty to have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities.
15. An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Horace Jones House LLP has been completed (see Appendix 2). The assessment suggests that the adoption of

the LLP will create housing opportunities within our stock that will mitigate the negative impacts identified. By creating voids within our social rented homes the City will be able to meet those whose housing need is prioritised within the overall Housing Allocations Policy.

16. Unanticipated circumstances may require minor adjustment or addition to the LLP. It is proposed that authority to approve such changes is delegated to the Director of Community and Children's Services in consultation with Chairman to approve minor changes that may be required.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

17. The City's Corporate Strategy seeks a world-class City that supports our communities through the appropriate provision of housing, and supports a safer and stronger City by supporting community cohesion. The proposed approach to rent, allocation and tenure at Horace Jones House supports the delivery of that vision, and is integral to the City's strategic priorities for housing set out in its Housing Strategy.

Implications

18. The Housing Act 1996 enables housing authorities to allocate particular accommodation to people of a particular description, whether or not they fall within the reasonable preference categories. This is the statutory basis for so-called 'local lettings policies' which may be used to achieve a wide variety of housing management and policy objectives.

Conclusion

19. The LLP proposed provides the basis by which the homes at Horace Jones House can be allocated in line with the wishes of Members and the wider housing objectives of the City of London.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Horace Jones House Local Lettings Policy
- Appendix 2 – Horace Jones House EqIA

Background Papers:

- Horace Jones House Report – Community and Children's Services Grand Committee, 13 June 2014
- Amendment to the Allocations Policy – Housing and Almshouses Sub Committee, 22 May 2014

Simon Cribbens

Policy Development Manager – Housing and Social Care

T: 020 7332 1210

E: simon.cribbens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Horace Jones House - Local Lettings Policy

Introduction

1. Horace Jones House is a development of 43 new affordable homes provided by the City of London Corporation (the City). The development is on a site within the London Borough of Southwark next to Tower Bridge and close to the Mayor of London's City Hall.
2. The scheme consists of:
 - 14 one-bedroom flats
 - 15 two-bedroom flats
 - 14 three-bedroom flats.
3. These new homes are delivered as part of the City's wider strategic commitment to increase the supply of homes which began with the delivery of 24 social rented homes within the Square Mile in 2013. The units at Horace Jones House will be offered at intermediate rent levels. The letting of these homes will be subject to a Local Lettings Policy (LLP).

Purpose of the Local Lettings Policy

4. This LLP sets how these properties will be let and which households will be prioritised.

Objectives of the Local Lettings Policy

5. The LLP for Horace Jones House will deliver a number of policy objectives:
 - to diversify the City's stock of 2,000 social rented homes through the provision of homes at an intermediate rent – increasing the choice available to, and opportunities for, those on medium incomes
 - to give priority to existing social tenants in the City of London, and in the City's housing estates in other boroughs in order to meet their aspirations and housing needs, and generate additional lettings within our stock for others in housing need
 - to create a sustainable community by ensuring stable lettings that minimise stock turnover and management costs
 - to meet housing need and encourage better management of our stock by giving priority to overcrowded and under occupying households.

Lettings arrangements

6. Homes at Horace Jones House for which the City of London have nomination rights will be let to those who currently live in the City of London (or one of the City's estates outside of the Square Mile) and have done so for a minimum of twelve months, or have been employed in the City of London for a minimum of twelve months.

7. Households nominated by the London Borough of Southwark will be either existing tenants of that local authority, or other applicants who qualify for the housing register or waiting list of that authority.
8. Applicants must be able to demonstrate their ability to meet the intermediate rent levels charged for these homes. A financial assessment will be undertaken.
9. Existing tenants will be permitted to transfer to a property of the same size as their existing homes, and those transferring from a studio flat will be considered for a 1 bedroom flat, unless in either case their need requires a larger property.
10. Priority will be given to existing social tenants. Within this group, those who are overcrowded, under occupying or who have a severe medical need will be prioritised in line with the approach and definitions of the City's Housing Allocations Scheme.
11. In the event of several households meeting these criteria and where households have the same level need, households will then be prioritised in priority date order from when they joined the Housing Register.
12. Thereafter other applicants and tenants of the London Borough of Southwark will be prioritised based on their level of housing needs and their date of application to the Housing Register.
13. For new applicants to the Housing Register wishing to be nominated to Horace Jones House, maximum level of household income will apply. For applicants whose requirement is for a two or three bedroom property, applicants should have a household income of no more than £60,000 per annum. For applicants whose requirement is for a one bedroom property, the maximum household income permissible is £45,000.
14. Applications from existing social tenants will be excluded where there is a history of rent arrears, antisocial behaviour or other significant breaches of tenancy conditions.

Tenancy type

15. Where homes in Horace Jones House are allocated to existing social tenants (whether a tenant of the City or of another social landlord) who already hold a lifetime tenancy, a lifetime secure tenancy will be granted.
16. A five-year fixed-term tenancy will be offered to:
 - I. transferring social tenants who already hold a fixed-term tenancy or a one-year introductory tenancy
 - II. new applicants who are not existing social tenants.
17. For new applicants, a fixed term tenancy will be offered subject to completion of a one year introductory tenancy.
18. A lifetime tenancy will always be offered to older people, adults with learning difficulties, adults with permanent support needs and households containing someone with long-term support or care needs.

19. Where a fixed-term tenancy is granted and reaches its end, a further term will normally be granted if there are no significant changes of circumstance. Exceptions to this may include:
- where the tenant has breached the terms of their tenancy and has failed to reach or maintain an agreement to remedy this breach
 - where there is no further need for purpose-built wheelchair-accessible accommodation or for accommodation to which substantial adaptations have been carried out.

Duration

20. This local lettings policy will be valid for three years from the date of its approval. At which point it must either be renewed or replaced, or the allocation of homes will be governed by the City's Allocation Policy.

This page is intentionally left blank



‘You will not get far if you perceive the duty to be over burdensome or take a mechanistic approach....there will be progress if the duty is seen as a way of fundamentally changing the core values and culture of the organisation.....we need and outcome-oriented approach’ – CRE Chair 2001

Equality Impact Assessment: Stage 1: Initial Screening Form for Policies or Functions (including new & revised)

A: Summary Details

Directorate: Community and Children's Services

Section: People

Person responsible for the assessment: Simon Cribbens

Contact details: simon.cribbens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Names of other people participating in review:

Name of Policy to be assessed: Horace Jones House local lettings policy

Is this a new or revised policy: new

Date policy scheduled for Committee (if relevant): 10 July 2014

B: Preparation

*It is important to consider all available information that could help determine whether the policy could have any actual or **potential** adverse impact. Please attach examples of available monitoring information, research and consultation reports.*

1. Do you have monitoring data available on the number of people (with protected characteristics*) who are using or are potentially impacted upon by your policy? *Please specify what monitoring information you have available (your monitoring information should be compared to the current available census data or more recent population data if available to see whether a proportionate number of people are taking up your service).*

Some monitoring data is available for households on the City of London's housing waiting list and for households housed in City homes, but this does not record or report all protected characteristics.

The number of people usually resident in the City is small, around 7,400. In addition, there are around 1400 people who have a second home in the City, but live elsewhere. There are 4,390 households and large numbers of people of working age. The City has proportionately more people aged between 25 and 69 than Greater London. Conversely there are fewer young people. Only 10% of households have children compared to around 30% for London and the rest of the country. Average household size is small and many people (56%) live alone.

The population is predominantly white. The second largest ethnic group is Asian. This group which includes Indian, Bangladeshi and Chinese populations has grown

over the past decade. The proportion of the City’s population that is black is smaller in comparison to both the London wide population and that of England and Wales. Figures and changes since 2001 are shown in Table 1.

	City of London		Greater London		England and Wales	
	% 2001	% 2011	% 2001	% 2011	%2001	% 2011
White	84.6	78.6	71.2	59.8	91.3	86
Mixed	2.3	3.9	3.2	5	1.3	2.2
Asian	8.9	12.7	13.2	18.5	4.8	7.5
Black	2.6	2.6	10.9	13.3	2.2	3.3
Other countries	1.7	2.1	1.6	3.4	0.4	1

Table 1: Ethnic Group 2001 and 2011

Source: Office of National Statistics© Crown Copyright

2. If monitoring has NOT been undertaken, will it be done in the future or do you have access to relevant monitoring data for this area? If not, specify the arrangement you intend to make; if not please give a reason for your decision.

The review and digitisation of housing records, and the further development of the Resident Insight Database, are departmental priorities which will in future provide more detailed profiling of those impacted by service change and policy development, and inform service design and delivery.

3. Please list any consultations that you may have had and/or local/national consultations, research or practical guidance that will assist you in completing this EqIA.

The EqIAs for the Housing Strategy, Tenancy Strategy and Homelessness Strategy have been examined in order to inform the completion of this assessment.

C: Your Policy or Function

1. What is the main purpose of the policy or function?

The local lettings policy governs the allocation of 43 affordable homes at Horace Jones House. This includes the 29 homes that the City of London will nominate tenants for, and the 14 units for which the London Borough of Southwark have agreed nomination rights.

- 2 Are there any other objectives of the policy or function, if so what are they?

The LLP for Horace Jones House will deliver a number of policy objectives:

- to diversify the City’s stock of social rented homes through the provision of homes at an intermediate rent – increasing the choice available to, and opportunities for, those on medium incomes
- to give priority to existing social tenants in the City of London, and in the City’s housing estates in other boroughs in order to meet their

aspirations and housing needs, and generate additional lettings within our stock for others in housing need

- to create a sustainable community by ensuring stable lettings that minimise stock turnover and management costs
- to meet housing need and encourage better management of our stock by giving priority to overcrowded and under occupying households.

3 Do any written procedures exist to enable delivery of this policy or function?

The Housing Act 1996 enables housing authorities to allocate particular accommodation to people of a particular description, whether or not they fall within the reasonable preference categories. This is the statutory basis for so-called 'local lettings policies' which may be used to achieve a wide variety of housing management and policy objectives.

4 Are there elements of common practice in the service area or function that are **not** clearly defined within the written procedures?

The local lettings policy is being adopted in order to define common practice.

5 Who are the main stakeholders of the policy?

Tenants of social housing owned by City of London, and of other social landlords within the City's boundaries; housing waiting list applicants; and homeless applicants. To the extent that the London Borough of Southwark has nomination rights, it will also apply to their tenants, waiting list applicants and homeless households.

6 Is the policy associated with any other Corporation policy (s)?

The strategy sits alongside the Housing Strategy, Tenancy Strategy and Housing Allocations Policy.

7 Are there any areas of the service/policy that are governed by discretionary powers? If so, is there clear guidance as to how to exercise these?

See section 3.

8 Is the responsibility for the proposed policy or function shared with another department or authority or organisation? If so, what responsibility, and which bodies?

The policy will govern the prioritisation of tenants nominated by both the City of London and London Borough of Southwark.

D: The Impact

Assess the potential impact that the policy could have on people who share the protected characteristics. The potential impact could be negative, positive or neutral. If you have assessed negative potential impact for any people who share one or more of the protected characteristics, you will need to also assess whether that negative potential impact is high, medium or low.

(N.B. Impact will not be equally negative or positive or neutral for all groups. There will be differing degrees of impact, the purpose of this section is to highlight whether it is disproportionately different)

a) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on men and women:

Gender	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Women			✓	
Men			✓	
Transgender/ transexual			✓	

b) identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on the basis of the following:

	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Pregnancy & Maternity		✓		Homelessness legislation provides specific protections for this group. The prioritisation of other groups may diminish the opportunities for homeless households, but they retain their reasonable preference in the

				allocation of social housing overall, and the prioritisation of existing tenants will create further housing opportunities at social rents for those needs groups.
Marriage & Civil Partnership			✓	

c) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on different race groups:

Page 42

Race	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Asian (including Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Indian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Other Asian Background – please specify_____)		✓ (low)		This group is over represented within statutory homelessness applications. The prioritisation of other groups may diminish the opportunities for homeless households, but they retain their reasonable preference in the allocation of social housing overall, and the prioritisation of existing tenants will create further housing opportunities at social rents for those needs groups.
Black (including Caribbean, Somali, Other African, Other black background – please specify_____)		✓ (low)		This group is over represented within statutory homelessness applications. The prioritisation of other groups may diminish the opportunities for homeless households, but they retain their reasonable preference in the

				allocation of social housing overall, and the prioritisation of existing tenants will create further housing opportunities at social rents for those needs groups.
White (including English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, Other white background – please specify _____)			✓	
Mixed/ Dual heritage (White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, Other mixed background - please specify _____)		✓ (low)		This group is over represented within statutory homelessness applications. The prioritisation of other groups may diminish the opportunities for homeless households, but they retain their reasonable preference in the allocation of social housing overall, and the prioritisation of existing tenants will create further housing opportunities at social rents for those needs groups.
Gypsies/Travellers			✓	Annual monitoring statistics suggest there are no clients in this group in the City.
Other (please specify)				

d) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on disabled people:

Disability	Positive	Negative (please	Neutral	Reason
------------	----------	------------------	---------	--------

		specify if High, Medium or Low)		
Physical Disability			✓	
Sensory Impairment			✓	
Learning Difficulties			✓	
Mental Health Issues			✓	

e) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on different age groups:

Age Group (specify, for example younger, older etc)	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Older People			✓	The income requirement for these intermediate rent units will exclude low income pensioners. This group may benefit from voids created by the scheme. Older people are more likely to under-occupy and households in this circumstance are given priority for this scheme and in the City's overall allocation scheme. The City is also undertaking a review of the housing needs of older people.
Young People/children			✓	The scheme predominantly provides

				family sized units. The local lettings policy is also aimed at alleviating overcrowding by prioritising this group, and creating voids within existing housing stock to meet these needs.
--	--	--	--	---

f) identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on lesbians, gay men, bisexual or heterosexual people:

Sexual Orientation	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Lesbian			✓	
Gay Men			✓	
Bisexual			✓	
Heterosexual			✓	

g) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on different religious/faith groups?

Religious/Faith groups (specify)	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Buddhist			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.
Christian			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.

Hindu			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.
Jewish			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.
Muslim			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.
Sikh			✓	This group is not monitored, but it is not anticipated that faith groups will be impacted negatively by the policy.
Other (please specify)				

Page 46
h) As a result of completing Question 1 a-f above what is the potential impact of your policy?
High ⑤ **Medium** ⑤ **Low** ✓

The safety net provision of legislation more broadly supports those with vulnerabilities such as age, mental health etc and are therefore deemed as priority. In addition, the City of London is committed to monitoring the equalities impact of the strategy within the context of the wider monitoring process.

2. Could you minimise or remove any negative potential impact? Explain How.

We believe that the policy will create housing opportunities within our stock that will mitigate the negative impacts identified. By creating voids within our social rented homes we will meet those whose housing need is prioritised within our overall Housing Allocations Policy. We also believe that the application of this policy to the 43 units at Horace Jones House will not dominate our Housing Allocations Policy, which governs our overall approach to housing allocations.

3. If there is no evidence that the policy promotes equality of opportunity or prevents unlawful discrimination– could it be adapted so that it does? How?

We believe that the policy promotes equality of opportunity / prevents unlawful discrimination.

Please ensure that all actions identified are included in the attached action plan and reflected in your service plan.

Please sign and date this form, keep one copy and send one to Equality, Diversity & Human Rights Manager

Signed

Signed

Signed

Simon Cribbens

Service Head

Date

Date

Date

Page 47

Action Plan

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones	Officer Responsible	Progress
Improve quality monitoring and data for tenants and waiting list applicants	Digitisation and Resident Insight Database			

Page 48

Agenda Item 7

Committees:	Dates:
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee Projects Sub Committee	10 July 2014 22 July 2014
Subject: Gateway 3/4 Options Appraisal - Door entry systems at the Golden Lane (partial), Holloway and York Way Estates	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision

Summary

Dashboard

Project Status	Green
Project Risk	Green
Time Line	Gateway 3/4 – July 2014 Tender for contractor to carry out works – complete November 2014 Appoint contractor – December 2014 Seek authority to commence works – December 2014 Schedule works from Spring 2015 through to March 2016
Programme status	Pending Approval of Gateway 3-4 Options Appraisal.
Approved works budget	£976,000
Latest estimated cost of works	£94,195.15- £578,983.57 (dependent upon option selected)
Expenditure to date	£4302.98 survey and staff costs

Changes since previous gateway:

Governance: The project will be monitored by the Housing Programme Board, which is Chaired by the Director of Community and Children's Services and includes representatives from the Departments of Community and Children's Services, the Built Environment, Chamberlains, City Surveyor's, Comptroller and City Solicitors.

Resident consultation

Consultation was carried out at the two housing estates which currently have audio-only functionality. The residents were consulted as to whether they would prefer to keep the audio functionality, or to change to an audio-visual system. 166 of 459 residents (36.2%) responded to the letter that was sent. Of the 11 blocks, in only one block did the majority of residents respond, 6/10 residents responded of whom 4 requested audio-visual. As such, it is considered there is not a significant majority of residents who wish for the system to be changed from audio to audio-visual.

Option recommended to develop to next Gateway

Option 1: The refurbishment of the existing door entry systems with like-for-like functionality; therefore, audio-visual functionality at Golden Lane Estate and audio functionality at Holloway and York Way Estates.

It is recommended that the like-for-like option, Option 1, should proceed. This is because Option 2 represents higher cost and there has been no majority requesting the option at the two estates concerned. Option 3 is not recommended as it offers no guarantee of improved service despite expenditure; therefore it does not represent best value for money.

Options

Description	Option 1 (like for like refurbishment)	Option 2 (audio-visual – all blocks)	Option 3 (10-year repair)
Works Costs	£415,766	£510,849.08	£79,926.04
Fees	£3802.98	£3802.98	£3802.98
Staff Costs	£52,446.12	£64,331.51	£10,466.13
Total	£472,015.10	£578,983.57	£94,195.15
Funding Strategy			
Source	HRA	HRA	HRA
Source	Service Charges	Service Charges	Service Charges

Next Steps

Carry out a technical specification. Undertake a procurement process to secure an appropriate contractor. Seek authority to commence work, appoint contractor and programme works.

Resource requirements to reach next Gateway and source of funding

£1000. The majority of cost associated with the next stage of the project will be internal staffing costs in order to undertake the procurement process.

Plans for consultation prior to the next Gateway report

Consultation will continue with other departments, including Town Clerks, Chamberlains and City Surveyors. Formal Section 20 Consultation will continue with long leaseholders.

Procurement Approach

A minimum of 3 quotes will be sought from contractors known to be capable of this type of work.

Recommendations

- Agreement to proceed to procurement and Gateway 5 with Option 1.
- Approval of budget of £472,015.10.

Options Appraisal Matrix

See attached.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Gateway 1/2 Project Proposal Report
-------------------	-------------------------------------

Contact

Report Author	Amy Carter
Email Address	Amy.Carter@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 3768

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option	Option 1 – Like for Like	Option 2 – All Audio-Visual	Option 3 – 10 year repair
1. Brief description	The refurbishment of the audio-only system at Holloway and York Way Estates. Refurbishment of the audio-visual system at Golden Lane Estate.	Installing audio-visual functionality at Holloway and York Way Estates. The refurbishment of the audio-visual system at Golden Lane Estate.	Repair of the existing door entry systems aiming to extend the working life for a further 10 years.
2. Scope and Exclusions	Scope – Golden Lane (partial) Holloway and York Way Estates. Exclusions – Basterfield, Bayer and Bowater Houses on the Golden Lane Estate. All other estates.		
Project Planning			
3. Programme and key dates	Gateway 3/4 – July 2014 Tender for contractor to carry out works – complete November 2014 Appoint contractor – December 2014 Seek authority to commence works – December 2014 Schedule works from Spring 2015 through to March 2016		As Options 1 and 2, with the earlier project completion time of March 2015.
Risk implications	Low. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refurbishment of the existing systems at 3 estates. 	Medium. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a risk of challenge that the works were not necessary where the service is changed from audio to audio-visual. 	Medium. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The works could achieve no discernible improvement in service despite the expenditure and the disruption for residents.
5. Benefits and disbenefits	Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full refurbishment of the system to achieve a 25 year life expectancy. Medium cost option. Disbenefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Causing disappointment to residents who requested audio-visual in consultation. 	Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full refurbishment of the equipment to achieve a 25 year life expectancy. Disbenefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher cost option. Of those consulted at Holloway and York Way, the majority did not select this option. 	Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repair of the equipment. Lower cost option. Disbenefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No warranty can be supplied for repaired equipment – therefore no guarantee of 10 years' service. High levels of disruption without guaranteed results.
6. Stakeholders and consultees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members and Ward Members. Officers including representatives from City Surveyors, Community and Children's Services and Town Clerk's. Residents of the three estates. 		

Option	Option 1 – Like for Like	Option 2 – All Audio-Visual	Option 3 – 10 year repair								
Resource Implications											
7. Total Estimated cost	£472,015.10	£578,983.57	£94,195.15								
	The costs above are estimates provided by our communications consultants as part of the feasibility study and recommendations report. The figures are estimated and are subject to change following a technical specification and tendering process.										
8. Funding strategy	Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and service charge contributions from leaseholders (proportionally by block).										
9. Ongoing revenue implications	There will be no increase in ongoing revenue implications. Following the contractors one-year defects repair responsibility, the systems will be serviced within the existing repairs and maintenance portfolio.										
10. Affordability	Works such as these are built into the 30 year Asset Management Plan and are a required part of the ongoing maintenance of the City's social housing stock. The works are fully-funded from the HRA and leasehold service charges.										
11. Procurement strategy	Tenders will be sought from a minimum of 3 contractors via the London Portal.										
12. Legal implications	None.										
13. Corporate property implications	None.										
14. Sustainability and energy implications	None.										
15. IS implications	None.										
16. Recommendation	Recommended.	Not Recommended.	Not recommended.								
17. Next Gateway	Gateway 5.										
18. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> <th>Funding Source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff time – 10 days</td> <td>Procurement</td> <td>£1000</td> <td>Local Risk</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funding Source	Staff time – 10 days	Procurement	£1000	Local Risk
Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funding Source								
Staff time – 10 days	Procurement	£1000	Local Risk								

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Projects Sub	22 January 2014
Subject: Project Proposal – To carry out renewal of the door entry systems at the Holloway Estate, York Way Estate and Golden Lane Estate (partial), following a detailed assessment of the current conditions and consideration of options.	Public
Report of: Director of the Department of Community and Children’s Services.	For Decision

Overview

1. Spending Committee	Community and Children’s Services
2. Senior Responsible Officer	Eddie Stevens, Housing Service Director
3. Project Board	Not recommended. It is anticipated that decisions relating to the project will be made without formal ratification, as per previous projects of this nature in this department.
4. Context	<p>Condition surveys were undertaken in 2010 to Holloway Estate, York Way Estate and Golden Lane Estate (blocks Crescent House, Cullum Welch House, Cuthbert Harrowing House, Great Arthur House, Hatfield House and Stanley Cohen House). The door entry systems are between 20-40 years old and have had various repairs. The surveys indicated the door entry systems had ‘life expired’, i.e. performed beyond their expected life at the point of installation. The survey reports indicate the door entry systems require major works of repair, refurbishment or replacement in order to continue functioning.</p> <p>There have been ongoing problems with the door entry systems at these blocks. System failures provide an ineffective level of service, below that which residents expect and pay for through their rent and service charges. Furthermore, the failures cause anxiety to residents owing to the reduction in security.</p> <p>A more detailed assessment is required to establish the best approach to resolve the functionality problems and preserve the value of our assets.</p>
5. Brief description of project	The door entry systems at Holloway Estate, York Way Estate and Golden Lane Estate (selected blocks, as above) will be assessed with a view to an options appraisal. At this stage, the options are:

	<p>1. Repair existing systems to extend the useful life by 10 plus years, by utilising as much of the existing cables as possible but with new entrance panels and receivers.</p> <p>2. Undertake complete system replacement with either (i) an audio only installation or (ii) an audio-visual installation for a 20+ year life.</p> <p>The project will include determining the estimated costs for both options via a further survey. The options and associated cost estimates will then be used for consultation in order to determine which approach to proceed with.</p> <p>At this stage, it is anticipated that the existing entrance doors and doorframes will be repaired and re-used for the repair and replacement options, unless the survey indicates otherwise.</p>
<p>6. Business case</p>	<p>It is uneconomical to continue to repair faults with door entry systems which are between 20-30 years old. Furthermore, due to the age of the systems, it is becoming harder to source the necessary spare parts (panels and receivers) required to keep these systems operational.</p> <p>In the financial year 2012-13, the cost of repairs to communal door entry systems at the affected blocks was £6961.46.</p> <p>This is formed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repairs to the door entry to the relevant blocks on the Golden Lane Estate totalling £3080.46. • Repairs to the door entry to the blocks of the Holloway Estate totalling £1086.90. • Repairs to the door entry to the blocks of the York Way Estate totalling £2794.10. <p>By assessing the options available, the City will be able to determine the most cost effective method of maintaining the assets and reduce spending on response repairs to these systems.</p>
<p>7. Consequences if project not approved</p>	<p>The door entry systems will continue to degrade and potentially could fail completely.</p> <p>Continued spending on responsive repairs.</p> <p>The City failing to provide the required facilities to residents and the likely dissatisfaction that this will cause.</p> <p>A potential increase in anti-social behaviour caused by an inability to prevent non-residents gaining access to the block.</p>
<p>8. Success criteria</p>	<p>Door entry systems with an extended life between 10-20+ years (dependent upon upgrade/replacement option selected).</p>

	<p>Reduced spending on the responsive repairs budget.</p> <p>Improved facilities (and therefore fewer complaints) from the residents living in the blocks.</p> <p>Extension of the lifetime of our assets.</p> <p>Improvement in safety and security for residents.</p>
9. Notable exclusions	<p>Other housing estates, where door entry systems have recently been replaced or do not have existing door entry systems.</p> <p>Bayer, Basterfield and Bowater Houses on the Golden Lane Estate, where door entry replacement was carried out in 2006.</p>
10. Key options to be considered	<p>To carry on maintaining the systems through responsive repairs is becoming more difficult and more costly. The surveys indicate that for some systems, at the Golden Lane and Holloway Estates, parts are already obsolete, and for all, parts are becoming harder to replace. Whilst it may be possible to continue in the short term, this does not offer a long term solution. Therefore, the following options must be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repair existing system to extend the useful life by 10 plus years, by utilising as much of the existing cable as possible but with new entrance panels and receivers. 2. Undertake complete replacement with either (i) an audio only installation or (ii) an audio-visual installation for a 20+ year life.

Prioritisation

11. Link to Strategic Aims	<p>SA2: To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes'. This project supports this aim.</p>
12. Link to departmental business plan	<p>Key priority 1 Improving the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals</p> <p>Key priority 4 Supporting and empowering our communities</p> <p>Key priority 5 Making best use of resources and improving the way we work.</p>
13. Links to other existing strategies, programmes and/or projects	<p>These works tie in with the Department of Community and Children's Services programme to upgrade or improve existing door entry systems, the Asset Management Strategy and the 30 year maintenance plan.</p> <p>This project also links with a CCTV installation project which is commencing shortly. The combination of the two projects</p>

	will improve security for residents of the estates.
14. Within which category does this project fit?	7a) Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
15. What is the priority of the project?	Essential

Financial Implications

16. Likely capital/ supplementary revenue cost range	<p>Subject to approval, the consultant will undertake the condition survey, and this will require up to two days for liaison with property services and estate staff. As at item 24, the consultant cost will be £3802.98.</p> <p>The surveys will indicate the viability and costs of the options, based on those outlined above.</p> <p>It is estimated that the cost of the project, whether option 1 or 2, will sit within the £250,000 - £2m range of projects.</p> <p>It is estimated at this stage, that should the surveys determine that the full upgrade of the door entry systems are required (Option 2), the costs would be :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golden Lane Estate: £458,000 • Holloway Estate: £225,000 • York Way Estate £293,000 TOTAL: £976,000 <p>There was a previous capital project addressing solely the door entry systems at Golden Lane (number 29100032). However, owing to the cost savings that would be achieved through principles of economies of scale it is suggested to combine the works on these 3 estates.</p> <p>The works will be proportionately recoverable via service charges.</p>
17. Potential source(s) of funding	The Housing Revenue Account (HRA).
18. On-going revenue requirements and departmental local risk budget(s) affected	<p>The response repairs budget will benefit from cost savings as fewer repairs to the renewed door entry systems will be required.</p> <p>Following the completion of the works, and expiry of any manufacturer's guarantees, the new installations will be the City of London Corporation's responsibility to maintain under normal contract repair and maintenance arrangements.</p>

Project Planning

19. Estimated programme and implications	<p>Corporate Projects Board – December 2013 Projects Sub – January 2014 Appoint Consultant – February 2014 Completion of Surveys – March 2014 Condition Survey reports issued – April 2014 Options Appraisal – May 2014 Tender for and appoint a contractor to carry out works – September 2014. (Procurement will be carried out in consultation with the City of London Procurement Service [CLPS] and using frameworks wherever possible in order to achieve best value.) Seek authority to commence works – October 2014 Schedule works through 2014/15.</p>
20. Potential risk implications	<p>The risk implications are low given the expected relatively low cost of the project and the limited affect that the works will have on residents, owing to the fact they are being carried out in communal areas.</p> <p>Once the recommended options for works are known, further risks will be drawn out based on the cost-benefit analysis of each option.</p>
21. Anticipated stakeholders and consultees	<p>Members, Department of Community and Children's Services Staff, residents of the estates, with reference to works completion and service charge recovery. The Chamberlains and Town Clerks will be involved in future reports.</p>
22. Equality Impact Assessment	<p>No equality impact assessment will be carried out. If works are subsequently approved all residents of the affected blocks should benefit from improved facilities. The works themselves are anticipated to be carried out with a minimum of disruption to residents of the blocks.</p>

Recommended Course of Action

23. Next Steps	<p>A consultant will be appointed to undertake the condition surveys of the blocks that are part of this project. The consultant's report will then be used to inform the Options Appraisal (Gateway 3/4) report where the required works and procurement approach will be determined.</p>
24. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	<p>Following a competitive tendering process, quotes have been received as follows:</p> <p>Butler and Young: £7471.00 Concero Ltd: £3802.98.</p> <p>The department intend to proceed with the best value quote, and Concero Ltd carrying out the surveys.</p>

Appendix 1

	Staff fees to assist in the facilitation of the condition surveys is estimated to be up to two days, at a cost of not more than £500 (internal staffing cost).
25. Funding source to reach next Gateway	Existing Housing Revenue Account local risk provision for feasibility studies.
26. Standard or Streamlined Approval Track	Streamlined

Appendices

N/A

Contact

Report Author	Amy Carter
Email Address	Amy.Carter@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3768

Committees:	Dates:
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee Projects Sub Committee	10 July 2014 22 July 2014
Subject: Decent Homes works to properties previously omitted from programmes - Gateway 3/4 Options Appraisal	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision

Summary

Dashboard

Project Status	Green
Time Line	Gateway 3-4 – July 2014. Gateway 5 – August/September 2014. Works/Gateway 6 reports – dependent upon option selected Works completion/Gateway 7 – April 2017
Programme status	Pending Approval of Gateway 3-4 Options Appraisal.
Approved works budget	£400,000
Latest estimated cost of works	£500,000
Expenditure to date	£1000 - staff costs to carry out surveys

Progress to date (including resources expended and any changes since previous gateway)

Governance

Governance: The project will be monitored by the Housing Programme Board, which is Chaired by the Director of Community and Children's Services and includes representatives from the Departments of Community and Children's Services, the Built Environment, Chamberlains, City Surveyor's, Comptroller and City Solicitors.

Resources Expended

£1000 has been spent on staff costs in surveying and procuring schedules of rates.

Change since previous Gateway – Budget Increase Recommendation

In the previous report, it was identified that an average of 14 properties per financial year were identified and had works carried out as callbacks. In 2013/14 only 3 properties had such works carried out. There are currently 28 properties that are identified as requiring works and have been pending the commencement of this project.

Since the previous gateway report, 5 properties have had Decent Homes works carried out reactively at a total cost of £19,161.77. These have included one requiring central heating refurbishment at a cost of £782 and 4 kitchen replacements at an average cost of £4595.09 per kitchen.

12 properties have already been surveyed for works to take place once this project receives formal authority to start works. Of those 12, 11 require new kitchens (estimated at £5000 each), 5 require new bathrooms (estimated at £3000 each) and 4 require central heating system upgrades (estimated at £3000 each). Total estimated cost for already surveyed properties: £82,000. There are a further 16 properties awaiting surveys. And it is anticipated that there will be further properties identified throughout 2014-17.

Owing to the numbers already identified, and considering the budget is intended to cover any required Decent Homes works until March 2017, it is recommended that the budget is increased by £100,000 to £500,000.

Overview of options

There are two potential options. Both involve doing the works subject to the budget cap of £500,000. Option 1 is phased by financial year. Option 2 completes works as required throughout the 3 financial years.

Proposed way forward and summary of recommended option

Both options are subject to a schedule of rates and the capped budget. The Asset Management team have full control of the budget and can stop any further works once the budget cap is reached. The recommended option is Option 2 as this offers the most reactive method of delivering these necessary works. This will enable the team to address works immediately – this is particularly important for void properties, owing to the need to minimise the amount of time the property is empty to keep rental loss low.

Procurement approach

Three quotes for schedules of rates have been sought from contractors known for their ability to complete these types of work. At Gateway 5, the best-value contractor will be appointed for the duration of the works.

Financial implications

Description	Option 1 £	Option 2 £
Works Costs	£495,000	£495,000
Fees	N/A	N/A
Staff Costs	£5000	£5000
Total	£500,000	£500,000
Funding Strategy		
Source	Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	Housing Revenue Account (HRA)
Total Funding Requirement	£500,000	£500,000

Recommendations

The following approvals are sought:

- Approval to proceed to Gateway 5 with Option 2.
- Approval of the budget of £500,000 from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

Appendices

Appendix 1	Gateway 1/2 Project Proposal Report
-------------------	-------------------------------------

Contact

Report Author	Amy Carter
Email Address	Amy.Carter@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 3768

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option	Financial Year Phases	Schedule of Rates – No Phases
1. Brief description	Dividing the £500,000 budget into 3 financial year phases and proceeding with the works that arise in each year.	Proceeding with the works that arise, as and when identified up to the budget cap of £500,000 over the 3 years.
2. Scope and Exclusions	Scope: the project will apply to any properties within the City's social housing stock that require this type of works. Exclusions: Avondale, Holloway and William Blake Estates where a full Decent Homes programme will shortly commence.	
Project Planning		
3. Programme and key dates	Gateway 3-4 – July 2014. Gateway 5 – August/September 2014. Works – programmed by financial year. Gateway 6 reports – annually in April of 2015 and 2016. Gateway 7 – April 2017.	Gateway 3-4 – July 2014. Gateway 5 – August/September 2014. Works – as necessary through 2014-17 Gateway 6 reports – as necessary through 2014-2017. Gateway 7 – April 2017.
Risk Implications	Medium. There is a risk of delay to necessary works in void properties owing to the need to secure approval in each financial year causing rental loss.	Low. The works are carried out reactively, scope of the works is known, the budget is capped, and should any additional works be required, they would be funded from the reactive repairs budget.
5. Benefits and disbenefits	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee will receive a request to release the funds on a financial year basis. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where works are required towards the end of a financial year, they may not be able to be completed until a further report has been approved. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The works can be delivered in a more reactive way as they are needed. This meets the needs of the department for example, in responding to voids. Once the total budget cap is reached, no further works will be completed.
6. Stakeholders and consultees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Officers (including representatives from City Surveyors, Community and Children's Services and Town Clerk's. Residents of the properties where the works are required. 	
Resource Implications		
7. Total Estimated Cost	£500,000.	
	£166,000 (a third of the total) will be allocated each year with a tolerance of 10% in Years 1 and 2. This tolerance	No phasing required. The project will commence with a schedule of rates and works will be completed as required until the cap is

Option	Financial Year Phases	Schedule of Rates – No Phases		
	would be offset, if needed, by a lower budget in Year 3.	reached.		
8. Funding strategy	Housing Revenue Account (HRA).			
9. Ongoing revenue implications	There will be no increase in ongoing revenue requirements. The replaced kitchens, bathrooms and central heating systems will fall within the scope of the current maintenance contracts operated by the department.			
10. Affordability	The works form part of the planned works of the department through the 5 and 30 year Asset Management Plans.			
11. Procurement strategy	Quotes for schedules of rates have been sought from 3 contractors who are capable of carrying out this type of work. These schedules of rates will be used as a basis for the costs, with acknowledgement of some variance dependent upon works required.			
12. Legal implications	None.			
13. Corporate property implications	None.			
14. Sustainability and energy implications	The replacement of heating systems within individual properties will improve the energy efficiency and thermal comfort of those properties. The data will be modelled to assess whether the overall stock SAP rating is improved by these installations.			
15. IS implications	None.			
16. Recommendation	Not recommended.		Recommended.	
17. Next Gateway	Gateway 5.			
18. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funding Source
	Staff time – 5 days	Completion of Procurement	£500	Local Risk

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Projects Sub Committee	25 February 2014
Subject: Project Proposal – to carry out Decent Homes works to properties previously omitted from programmes.	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children’s Services.	For Decision

Overview

1. Spending Committee	Community and Children’s Services										
2. Senior Responsible Officer	Eddie Stevens, Director Housing Services										
3. Project Board	Not recommended, owing to the low levels of cost and risk.										
4. Context	<p>In 2000, the government announced that all social housing properties were required to meet the ‘Decent Homes Standard’ by 2010. In summary, for a property to achieve the standard it must have no outstanding health and safety related repairs, be weatherproof and have ‘reasonably modern’ kitchen, bathroom and heating facilities.</p> <p>Programmes of works to bring the majority of properties up to standard were carried out to City of London Corporation housing stock to meet the initial 2010 deadline.</p> <p>A number of properties did not receive the works during the initial programmes. The reasons for the property not having the works completed may include the property meeting the standard at the time, or it may have been unsuitable timing for the individual resident. Throughout the year, as properties become void or requests are made by residents, the department carry out the necessary works to those properties. This is known as a ‘call-back’. Below are numbers of call-backs carried out in the last 4 financial years:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of properties</th> <th>Financial Year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>2009-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>2010-11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>2011-12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>2012-13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To date, 14 properties have been identified as currently requiring the works. We are seeking to establish a budget and a programme for 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 to complete them.</p> <p>Housing stock requires continual maintenance, Decent Homes works are therefore carried out on rolling estate-wide programmes. This project seeks to address those properties missed from former programmes, where future programmes are not due to commence for a number of years and the condition of the property requires some urgency.</p>	Number of properties	Financial Year	22	2009-10	6	2010-11	14	2011-12	14	2012-13
Number of properties	Financial Year										
22	2009-10										
6	2010-11										
14	2011-12										
14	2012-13										
5. Brief description of	Identify properties that require works.										

<p>project</p>	<p>Undertake surveys of each property to confirm the works required. Present an Options Appraisal report based on the surveys. Confirm contractor(s) to undertake the work. Seek authority to commence works and complete required works.</p>
<p>6. Business case</p>	<p>It is uneconomical to allow ongoing repairs and maintenance works to be carried out to bathrooms and kitchens that are more than 20 years old and central heating boilers that are over 15 years old. Due to the age of the installations, it becomes harder to source the necessary spare parts and frequent attendance for repairs has a high staff and contractor cost.</p> <p>Some items will degrade without entirely failing, and may not be reported as a repair. It is important to replace sub-standard facilities in order to maintain the asset and preserve the property for future use.</p> <p>By setting a budget for the callbacks, there will be a positive impact on the reactive repairs and maintenance and voids budgets. At present, there is a high level of unpredictability in these budgets caused by the need to undertake Decent Homes works to these properties.</p>
<p>7. Consequences if project not approved</p>	<p>The internal condition of the properties will continue to degrade, and individual items will fail.</p> <p>Continued and frequent spending on repairs and maintenance to the current installations.</p> <p>The City of London Corporation failing to provide the required facilities to residents, with both statutory consequence and the likely dissatisfaction this will cause.</p>
<p>8. Success criteria</p>	<p>Completion of works to identified properties, meeting the Decent Homes standard requirements and extending the lifetime of our housing assets.</p> <p>Reduced spending through the repairs and maintenance response budget.</p> <p>Improved facilities for the residents living in the properties where works are completed. Measured by reduced complaints relating to replaced installations in those properties.</p>
<p>9. Notable exclusions</p>	<p>Properties requiring the works on Avondale Square Estate, Holloway Estate and William Blake Estate, which form part of a Decent Homes Programme due to commence in 2014/15.</p>
<p>10. Key options to be considered</p>	<p>The following options are presented for consideration:</p> <p>Option 1 To establish a budgeted programme of works to capture those properties which were not completed during the initial programmes for each estate. This option is recommended.</p> <p>Option 2 To continue carrying out ad-hoc repairs and replacements via the responsive repairs process and voids budgets. Owing to the higher levels of uncertainty and cost, this option is not recommended</p>

Prioritisation

11. Link to Strategic Aims	SA2: 'To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes'.
12. Link to departmental business plan	Key priority 1 Improving the health and wellbeing of communities and individuals Key priority 4 Supporting and empowering our communities Key priority 5 Making best use of resources and improving the way we work. The planned works would help meet all the above three key priorities of the Departmental business plan.
13. Links to other existing strategies, programmes and/or projects	The proposed works will meet strategic objectives SO1 and SO2 of the Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy 2012/2016 by ensuring that the "assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition" and the "assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs".
14. Within which category does this project fit?	2. Statutory 7a. Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
15. What is the priority of the project?	Essential.

Financial Implications

16. Likely capital/ supplementary revenue cost range	<p>The project lies within the £250,000 - £2m range. The predicted capital cost is circa £400,000.</p> <p>On average, over the last 4 financial years, there have been 14 call-back properties per year. Each callback property may require replacement of one or all of kitchen, bathroom and central heating therefor each callback will cost a different amount. Equivalent numbers of callbacks are anticipated for the next 3 financial years.</p> <p>Budgetary estimates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 kitchen replacements at an average of £5000 per kitchen - £200,000 • 33 bathroom replacements at an average of £3000 per bathroom - £100,000 • 33 central heating replacements at an average of £3000 per system - £100,000 <p>Total: £400,000</p> <p>The budget will be flexible and not set for each item, for example, more bathroom replacements may be required than kitchens. The £400,000 will cover a 3 year period – 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17.</p>
17. Potential source(s) of	The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) – Capital.

funding	
18. On-going revenue requirements and departmental local risk budget(s) affected	The responsive repairs and maintenance budget will resume responsibility for these assets following the completion of the works. The response repairs budget will benefit from savings as fewer repairs will be required to the replaced installations.
19. Indicative Procurement Approach	The option of appointing a contractor with a set schedule of rates will be explored by the department. A lower cost is hoped to be achieved by undertaking the works through a structured 3 year programme. Advice from CLPS will be sought for the procurement.

Project Planning

20. Estimated programme and implications	Gateway 1 – January 2014. Gateway 2 and Initial Surveys – February 2014. Gateway 3/4 Options Appraisal – March 2014 Gateway 5 Authority to commence works – April 2014 Begin works – April/May 2014. Undertake works through 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016-17.
21. Potential risk implications	The risk implications are low as the extent of the works required will be known prior to commencement.
22. Anticipated stakeholders and consultees	Members, Department of Community and Children's Services, Chamberlains and Town Clerks. Tenants will be consulted; leaseholder consultation will not be required for this project, as works are solely to tenant's homes and funded from the HRA.
23. Equality Impact Assessment	No equality impact assessment will be carried out for the project; on-site assessments will be carried out to reduce any negative impact on vulnerable residents during the works.
24. Sustainability Implications	Newly installed facilities such as central heating boilers will improve the sustainability rating of individual properties.

Recommended Course of Action

25. Next Steps	Should the project receive approval to commence, the next step would be carrying out surveys to those properties that have been reported as requiring works in order to inform Gateways 3 and 4 with a better estimate of the amount of works required.
26. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Nil spend. Staffing costs to undertake surveys, at an estimated £30 per survey. There are currently 14 properties requiring survey, therefore the expected cost is £420.
27. Funding source to reach next	Nil spend.

Gateway	Internal staffing cost as above.
28. Standard or Streamlined Approval Track	Streamlined.

Appendices

N/A

Contact

Report Author	Amy Carter
Email Address	Amy.Carter@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3768

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank