



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

**Date:** MONDAY, 25 APRIL 2016  
**Time:** 1.45 pm  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:** Virginia Rounding (Chairman)  
Ann Holmes (Deputy Chairman)  
Randall Anderson  
Revd Dr Martin Dudley  
John Fletcher  
Alderman David Graves  
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines  
Deputy Henry Jones  
Deputy Catherine McGuinness  
Gareth Moore  
Dhruv Patel  
Deputy Elizabeth Rogula  
Mark Wheatley

**Enquiries:** Philippa Sewell  
tel. no.: 020 7332 1426  
[philippa.sewell@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:philippa.sewell@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

**Lunch will be served in the Guildhall Club at 1pm**  
**NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or video recording**

**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 non-public summary of the meeting on 18 January 2016.  

**For Decision**  
(Pages 1 - 4)
4. **CITY OF LONDON ALMSHOUSES UPDATE**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 5 - 8)
5. **HOUSING ESTATES - ALLOCATED MEMBERS' REPORT**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 9 - 16)
6. **HOUSING UPDATE**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 17 - 22)
7. **DECANT POLICY - SHELTERED HOUSING REVIEW PART 2**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Decision**  
(Pages 23 - 60)
8. **TACKLING SOCIAL HOUSING TENANCY FRAUD**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 61 - 66)
9. **RIGHT TO BUY SOCIAL MOBILITY FUND (CITY HOME PURCHASE GRANTS)**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 67 - 70)
10. **CCTV INSTALLATION IN CITY HOUSING ESTATES**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  

**For Information**  
(Pages 71 - 74)

11. **CITY OF LONDON ALMSHOUSES REFURBISHMENT PROGRAMME**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 75 - 76)
12. **WATER SYSTEM SAFETY WORKS AT RESIDENTIAL HOUSING ESTATES**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  
**NB: This report will also be considered by the Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee on 6 June 2016, the Barbican Residential Committee on 13 June 2016, and Projects Sub Committee on 29 June 2016.**  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 77 - 86)
13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
15. **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**

16. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**  
To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2016.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 87 - 88)
17. **DRON HOUSE COMMUNITY CENTRE CONVERSION**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.  
**NB: This report will also be considered by the Projects Sub Committee on 1 May 2016.**  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 89 - 94)
18. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
19. **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

Monday, 18 January 2016

**Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm**

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Virginia Rounding (Chairman)	Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines
Ann Holmes (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Henry Jones
Randall Anderson	Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Revd Dr Martin Dudley	Gareth Moore
John Fletcher	Dhruv Patel
Alderman David Graves	Mark Wheatley

#### **Officers:**

Philippa Sewell	- Town Clerk's Department
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlain's Department
Jacquie Campbell	- Community and Children's Services Department
Amy Carter	- Community & Children's Services Department
Robert Jacks	- Community & Children's Services
Paul Jackson	- Community and Children's Services Department
Lochlan MacDonald	- Community and Children's Services Department
Paul Murtagh	- Community & Children's Services Department

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Elizabeth Rogula and the Director of Community & Children's Services.

### **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, and Deputy Henry Jones declared an interest in matters relating to the Middlesex Street Estate, as he was a residential and business lease holder.

### **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 2 November 2015 be approved as a correct record.

### **Matters Arising**

### **Residents' Celebration Day**

Members noted that the next Residents' Celebration Day would be held in Spring 2017, and work with residents was underway regarding organisation and entertainment.

### **City of London Almshouses**

The Chairman advised that she had met with Dave Walker from the Southwark Mediation Centre and would be undertaking a visit to the Almshouses later this year.

### **Cladding of Great Arthur House**

Officers reported that the setting up of the site compound was well underway and would be completed by the end of February 2016. The work to the curtain walling would start in March/April 2016 and was expected to last approximately one year.

### **CCTV on Middlesex Street**

In response to a Member's question, officers advised that all the monies had now been received.

#### **4. CITY OF LONDON ALMSHOUSES REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2015/16 AND 2016/17**

The Sub Committee considered a joint report of the Chamberlain and Director of Community & Children's Services regarding the City of London Almshouses Revenue and Capital Budgets 2015/16 and 2016/17. Members discussed the report and, in response to a Member's comment, the Chamberlain advised that future reports would include the Original as well as the Latest Budget for clarity of comparison.

**RESOLVED** – That the 2016/17 revenue budget be approved.

#### **5. SAFEGUARDING POLICY - HOUSING SERVICES**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services regarding the Safeguarding Policy for Housing Services. The Chairman commended the links to public health, and Members discussed how this document would be used in the Local Authorities where the City of London Housing Estates are based. Officers confirmed that this document was applicable to all, but would be underpinned by a series of procedures specific to each site. Members suggested some amendments, and noted that the appropriate safeguarding training for officers had already been carried out.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to Members' comments, the Safeguarding Policy be approved.

#### **6. ESTATES SATISFACTION SURVEY 2015**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services regarding the Estates Satisfaction Survey for 2015. Members discussed the response rate, which was lower than the previous year, and made the following suggestions for future surveys:

- Send out separate surveys to leaseholders and tenants with some questions in common and some specific to each;
- Offer an incentive for participating in the survey; and
- Have both paper and electronic versions of the survey available.

Officers noted the comments, and undertook to compare the response rate with that received by neighbouring London Boroughs.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted, and the response rate be compared with that received by neighbouring London Boroughs.

**7. THE CITY OF LONDON HOUSING TENANTS' AGREEMENT AND HANDBOOK**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services regarding the Tenants' Agreement and Handbook. Members praised the documents and the format, and made a number of suggestions to clarify wording.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to Members' comments, the City of London Housing Tenants' Agreement and Handbook be approved.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

**10. 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.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Paragraph</b>
11	3&7
12-14	3
15-16	-

**11. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2015 be approved as a correct record.

**12. AVONDALE SQUARE, GOLDEN LANE AND YORK WAY ESTATES, EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL COMMON PARTS REDECORATION**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.

**13. CCTV INSTALLATION**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.

14. **AVONDALE SQUARE ESTATE - WINDOW OVERHAUL**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.

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

There were no questions.

16. **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 closed at 2.35 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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



<b>Committee</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	25 04 2016
<b>Subject:</b> City of London Almshouses Update	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Jacqueline Whitmore, Sheltered Housing Manager	

## Summary

This report gives Members an information update on the City of London Almshouses, in Lambeth. Some of the information in the report also relates to the eight Gresham Almshouses on the estate.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. In February 2013 the City of London Almshouses Trustees Committee was merged with the Housing Management Sub-Committee to form the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee. This report is presented to alternate meetings of the Sub-Committee. It updates Members on operational matters relating to the Almshouses and their residents, and highlights any issues of concern, particularly where funding is required for which is not included in the current year's budget.

### Current Position

#### 2. Social activities

Residents enjoyed their Christmas hampers purchased from Marks & Spencer for the first time. There were several social activities over the holiday period which was enjoyed by many. Over the Easter break, residents enjoyed watching DVD films in the communal hall. Officers will be discussing options for summer events with residents. As this year is the Queen's 90th birthday, to celebrate the event officers have decided to have a joint event for all sheltered housing residents to be held at the new community hall at Avondale Square which will be open mid-summer. Details and invitations will be issued once dates have been finalised. Officers would be pleased if Members of the Sub-Committee were able to attend.

### **3. Estate meetings**

Officers continue to work with Southwark Mediation Centre and the residents to explore and agree new ways of communication and working together.

At a recent meeting, residents agreed that, when working together with officers, for instance on repairs and maintenance issues, they had found that consultation and collaborative working resulted in an improved service, as well a sense of involvement for residents.

The view of the Manager of Southwark Mediation Centre is that this approach has worked extremely well. He feels that residents have appreciated involvement in resolving their repairs issues and that there is greater satisfaction with repairs.

At our next meeting officers and residents will be reviewing the Estate Handbook using the same approach. The handbook has not been updated since 2012 and some sections are out of date. As the HRA Tenant's Handbook has been recently updated, officers will use this as the starting point for consultation with Almshouses residents to review and update their own handbook.

### **4. Letter of Appointment**

The Almshouses Association has recently updated their Standards of Management which includes a new Letter of Appointment. Officers consider this would be an appropriate time to review the Letter of Appointment in current use and update this for all residents accordingly. This would tie in well with the review of the Estate Handbook. Officers will bring a draft new Letter of Appointment to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee once this has been developed in liaison with the Comptroller and City Solicitors.

### **5. Tree pruning**

In February, London Borough of Islington and their contractors undertook long-awaited tree maintenance with advice and permission granted by the Tree Preservation Officer from London Borough of Lambeth. There is a small amount of work to finish, however there are nesting birds in these areas so this will have to be undertaken later in the year.

### **6. Repairs**

The Property Services Team Manager continues to visit the estate on a monthly basis to ensure all work undertaken is to a high standard. Residents have agreed this has worked well in maintaining an improved standard. There would appear to be higher satisfaction with repairs and we are certainly hearing of fewer issues.

The estate still needs a major refurbishment programme, encompassing roof repairs, new windows, redecoration and other works. A condition survey has been carried out to establish the extent of work needed, and indicate likely costs. We hope to appoint a contractor to carry out the full programme in a two year

period. A paper asking for approval to proceed with the procurement is being presented to your Sub-Committee. If agreed, we will also be able to commence consultation with residents. A similar paper will be taken to the Gresham Committee in relation to the eight Gresham properties.

## **7. Complaints**

There has been one formal complaint regarding the position of a new notice board. This is being managed with the help of Southwark Mediation Centre.

## **8. Rent Arrears**

The current arrears are higher than officers anticipated; £7,490.25 at the end of the financial year. However, this higher amount relates mainly to two large debts - officers can provide details to Committee Members on these upon request. Without these two debts the outstanding sum would be only £975.09.

## **9. Vacancies**

There are currently two vacancies. These will be offered to residents of Mais House as a priority after Community & Children's' Services Committee agreed redevelopment of Mais House in January this year.

**Jacqueline Whitmore**  
**Sheltered Housing Manager**

T: 020 7332 3582

E: [Jacqueline.whitmore@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Jacqueline.whitmore@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	25 April 2016
<b>Subject:</b> Housing Estates – Allocated Members’ Report	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children’s Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Wendy Giaccaglia, Area Manager, Out-of-City Estates	

## Summary

This report, which is for information, provides an update for the Committee on events and activities on the City of London Corporation’s social housing estates.

The report is compiled in collaboration with Allocated Members, whose role is to take an active interest in their estate, to champion residents and local staff and to engage with housing issues in order to play an informed part in housing-related debates within the Committee.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. The Allocated Members Scheme was introduced in 2000, when Members of the Community & Children’s Services Committee were allocated to different City of London Corporation housing estates. This report is presented to the Housing Management Sub-Committee twice a year.

### General Estate Matters

2. Tesco have teamed up with Groundwork to launch a grant-giving initiative, which is funded by the 5p bag levy. We are pleased to announce that three of our estates have won grants. Holloway Estate was awarded the £8,000 and a gardening group will be putting the money to good use. Edible Golden Lane was successful in getting the second place amount of £10,000, which will be used to replace bag allotments with raised beds on the Golden Lane Estate. Harman Close on the Avondale Square Estate won the 1<sup>st</sup> place grant of £12,000. Estate staff will support residents to carry out gardening projects.
3. On 9 December, Members, residents and staff attended the Topping Out ceremony at Avondale Square Estate for the new flats, Estate Office, and Community Centre. At the ceremony, Community & Children’s Services

Committee Chairman Dhruv Patel spoke about our homebuilding target, and guests were given a tour of the worksite.

4. Estates continue to encourage residents to sign up to the Self-Service internet service, where residents can see their rent accounts, report repairs online, and pay their rent.
5. We continue to support tenants through the impact of Universal Credit. The fully live digital service has been rolled out to Avondale Square Estate, meaning that anyone of working age applying for any of the legacy benefits will have to apply online for Universal Credit. A lot of work is going on behind the scenes to identify residents who will be negatively impacted by this new system, and we are working with these residents to minimise the negative impacts.

### **Avondale Square Estate - Allocated Member, Virginia Rounding**

6. Shaun Thurston, the new Estate Manager, has recently emailed me to introduce himself and update me on the many projects happening on the estate. I look forward to meeting him personally on the estate now that he has settled into his role.
7. As mentioned in the general estate matters section of the report, the Harman Close Scheme Manager was successful in getting the first place grant of £12,000 from Tesco Bags of Help. With this, they plan to put in new flower beds, new fencing with a trellis and new paving – which has been needed for some time.
8. The new flats, estate office and community centre are due to be completed at the end of June, and estate staff will be working with residents to make the best use of the new facilities.
9. Decent Homes works are progressing, and Shaun has been meeting with the contractors weekly to discuss progress and any concerns the estate office becomes aware of through residents.
10. In addition to the large projects already happening on the Avondale Square Estate, the Gas Board are carrying out works to move gas supplies from inside flats to the outer fabric of the buildings. This is a very large piece of work, but estate staff have been helping to coordinate it, and have used it as a way to get residents to clear their balconies of clutter.
11. I was proud to hear that several residents and City of London staff received awards from the Mayor of Southwark for their work in improving the South Bermondsey neighbourhood. At a ceremony in February, six residents, along with Kirsty Leitch, Neighbourhood Development and Engagement Manager, and Wendy Giaccaglia, Area Manager for the Out-of-City Estates were presented with the awards.

12. At the City of London Time Credits 4<sup>th</sup> birthday celebrations in February, the Avondale Square Estate staff, Avondale Community Events, and Edible Avondale SE1 jointly won the “Making a Lasting Difference” award.

**Small Estates (Dron House, Isleden House and Windsor House) – Allocated Member, Deputy Elizabeth Rogula**

13. I have met with Angela Smith, the Estate Manager and her team, and have visited all three estates to discuss issues relating to them.
14. Members will recall that we have a Neighbourhood Security Patrol Service, Parkguard, who provide security services to our housing estates in the City and to York Way and Holloway Estate. Parkguard have extended their services to Windsor House to tackle low-level nuisance on our estates. Their work is to support that which is done by the estate office and the local Police, and will also provide an extra sense of security to residents. Patrols started on 1st February 2016, with very positive feedback on this service from residents and staff.
15. The refurbishment project at Dron House was completed on 28 January 2016. The community hall and estate office is now open and functioning, along with a brand new 3-bedroom property. The new resident is preparing to move in by the end of March. The new community centre will be a valuable resource in the local area. Estate Staff are currently negotiating with a local business to set up a community nursery. This will be a pre-school provision Monday to Friday (9-12.30) for children between the ages of 2-5. It is hoped services will commence in May.
16. The Estate staff held an opening reception of the community centre on 10 March. This was an enjoyable evening attended by many residents and staff members.
17. At Isleden House, the London borough of Islington have agreed the pre-planning application in principle for the proposed conversion of a workshop into three flats. This project will provide much-needed additional accommodation to relieve pressure on the City of London’s housing register.
18. I hope to attend further resident meetings at Windsor House, Isleden House and Dron House arranged in May and November 2016.

**Golden Lane – Allocated Members, Gareth Moore and Deputy John Barker, OBE**

19. We communicate on a regular basis with Laurence Jones, the Estate Manager and aim to be a very visible presence on the estate.
20. Members will be pleased to know that the recladding project at Great Arthur House is now well underway. The new windows have passed all the stringent testing and all the technical issues have been resolved. It is hope that by the time this report is published we would have seen the installation of the first

windows. Residents continue to be kept informed of progress through regular bulletins and newsletters. We are working with the contractor to ensure they remain well-supported through the process.

21. The Community Centre has now been returned to the management of the City of London. A joint steering group of officers and residents has been set up to look at ideas and proposals for the future use and management of the centre. Residents will be fully consulted once proposals are collated.
22. The refurbishment of the under-5s play area has now received all the relevant permissions. The contract to undertake the work is currently being tendered. We anticipate that work will be completed in time to allow use in the summer months. There will be no charge to leaseholders or to the Housing Revenue Account.
23. Resident drop-in sessions have now taken the place of the previous format of open meetings. The three drop-in sessions so far held have been an overwhelming success, with a greater number of residents attending. Officers from the City of London, our contractors, and the City of London Police have been in attendance. This format not only attracts a wider audience, but gives those residents who would not usually comment at meetings the opportunity and the ability to speak freely to officers on a one-to-one basis about projects on the estate or surrounding areas. Feedback from residents has been extremely favourable with many supporting this format for continual engagement.

**Holloway & York Way Estates – Allocated Members, Deputy Catherine McGuinness, Michael Welbank, MBE and Barbara Newman, CBE**

24. We have met with Michelle Warman, the Estate Manager, on a number of occasions over the past few months to discuss issues relating to Holloway and York Way Estate, and have attended walkabouts on each of the estates.
25. Resident Meetings were held on both Estates in March. The York Way meeting, although not very well attended, was very interactive and allowed for residents to discuss issues important to them. The meetings focused on the current major works, such as the new door entry system, the Decent Homes project and concerns regarding repairs. Parkguard patrol officers attended to give residents an update as well as an opportunity to raise any issues with the service. Residents praised the work that Parkguard do in keeping the estate safe and deterring perpetrators of anti-social behaviour.
26. The new door entry system is almost complete on both Holloway & York Way Estate. There have been some issues with works being carried out in early evenings and Saturdays, but on the whole, the process has been managed well by Michelle, the Property Services Team and the contractors, AJS. Michelle has put together a very clear and practical way of issuing the fobs to the residents in good time for the system to go live.



27. The Planning application submitted over a year ago for the redevelopment of the Islington Arts Factory was registered on 18 March 2015. An application has been made to Historic England to list the church properties (Church, old school house and Vergers cottage). This has yet to be determined by Historic England. If it is listed, a listed building application will be required. We have now agreed nomination rights with the London Borough of Islington's Housing Department.
28. Michelle has been working with the London Borough of Islington's local police and three other social landlords - Southern Housing, Hyde and Circle 33 Housing Group to share the cost of neighbourhood patrols by Parkguard, who already work in other parts of Islington to tackle low-level nuisance. They have some powers to assist Police and also have the flexibility to build a rapport with residents on the estates as well as assist in combating anti-social behaviour. This pilot commenced in June 2015, and the feedback so far has been very positive. Parkguard have provided a very detailed report of what they've done so far.
29. Communication with the residents has continued with the review of the quarterly newsletters, regular correspondence and weekly bulletins in the notice boards. Holloway Estate is still developing their Resident Group, and they have incorporated a sub-group to focus on a garden project. The Estate Manager was successful in a bid for external funding from Ground Works for £8,000 from Tesco's 5p carrier bag charges. This was a result of the residents' comments and feedback from our walkabouts to improve the look and feel of the estate. The residents are keen to utilise the services of Ground Works to bring their project to life.
30. We are pleased that both York Way and Holloway Residents are planning community events for HRH The Queen's birthday and will also be taking the opportunity to earn Time Credits. To date there have been 416 time credits earned across both Estates. The Time Credit programme has also been an opportunity for residents to network with other resident groups around idea generating, funding, and support.

#### **Middlesex Street Estate - Allocated Member, Deputy Henry Jones**

31. I maintain regular contact with the Estate Manager, Paul Richardson and discuss any issues with him as and when they arise.
32. Greg Nott has settled very well into the role of Estate Officer. He has brought with him new processes and streamlined old ones. These have been well received, and have enabled the estate to run smoothly. Billy Lambert, Customer Services Officer, also continues to provide a high level of service, and I know that his efforts are much appreciated by Paul Richardson.
33. The latest Residents' Meeting was held on Wednesday 10th February and was well attended by residents. Among the subjects discussed were food recycling, the City of London Police update, the on-going ramp removal project, and project updates for the estate.

34. The outdoor gym proposal is still in discussion, and further information on progress will be communicated to the estate when it becomes available.
35. A shopkeepers meeting was held on Wednesday 2nd March. During the meeting, we discussed leases, estate issues, and recycling for the commercial units. It is anticipated that if the commercial units were to recycle, a saving could be made for each unit. The estate team and Amey (our refuse contractor) are to commence recycling for the commercial units in the new financial year.
36. The estate recycling area has recently been moved from outside the car park shutters to inside the ground floor car park. The sign has been moved to redirect residents to the correct area. The estate team continue to work closely with their recycling colleagues to increase recycling participation on the estate.
37. A few residents organised a children's Christmas party at the estate. Lots of children attended and had great fun on the day. Snacks and juice were provided, as well as a gift for each child.

#### **Southbank Estates – Allocated Member, Randall Anderson**

38. An open meeting for residents was held in December 2015, taking on a more festive feel as an informal drop-in session. Staff served mulled wine and mince pies to residents as they took the opportunity to talk to officers and managers on a one-to-one basis. Staff sought residents' views for the recently updated Estate Plan. Updates were given on forthcoming estate projects and ideas for community events.
39. Lift renewal works have started at Collinson Court .The project has gone very well so far, with the works running approximately three weeks ahead of schedule. Estate staff are hopeful that a local project to install CCTV in the new lifts to detect and deter vandalism will be approved.
40. In February, a Pancake Mardi Gras celebration was held at Collinson Court on Shrove Tuesday. The event was a huge success involving residents of all ages, local businesses and voluntary groups. They took part in pancake tossing races, face painting and adapted bicycle rides. It's hoped that this will be the first of many events.
41. Deputy Chairman, Ann Holmes, accompanied the Director of Community and Children's Services on a tour of the Southbank Estates in February to explore sites for potential housing development.
42. Since the last report, there have been some staff changes. The Estate Officer for William Blake Estate left the City in January to take up a post with Guinness Trust Housing. In January, a new Estate Officer for Sumner Buildings, Jack Balnaves, joined the Southbank team from Hackney Homes. He is really making an impact on the estate so far, and is very proactive.

43. The defects liability period at Horace Jones House is almost up. There have been many challenges, but estate management staff are working in partnership with City Surveyors and the developers to resolve outstanding issues.

#### **Sydenham Hill Estate – Allocated Member, Mark Wheatley**

44. I had an enjoyable tour of Sydenham Hill Estate and Mais House in January where I was able to meet with estate staff. I am delighted to learn that visits have been arranged for other members to see Sydenham Hill and Mais House. Two resident meetings were held in January at Sydenham Hill Estate. The first was to seek residents' views on the content of the Estate Plan, which is soon to be distributed to all residents. The second was a general open meeting. A representative from the gardening contractors, Walworth Garden, attended to talk about their work as a registered charity and their ethos of trying to give young people a start in working life. Residents appreciated hearing this, and were very complimentary about the standard of ground maintenance Walworth Garden is providing on the Estate.

#### **Sheltered Housing – Allocated Members, Ann Holmes and Mark Wheatley**

45. We have spoken with Jacqueline Whitmore on several occasions recently to discuss matters relating to all the sheltered schemes, and to arrange visits.

46. Each sheltered estate enjoyed celebratory events over the Christmas period including lunches out in local restaurants, quizzes and live music entertainment.

47. As previously reported, City of London Officers are continuing to work with residents at Mais house after the decision of the Community and Children's Services Committee in January to redevelop the site. Residents have been interviewed and initial details of preferences for home moves have been gathered.

48. As mentioned in the General Estates Update section, Harman Close Scheme Manager, Carl Newbold, has successfully won a grant through an initiative called Tesco Bags of Help. The grants are raised from the 5p bag levy recently introduced. Carl is delighted with winning bid and the residents at Harman close are looking forward to a revamped garden for the summer.

49. Residents at Isleden House are in consultation with Fusion regarding the installation of an outdoor gym. The gym is designed to encourage older people to undertake outdoor exercise and promote healthier living. In February, a local youth group, Urban Hope, visited the residents for a skills exchange. Residents taught the group how to play old fashioned card games and how to knit and crochet, whilst the group reciprocated by helping residents with their electronic glitches, like how to manage text messages on mobile phones, reprogramming a kindle and setting up a DVD so one resident could have subtitles on his films. The group enjoyed their time at Isleden

House so much that they have invited the residents to a supper night at their hall where they will be cooking the meal themselves.

### **Background Papers**

50. This report was compiled in consultation with the Allocated Members, managers and staff of the City of London's housing estates.

**Contact:**

Wendy Giaccaglia, Area Manager for the Out-of-City Estates  
0207 332 3784  
wendy.giaccaglia@cityoflondon.gov.uk

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	25/04/2016
<b>Subject:</b> Housing Update	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Bob Jacks, Head of Estates Housing & Neighbourhoods Division	

## Summary

This six monthly update on Housing Service performance and management information keeps Members up to date with progress against key areas of work. The report covers performance for the second half of the financial year (October 2015 to March 2016).

Members may wish to note that:

- Performance on responsive repairs has exceeded targets in all performance indicators;
- Performance on rent collection has exceeded the target despite the impact of welfare benefit reforms;
- Performance on benefit claims has exceeded targets in all three performance indicators;
- A Time Credit Celebration Event was held in St Ethelburga's Church in February to celebrate 4 years of the scheme operating in the City of London;
- Only one of the 26 complaints received escalated to the Ombudsman.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. This report is presented to the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee every six months. It provides Members with an overview of Housing Service performance and progress on key issues, plus some additional information of interest.
2. This report covers the period October 2015 to March 2016. It has been organised to give Members information on each of eight areas of work:

- Repairs & Maintenance
- Estate Management
- Resident Engagement
- Revenues
- Allocations
- Affordable Housing
- Benefits
- Complaints

### Repairs & Maintenance

3. Performance information on our responsive repairs service is collected and reported quarterly. Indicators are reviewed annually to ensure they produce meaningful data that can be monitored effectively. The service is delivered by our contractor, Wates Living Space.

Performance indicator	Target	Year-end performance
Overall	96%	98%
Priority One repairs (complete within 24 hours)	95%	98%
Priority Two repairs (complete within 3 working days)	95%	97%
Priority Three repairs (complete within 5 working days)	93%	99%
Priority Four (complete within 20 working days)	96%	99%
% of jobs for which post-work inspections were carried out	15%	22%

4. Gas servicing is done by our contractor, Carillion, who work closely with City staff to gain access to properties and carry out the necessary checks. At the end of this reporting period, 99.32% of our properties have up to date CP12 gas safety certificates; only 11 properties remain outstanding. Our target remains 100%.

### Estate Management

5. 13 Right to Buy applications were made between October 2015 and March 2016. None of these completed during the reporting period. However, four applications received prior to October completed during this time. These 4 completions represent approximately 0.2% of the remaining social rented stock.
6. There were 32 new incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour on our estates during the past six months. These can be broken down as follows:

Avondale Square	9	Windsor House	3
Golden Lane	2	Sydenham Hill	1
Southbank	7	Middlesex Street	8
Isleden House	1	Dron House	1

7. Most of these were minor issues which would not be classed as anti-social behaviour by the police. We have a new Anti-Social Behaviour policy which has been approved by the Sub-Committee and we are currently developing a suite of staff procedures to underpin this.
8. The Neighbourhood Patrol Service, being run as a pilot in partnership with the Community Safety Team, City Police and Parkguard, is proving popular and successful so far. Feedback from residents has been positive and the daily reports have highlighted issues which we have been able to address speedily. The service has now been extended to include Dron House and Windsor House where feedback has been equally positive.

### **Resident Engagement**

9. The 'Remembering Yesterday, Celebrating Today' programme of events has continued across City of London Estates. The key highlight was staff and residents working together to sell poppies at Barbican Station for the British Royal Legion. Staff and residents collected during 'London Poppy Week' to raise an impressive £6,000, which is almost triple the amount raised last year. The Town Clerk and Deputy Town Clerk joined the housing team's efforts.
10. This year's Lord Mayor's Show was celebrated with the Portsoken Community having their very own float in the parade. It was a real community effort which saw 11 separate groups join forces at workshops to make arches which represented the area. Groups like Sir John Cass school, local gardening and women's groups as well as the congregation of St Botolph's Church put together a wonderful spectacle based around the theme of Portsoken 'Past, Present and Future'. It was a wonderful day, despite the rain. Some of those involved have gone on to join the steering committee of the City Play East, to be held in 2017.
11. Residents continue to give much of their time to support community engagement on their estates. In this period 1346 hours of time was given by individuals earning Time Credits on their estates. Ways in which time was given include consultation through the Housing Users Board, design sessions for the Portsoken Lord Mayor's Float and supporting the City to shape services and organising a wide range of events. These have included gardening, tea dances, information evenings, craft activities, Halloween parties, Christmas lunches and a pancake day / mardi gras event, to name a few.
12. A Time Credit Celebration Event was held in St Ethelburga's Church in February to celebrate 4 years of the scheme operating in the City of London. This was very well attended by groups and individuals, with over 100 people turning out. The event was co-chaired by a tenant within the City of London, who has made a huge impact volunteering on her estate and donating her Time Credits to carers and families for them to be able to spend on days out.

### **Revenues**

13. Our team of Income Recovery Officers, Rent Officers and Estate Managers continue to work tirelessly to maintain the HRA rent collection rate at the level

previously achieved despite the introduction, in some areas, of Universal Credit. Our team has surpassed expectations this year by returning a HRA rent collection rate during 2015/16 of 98.8%, exceeding the already stretching target of 98.6%.

14. By continuing to use a range of communication measures including letters, emails, texts, personal visits etc the estate management team were able to apply prompt, remedial action whenever arrears accrued on accounts resolving many issues swiftly. Given the ongoing financial climate an achievement of this nature should not be underestimated.

## **Allocations**

15. There are currently 815 people on the Housing Waiting List. The updated Housing Allocations Policy as agreed by the Community & Children's Services Committee comes into effect on 1 April 2016.
16. The Housing Needs Team is in receipt of approximately 60 applications per month not all of which are eligible for the Housing Register. Due to the decant of Mais House, the waiting list for sheltered housing is currently suspended and the Housing Needs Team are no longer sending out applications to applicants.
17. At 31 March 2016 there were 6 vacant properties. Over the six month period there have been 38 voids. The average time taken to re-let a property was 25 days. The target is 24 days. Over the last 12 months there have been 146 voids with the average time to re-let a property being a fraction over 19 days.

## **Affordable Housing**

18. The City of London's policy objective to deliver 3700 new homes over the next 10 years to help fight the chronic shortage has been approved by the Policy and Resources Committee and endorsed by the Grand Committee. It is envisaged that 3000 of these properties will be built on surplus land holdings and their project delivery will be managed by the City Surveyor. 700+ homes will be provided on existing HRA land over the next 10 years.
19. A report on the delivery of this programme will be considered by Grand Committee which will include the development and implementation of a communication and engagement strategy with residents and exploration of delivery options
20. Construction commenced in January 2015 at Avondale Square Estate and we are scheduled to complete 18 new homes in June 2016 (4 one bed, 5 two bed, 5 three bed and 4 four bed) on the site of the former Avondale Community Centre/estate office. This will also include new community facilities for residents and a new estate office. This is scheduled to complete in June 2016.
21. A new three bedroom wheelchair adapted dwelling and community space at Dron House was delivered in January 2016.



22. Planning applications have been submitted for 3 three bed units and a new community space at Isleden House and for the redevelopment of the Islington Arts Factory, Holloway Estate, to provide 32 additional units.

23. We are also working closely with London Borough of Islington to provide a new, two form entry, primary school and nursery and up to 70 homes on the Richard Cloudesley site, Golden Lane, which now has a target completion date of September 2018.

### Benefits

24. There are currently 983 households in the City and on our housing estates claiming benefits. Performance on our indicators is as follows:

Performance indicator	Target	Year-end performance
Average time taken to process new benefit claims	<26 days	21 days
% New claims decided within 14 days	>90%	97%
Average number of days taken to process notification of changes of circumstance	10 days	8 days

### Complaints

25. We received a total of 26 formal complaints during the reporting period. The broad subject areas of the complaints received can be broken down as follows:

	Number received in reporting period
Responsive repairs	7
Parking	2
Service charge/rent (including Benefits)	4
Customer Service	5
Estate management	8

26. Of the 26 complaints received, 22 were addressed at Stage 1 within the agreed ten working day deadline, 13 of which were not upheld, four partially upheld and five were upheld. Three of these complaints were escalated to Stage 2 and have subsequently not been upheld.

27. One complaint then went on to be escalated to Stage 3. This related to:

- Housing application and request for additional points, for which the applicants was not eligible. The complaint was not upheld.

28. The above complaint was escalated to the Local Government Ombudsman/ Housing Ombudsman. We are awaiting the outcome of the Ombudsman investigation.

## Appendices

- None

**Robert Jacks**  
**Head of Estates**

T: 020 7332 1916

E: [robert.jacks@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:robert.jacks@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

<b>Committee</b> Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 25.04.2016
<b>Subject:</b> Decant Policy – Sheltered Housing Review Part 2	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community and Children’s Services	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Paul Jackson – Department of Community and Children’s Services	

## Summary

On 15 January 2016 Members approved a proposal to redevelop the Corporation’s sheltered housing scheme at Mais House in Lewisham. The proposal requires vacant possession of Mais House and the rehousing (decanting) of residents and associated payment of compensation. A Decant Policy (attached as Appendix 1) has therefore been drafted to ensure compliance with legislation and other Corporation policies.

The policy has been drafted principally in response to the decision to redevelop Mais House and therefore applies to secure tenants only. Home loss and disturbance payments are expected to be payable for all residents at Mais House. It is recommended that the overall initial estimated budget required to meet claims for compensation at Mais House be set at £450,000, subject to regular review.

## Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve the decant policy attached as Appendix 1.
- Approve the creation of an initial budget of £450,000 for home loss and disturbance payments for residents of Mais House over the life of the decant programme.

## Main Report

### Background

1. At a meeting of the Community and Children’s Services Committee on 15 January 2016 Members approved a recommendation to redevelop the Corporation’s sheltered housing scheme at Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme, prioritised for older people. Residents were formally notified of the Committee’s decision in a letter dated 18 January 2016. The proposal to redevelop requires vacant possession of Mais House and the permanent rehousing of all residents.
2. The power to require tenants to give a landlord vacant possession of their existing home as part of a planned improvement or redevelopment plan, and the associated duties to provide suitable alternative accommodation and financial compensation for tenants are set out in the Land Compensation Act 1973, and

the Housing Act 1985, as amended. Due regard will also be paid to other legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1998.

### **Current Position**

3. Officers have undertaken a housing needs survey to establish the rehousing requirement at Mais House. Initial interviews have taken place with most residents. Offers of rehousing will begin as suitable properties become available.
4. The Department of Community and Children's Services has not previously undertaken a large scale redevelopment programme requiring vacant possession and the rehousing of residents. Officers have therefore drafted a decant policy (attached as Appendix 1) setting out the required arrangements to ensure compliance with relevant legislation and other Corporation policies.
5. The cost of compensating displaced tenants is currently estimated at £450,000 over the life of the decant programme. This will be funded as part of the overall capital costs of the redevelopment work at Mais House. The contract for redevelopment work at Mais House has not yet been let, but a budget is being established now so that approved claims for compensation can be paid straight away.

### **Purpose**

6. The decant policy has been drafted principally to implement the decision to redevelop Mais House where all existing residents are secure tenants. A separate policy will be required for leaseholders or freeholders, or for the exercising of compulsory purchase orders, should the need arise in future.
7. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the decant policy and the creation of a budget to ensure compensation can be paid to displaced tenants.

### **The decant policy**

8. Responsibility for decanting and rehousing affected residents will lie with the Corporation. The policy will apply once the appropriate Committee has decided to proceed with a modernisation, redevelopment or demolition scheme proposal. The policy aims to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all tenants. An equalities impact assessment is attached at Appendix 2.
9. The policy sets out the arrangements by which tenants will be rehoused, supported and compensated for the loss of their existing home and the associated costs of moving. These include:
  - The decanting and rehousing of tenants, including
    - decant programmes, residents rights and eligibility for assistance;
    - housing needs survey and assessment ; priority for rehousing, and making offers of accommodation;
    - support for vulnerable households.
  - The financial compensation payment to tenants:
    - home loss payments;

- disturbance payments and allowances
10. Decanting programmes will vary. In some residents may move temporarily pending a move back to their substantive home after; in others it may be necessary to rehouse residents permanently with an option to move back after redevelopment. There is no legal requirement to allow secure tenants to return to new properties on a redeveloped site. However, the Corporation is committed to allowing residents who wish to return to be given priority to do so.

#### Assessment of housing need

11. The legislation requires that the following people will be eligible for rehousing and assistance:
- tenants living in an affected property 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision to proceed with the proposed scheme;
  - family members including children living with living with the tenant at the property 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision;
  - partners and spouses living with the tenant 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision.

The Corporation will not rehouse unauthorised occupants, sub-tenants, lodgers, licensees, children of the tenant whose main or principal home is elsewhere, or other non-secure occupants.

12. A housing needs survey will be undertaken to inform the decant programme. All residents will be offered a visit to assess their individual households' rehousing needs, preferences and support requirements.
13. The size of alternative property to be offered will be determined using the Corporation's allocation policy in the first instance. Additional properties or smaller or larger properties than that currently occupied may be allocated in line with the allocation policy or where the housing need survey identifies a need.

#### Offers of accommodation

14. Residents requiring rehousing as part of a decant programme will be awarded points equivalent to the category of management transfer. Additional points may be awarded for medical needs or local connection as determined by the allocation policy.
15. Residents in a decant programme will be eligible to bid for suitable alternative accommodation through the Corporation's choice-based lettings scheme. However, for residents of sheltered schemes, such as Mais House, offers of suitable alternative accommodation will be made directly to make it easier for residents, and officers will provide support throughout the process.
16. Residents moving within the Corporation's own housing stock will be given new tenancies when they are decanted (unless they are moving on a temporary basis). These will be for the same term as the tenancy currently held ie if a lifetime tenancy the new tenancy will be a lifetime tenancy. Tenure may change if residents opt to move to another housing provider.

17. The Corporation is committed to moving households on a voluntary basis through mutual agreement where possible. Every effort will be made to ensure suitable alternative accommodation which meets the reasonable needs and preferences of households is offered. In the event of refusal of a final offer of suitable alternative accommodation, the Director of Community & Children's Services, in line with the Scheme of Delegation, will review the offer to determine its reasonableness. Legal action to gain possession of tenanted properties will be a last resort.

#### Support for residents

18. The Corporation is committed to supporting residents who may be vulnerable because of age, disability, or other medical problems or conditions. The Corporation will do all it can to ensure extra support to residents who need it when they are moving home. In addition to liaising directly with health and care providers this will include practical help with the necessary arrangements for furniture removal and associated requirements such as reconnection of appliances, provision of aids and adaptations and decoration allowances.

#### **Compensation and financial assistance for displaced residents**

19. The policy sets out the statutory home loss and disturbance payments to be made to residents who have to move as a result of demolition or a programme of modernisation or redevelopment work

#### Home loss payments

20. Home loss payments are paid to tenants who move permanently from their home as a consequence of demolition and/or redevelopment works. Home loss will not be payable to tenants who move temporarily and return to their substantive home following work. Payments are payable once only, per property and are divided between joint tenants. As at October 2015 home loss payments for tenants are set at £5,300.

#### Disturbance payments

21. Disturbance payments are paid for reasonable expenses incurred in moving. Where tenants are required to move twice, disturbance payments will be paid twice.

22. The following expenses considered as standard will normally be met by a disturbance payment:

- cost of removals, disconnection and reconnection charges for domestic appliances, telephone lines etc.
- cost of redirection of post for up to 3 month;
- cost of refitting or replacement of existing carpets, curtains and blinds.

Other costs may be eligible for reimbursement including, but not limited to:

- re-provision or refitting of disability aids and adaptations, security alarms and equipment

- costs of redecoration where decoration to temporary or permanent accommodation has not has not been carried out by the Corporation.

23. Tenants will be required to submit estimates for expenses when moving home. Claims will be assessed to determine the reasonableness of the expense incurred. Tenants may also opt to use Corporation approved contractors for some of the work. In these instances the associated costs will be met and paid directly by the Corporation.

24. Alternatively, where tenants wish to undertake removal work themselves, to alleviate the administrative burden associated with moving, tenants may claim a single, flat rate payment to undertake removals work deemed as standard as detailed in paragraph 22 above. The claim for standard items will be considered by the Corporation to be pre-approved. It will not be necessary for tenants to submit estimates or receipts although tenants will be expected to make the necessary removal arrangements themselves. Rates are detailed in Appendix 1 of the decant policy document (attached).

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

25. Increasing the supply of housing within the City and our neighbouring areas is the cornerstone of our housing strategy over the next three years. Redeveloping Mais House supports this aim.

26. A full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Sheltered Housing Review Phase 2, including this policy and is attached at Appendix 2.

### **Implications**

27. There are financial and legal implications flowing from the decision to redevelop Mais House and the associated requirement for vacant possession.

28. The rights of residents and their entitlement to financial assistance compensation are set out in the Land Compensation Act 1973. The decant policy sets out the Corporations general arrangements to ensure it complies with the statutory requirements when decanting properties in relation to improvement or redevelopment programmes.

29. The decanting programme at Mais House will require funding to meet the home loss and disturbance payments claims from displaced tenants. Whilst home loss payments are fixed by statute, housing providers are required only to meet claims for reasonable expenses incurred in moving, which may vary widely. At present it is estimated that funding up to £450,000 may be required. These costs can be capitalised once a capital budget for redevelopment work at Mais house is approved. In the meantime, a budget is being established so that payments can be made to residents as soon as they are ready to move.

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 - Decant Policy for Social Housing
- Appendix 2 – Equalities Impact Assessment

## **Background Papers**

Sheltered Housing Review Phase 2  
Community and Children's Services Committee 15 January 2016

### **Paul Jackson**

Interim Programme Manager

T: 0207 332 1574

Email: [paul.jackson@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:paul.jackson@cityoflondon.gov.uk)





# Decant Policy for Social Housing Secure Tenants

Department of Community and Children's Services

**City of London Corporation****Decant Policy for Social housing Secure Tenants**

Document status:	Draft
Prepared by:	Paul Jackson
Reviewed by:	JC
Owner:	Jacquie Campbell
Approved by:	Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee
Implementation date:	25 April 2016 (subject to approval)
Review date:	+ 12 months
Document end date:	+ 3 years
Version:	1.0

## Table of Contents

Document status: .....	1
Policy overview .....	3
The decant programme .....	4
<b>Decanting arrangements – scheme types and residents rights</b> .....	4
<b>Local lettings plans</b> .....	5
<b>Housing needs survey</b> .....	5
<b>Eligibility – qualifications and exclusions</b> .....	5
<b>Housing needs assessment and size of accommodation</b> .....	6
<b>Offers of accommodation</b> .....	6
<b>Priority for rehousing</b> .....	7
<b>Bidding for properties</b> .....	7
<b>Direct offers</b> .....	7
<b>Tenancies</b> .....	7
<b>Support for vulnerable households</b> .....	8
<b>Refusal of offers</b> .....	8
Compensation and financial assistance for displaced residents .....	8
<b>Home loss payments</b> .....	8
<b>Disturbance payments</b> .....	9
<b>Claims and reimbursement arrangements</b> .....	9
<b>Discretionary payments</b> .....	10
<b>Appeals and complaints</b> .....	10
<b>Appendix 1</b> .....	11

## Policy overview

This decant policy sets out the Corporation's approach to managing the rehousing of residents when it is necessary to move residents from their existing home into temporary or permanent alternative accommodation or in order to facilitate modernisation or redevelopment works. This process is known as decanting.

The policy applies only to housing stock of which the Corporation is the landlord and only to the decanting of residents who are secure tenants of the Corporation to enable modernisation, redevelopment or demolition programmes to take place. It will not apply in cases of compulsory purchase orders, emergency repair or the undertaking of work to housing stock with residents in occupation. Separate policy requirements will apply in these instances.

The policy outlines arrangements for the rehousing and financial compensation of residents in line with the Corporation's allocation policy and legal requirements in order to deliver vacant possession of affected properties and ensure effective use of public funds. The policy provides for estate-specific plans to be applied to decant requirements where necessary to meet the particular needs and circumstances of individual estates and works programmes.

Responsibility for decanting and rehousing affected residents lies with the Corporation although rehousing into another housing provider's property is permissible subject to a satisfactory match with residents' needs and their agreement.

The policy aims to ensure no person will receive less favourable treatment on the grounds of race, gender, religion, belief, age, sexual orientation, physical disability, appearance, and economic or marital status.

The policy will apply once the appropriate Committee has decided to proceed with a modernisation, redevelopment or demolition scheme proposal and will be implemented through a dedicated decant programme. Consultation with affected residents will be carried out prior to the Committee's consideration of the proposal. Consultation will continue throughout the decant programme where appropriate on the detail of the modernisation or redevelopment programme.

## The decant programme

A decant programme will commence once a Committee decision has been made to proceed with a proposal for a modernisation or redevelopment scheme. The decant programme will manage the rehousing of residents where their home is to be redeveloped or substantially modernised to the extent that they are unable to remain in occupation whilst work takes place.

Decant programmes will be scheme-specific. The approach to decanting will take into account scheme proposals, works requirements, residents' choices to be rehoused temporarily or permanently, and residents' rehousing needs and preferences. Decant programmes will be underpinned by a housing needs survey of all affected residents and households and, for new or redevelopment schemes, a lettings plan where appropriate.

Programmes will be managed by dedicated officers who will manage communication and consultation with residents and provide the first point of contact for advice and support for all households affected by the decanting programme.

### ***Decanting arrangements – scheme types and residents rights***

The approach to decanting properties will depend on the type and requirements of the scheme proposals and the rehousing rights and choices of residents during the programme once works are completed. In some programmes, such as modernisation works, it may be possible to rehouse residents temporarily pending a move back to their substantive home; in others, such as a redevelopment, residents may be required to move, temporarily or permanently, with the option of an offer to return to a newly redeveloped property accommodation on the new scheme where possible. Whilst there is no legal requirement to allow residents to return to properties in a redeveloped site, the Corporation is committed to allowing residents who wish to return to be given priority to do so subject to availability of suitable properties which meet the identified needs and requirements of their household. Local lettings plans may be applied to the letting of new or redeveloped properties units to facilitate this.

On large estates with multiple blocks decanting may be phased to meet the requirements of the works programme.

Modernisation or refurbishment schemes – in these schemes the shell of existing properties may be retained making it possible for residents to move temporarily and return to their substantive home upon completion of works. In these cases residents will:

- retain the tenancy of their existing substantive home
- move temporarily with a licence to occupy their temporary decant property
- pay the lower of the two property rents during the period of the works
- have the right to return to their substantive home upon completion of the work.

Demolition and redevelopment schemes – in these schemes it will not be possible for residents to return to their existing, substantive homes. In these cases residents will:

- in the case of demolition be offered suitable permanent alternative accommodation
- in the case of redevelopment schemes, either
  - move permanently into one of the newly developed properties where suitable properties become available prior to the need to decant sites or
  - be offered suitable permanent accommodation and retain the option of an offer of accommodation on the new scheme where possible.

### ***Local lettings plans***

For redevelopment schemes, a local letting plan will identify the potential for residents to return and will govern the allocation of newly developed properties. The lettings plan will identify residents who wish to return. It will set out letting criteria to ensure qualifying residents are allocated first opportunity of rehousing into the new properties subject to availability of properties which meet the identified needs and requirements of their household. In the event of insufficient numbers of suitable properties the letting plan will set out criteria for determining priority. These will include local connection and length of residence.

### ***Housing needs survey***

A housing needs survey of the affected site will be undertaken to inform the decant programme and identify the scale and nature of the overall rehousing requirement. All residents will be offered a visit or interview to assess their individual households' rehousing needs, preferences and support requirements, and determine their eligibility for help with rehousing and financial compensation. A decant rehousing application will be created for each eligible household and all applications will be registered on the Corporation's housing register.

Household details will be updated periodically throughout the duration of the programme and further visits will be undertaken prior to rehousing to check requirements and enable claims for financial compensation.

### ***Eligibility – qualifications and exclusions***

The following residents will be eligible for rehousing and assistance:

- tenants living in affected property 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision to proceed with the proposed scheme
- family members including children living with the tenant at the property 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision to proceed with the proposed scheme
- partners and spouses living with the tenant 12 months prior to the date of the Committee decision to proceed with the proposed scheme.

Proof that residents meet the eligibility criteria may be required. The Corporation will not rehouse unauthorised occupants, sub-tenants, lodgers, licensees, children of the tenant whose main or principal home is elsewhere, or other non-secure occupants.

### ***Housing needs assessment and size of accommodation***

The size of alternative property to be offered will depend on the number and age of eligible household members and the size of their current property at the time of the move. This will be determined using the Corporation's allocation policy in the first instance. Additional properties or smaller or larger properties than that currently occupied may be allocated in line with the allocation policy or where the housing need survey identifies a need.

Hidden households (separate households within a known household, for example an adult child of the tenant living in the property with a spouse, partner and/or one or more children) and non-dependent adults will be offered the option of separate accommodation which meets their housing need, subject to meeting the eligibility criteria set out above.

Households under-occupying their current accommodation will generally be offered accommodation that meets their current need, except in certain circumstances where accommodation providing one bedroom more than the household's identified needs may be offered. This will be at the Corporation's discretion and will normally apply on health grounds as assessed by the Corporation's medical adviser.

Single person households over the age of forty-five occupying a studio flat will be eligible for a one bedroom property. Single person households occupying a one bedroom property will be eligible for a one bedroom property. It is not expected that these households would be rehoused into a studio flat unless on a voluntary basis.

Under-occupying households and single-person households in one bedroom accommodation who move into smaller accommodation (ie a studio flat) will qualify for additional financial compensation under the Corporation's shift allowance for tenants who downsize. Under this policy, single person households over the age of forty-five occupying a studio flat who would be eligible for a one bedroom flat will also qualify for the shift allowance if they accept an offer of a studio flat. Current rates for the shift allowance are shown at Appendix 1 (see pages 10-11).

Where necessary, estate-specific decant plans will allow flexibility and discretion to adapt requirements to the particular needs and circumstances of individual estates and works programmes.

### ***Offers of accommodation***

Offers of accommodation will be made following the completion of the housing needs survey and the assessment of individual residents' and their households' requirements, including medical assessments where necessary. Residents will be notified in writing of the size of property they are entitled to, their priority for rehousing, and their stated preferences for rehousing. They will also be notified of

their right to return to their substantive property where applicable or the option of an offer of accommodation on the new scheme or redevelopment where possible. Offers will meet the reasonable needs of residents as assessed from information provided at the time of application and/or held on tenancy records. The Corporation will make every effort to meet residents' preferences but this cannot be guaranteed.

### ***Priority for rehousing***

Priority for offers of rehousing will be awarded in line with the Corporation's allocation policy in the first instance. Residents requiring rehousing as part of a decant programme will be awarded points equivalent to the category of management move. Additional points may be awarded for medical needs or welfare needs as determined by the allocation policy.

### ***Bidding for properties***

Residents in a decant programme will be eligible to bid for suitable alternative accommodation, including properties available through other registered providers (such as housing associations) through the Corporation's choice-based lettings scheme, for a period up to 12 months prior to the scheduled site vacation date, subject to the requirements of individual works programmes. Any alterations to this period will be publicised. Advice and support will be given to residents who may also wish to seek accommodation in the private sector or to purchase on the open market.

The Corporation will notify decanting households who are still on the housing register within three months of the scheduled site vacation date. The Corporation may award discretionary priority to these households. Once the bidding period has closed the Corporation will make an offer of suitable alternative accommodation directly to qualifying households.

### ***Direct offers***

For households in specialist housing or sheltered housing, households requiring mobility category properties, or households otherwise unable to use the bidding system, offers of suitable alternative accommodation will be made directly. The Corporation will make every effort to ensure offers meet the reasonable requirements of households and residents will normally be expected to accept the first reasonable offer which meets their housing need. Additional provision, such as aids and adaptations, and support during the move will be offered where appropriate to ensure offers meet households' identified needs.

### ***Tenancies***

Residents moving within the Corporation's own housing stock will be given new tenancies when they are decanted (unless they are moving on a temporary basis, in which case they will be granted a licence and retain the existing tenancy of their substantive tenancies pending their return). These will be for the same term as the tenancy currently held ie if a lifetime tenancy the new tenancy will be a lifetime tenancy. Tenure may change if residents opt to move to another housing provider.



For example, housing associations generally offer accommodation on assured tenancies; in some instances these may be offered as a fixed term tenancy. Residents opting to do this will be advised about any change in their tenure or conditions of tenancy prior to accepting offers.

### ***Support for vulnerable households***

The Corporation is committed to supporting residents who may be vulnerable because of age, disability, or other medical problems or conditions. The Corporation will provide extra support to residents who need it when they are moving home. This will include:

- accompanied viewings of properties,
- liaison with health and care providers and new housing managers or providers,
- practical help and advice with arrangements for:
  - furniture removal
  - disconnection and reconnection of appliances,
  - provision of aids and adaptations
  - decoration allowances, and
  - assistance in claiming home loss and disturbance payments.

### ***Refusal of offers***

The Corporation is committed to moving households on a voluntary basis through mutual agreement where possible. Every effort will be made to ensure suitable alternative accommodation which meets the reasonable needs and preferences of households is offered. Legal action to gain possession of tenanted properties will be a last resort. In the event of refusal of a final offer of suitable alternative accommodation, the Director of Community & Children's Services, under the Scheme of Delegation, will decide on the reasonableness of the offer of accommodation. Where final offers are considered reasonable the Corporation will apply for possession proceedings to secure vacant possession and allow work programmes to proceed.

## **Compensation and financial assistance for displaced residents**

The Corporation is committed to compensating residents for the loss of their home and the reasonable costs incurred in moving. The Land Compensation Act 1973 provides for statutory home loss and disturbance payments to be made to residents (named tenants) displaced as a result of demolition or a programme of modernisation or redevelopment work.

### ***Home loss payments***

Home loss payments are paid to compensate eligible tenants, as defined above, who are required either to move permanently from their home as a consequence of demolition and/or redevelopment works, or to move temporarily and return subsequently to a newly developed home. Home loss will not be payable to tenants who are able to return to their substantive home following work.

Home loss payments are payable once only, against the property. Payments will therefore be divided between joint tenants. Payments are subject to maximum and minimum thresholds and annual review by Government. As at October 2015 home loss payments for tenants are set at £5,300. Payments made by the Corporation under this policy will be reviewed regularly to ensure they meet the required statutory level.

Tenants will be required to claim for a home loss payment. Guidance about how to claim will be provided to tenants at the time of their move. Claims will be accepted up to 6 years after the date of removal and will be paid within 3 months of receiving the claim. The Corporation reserves the right to offset rent arrears or other debts owed to the Corporation against home loss payments.

### ***Disturbance payments***

Disturbance payments are paid to compensate eligible tenants, as defined above, for reasonable expenses incurred in moving where they are required to move permanently from their home as a consequence of demolition and/or redevelopment works. Where tenants are required to move twice, for example where they are rehoused temporarily before returning to either their substantive home or a newly modernised or redeveloped home, disturbance payments will be paid twice.

The following expenses are considered to be standard and will normally be met by a disturbance payment:

- cost of removals
- disconnection and reconnection charges for domestic appliances, telephone lines and extensions and television aerials or satellite dishes
- cost of redirection of post for up to 3 months
- cost of refitting or replacement of existing carpets, curtains and blinds up to a maximum.

Other costs may be eligible for reimbursement including, but not limited to:

- re-provision or refitting of disability aids and adaptations for special needs
- refitting security alarms or other security equipment
- costs of redecoration where decoration to temporary or permanent accommodation has not been carried out by the Corporation.

Removal and associated costs eligible for disturbance payments are set out in more detail in Appendix 1.

Compensation for authorised improvements by tenants to existing properties will be paid under the Corporation's existing policy. Properties will be inspected prior to moving out to agree compensation for improvements and the amount of refitting or replacement work required as part of the disturbance payments.

### ***Claims and reimbursement arrangements***

The Corporation is committed to ensuring that residents are not unduly inconvenienced or left out of pocket as a consequence of having to leave their home and that public funds are used fairly and effectively in reimbursing legitimate costs.

The Corporation also wishes to ensure that residents are supported in choosing how best to arrange their move. Arrangements for the work associated with removals and the reimbursement of expenses may be undertaken as follows.

Residents who wish to minimise the financial outlay required to move before claiming reimbursement may opt to use Corporation-approved contractors to undertake removals, carpet and curtain refitting/replacement and disconnection/reconnection of domestic appliances to agreed levels and costs. In these instances the associated costs will be met and paid directly by the Corporation. Claims for additional items as listed in Appendix 1 will require written quotations for approval by the Corporation before proceeding.

Residents wishing to use their own contractors will need to submit written quotations for work for approval by the Corporation before proceeding. Claims will be assessed to determine the reasonableness of the expense incurred. Following approval tenants may instruct their chosen contractor and on completion of the work should submit receipts for payment to the Council who will reimburse the approved cost within 14 working days.

Alternatively, where residents wish to undertake the removal and other associated work themselves, they may claim and accept a flat rate disturbance payment in lieu of a claim for items deemed as standard (see Disturbance Payments, page 8). This payment would be made on confirmation that the tenant has accepted in writing an offer of suitable alternative accommodation and the tenancy is expected to start within the following 14 days. The claim for a flat rate payment claim for standard items will be considered by the Corporation to be pre-approved. It will not be necessary for residents to submit estimates or receipts although tenants will be expected to make all necessary removal arrangements and other provision themselves. The acceptance of this payment would not prevent claims for additional items such as the refitting of security alarms or showers other reasonable expenditure for which written quotations would be required prior to the work being authorised.

Further details about these options and levels of payment are set out in Appendix (see pages 11-12).

### ***Discretionary payments***

The Corporation may, exceptionally, exercise discretion to provide compensation or financial assistance where tenants are not legally eligible for home loss payments or incur costs beyond those set out in this policy. Where applicable this assistance will be defined as part of a scheme-specific decant and works programme and claims will be considered on a case-by-case basis. These discretionary payments cases will not be subject to appeal.

### ***Appeals and complaints***

An appeal against any aspect of this policy or decision made under it will be treated as a complaint and dealt with in accordance with the Corporation's complaints policy and procedure.

**Appendix 1**

Table 1  
Schedule of disturbance payments

1.	Removal costs	To include packing/unpacking for vulnerable/older tenants where approved
2.	Redirection of mail	For three months
3.	Disconnection and reconnection of domestic appliances	Cooker, dishwasher, washing machine. Must be undertaken by industry approved tradesperson
4.	Disconnection and reconnection of telephone line, broadband, satellite dishes, aerials	
5.	Carpets, floor covering	Uplift, alteration and refitting of existing or disposal and replacement to Corporation-approved standard
6.	Curtains, curtain tracks, blinds	Alteration and refitting of existing or replacement to Corporation-approved standard
7.	Redecoration	Allowance or redecoration to approved re-let standards where Corporation is the landlord. Allowance for non-Corporation properties subject to deduction of any landlord decoration allowance
8.	Security devices	Special or additional alarms, locks where fitted by tenant
9.	Aids and adaptations	To be refitted/re-provided where previously approved by the Corporation; allowance or reimbursement for same where provided by the tenant subject to proof or approval of costs
10.	Fitted furniture	Dismantling and refitting of wardrobes and kitchens where provided by tenant
11.	Other home improvements	Compensation and reimbursement as per existing policy
12.	Sheds, garden furniture	Dismantling and reassembly; reimbursement for loss or replacement
13.	Loss of earnings	For up to two eligible members of household. Written proof required
14.	School uniforms	Where change of school required
15.	Storage	For temporary decants only
16.	Other	Other exceptional or special costs may be considered and approved by the Corporation

Table 2Flat rate disturbance allowance – rates of payment

Flat rate disturbance payments are payable for items 1 to 6 as set out in Table 1 of this Appendix. Current rates are set out below. Rates will be subject to review.

<b>Size of Property</b>	<b>Flat rate allowance</b>
Studio	£1145
One bedroom	£1545
Two bedrooms	£1945
Three bedroom	£2345
Four bedroom	£2465

Table 3Decoration allowance – rates of payment

Where properties are undecorated tenants can claim an allowance at the following rates:

<b>Size of property</b>	<b>Decoration allowance</b>
One bedroom	£274
Two bedrooms	£355
Three bedroom	£517
Four bedroom	£598

Shift allowance - rates of payment

The shift allowance (payable where tenants 'downsize' or give up a bedroom as they move) is payable as follows:

First bedroom released	£2000
Subsequent rooms	£1000

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: Housing and Neighbourhoods

Person responsible for the assessment: Paul Jackson

Contact details: paul.jackson@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Names of other people participating in review: Jacqueline Campbell

Name of Policy to be assessed: Sheltered Housing Review Phase 2; Decant Policy for Secure Social Housing Tenants

Is this a new or revised policy: New

Date policy scheduled for Committee (if relevant): CCS 11 March 2016

### 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).*

- City of London population percentages by BAME group relating to the growing older population in the City (see Appendix 1).
- Age bands of residents at Mais House (See Appendix 1).
- Ethnicity of residents at Mais House by gender (Appendix 1)
- ONS data shows the number of older people in the City of London is growing more rapidly. Over the past decade number of people aged 60 and over grew from 1270 to 1500, an increase of 18%. This increase could rise to more than 25% by 2021.

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.



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.
- Sheltered housing review Phase 1:
    - Consultation through focus groups with older people in general needs and sheltered housing
    - Written responses from residents of Mais House to the Committee report: Sheltered Housing Review Phase 2
  - Housing our Ageing Population: Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) report
  - Best practice in promoting social well-being in extra care housing: A literature review – Joseph Rowntree Foundation

**C: Your Policy or Function**

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

To rehouse existing residents of Mais House, temporarily or permanently, to permit the redevelopment of Mais House as a lifetime homes scheme prioritised for older people.

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

To ensure additional support is provided to existing residents of Mais House as required throughout the decanting and rehousing process.

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

- The City’s Allocations Policy will be used implement the rehousing of existing and future residents.
- A decant policy will be created for Committee approval to enable other aspects and specific requirements of the policy (for example, payment of home loss and disturbance payments).
- The City’s procurement procedures will be used to procure services to redevelop Mais House.

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

No.

- 5 Who are the main stakeholders of the policy?

- Members of Community & Children’s Services Committee
- Departmental Leadership Team (CCS)
- Housing and Neighbourhoods Division
- Housing Programme Board
- Sheltered Housing Residents (Mais House)

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

See C) 3 above.

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?

No.

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 redevelopment of Mais House will be undertaken by the Department of Community and Children's Services in conjunction with the City Surveyor and overseen by the Housing Programme board.

**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:

Page 47

Gender	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Women			x	Mais House and the proposed general needs lifetime homes scheme cater for all genders. The number of women residents at Mais House is approximately half that of the men but there is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on women.
Men			x	Mais House and the proposed general needs lifetime homes scheme cater for all genders. The number of women residents at Mais House is approximately half that of the men but there is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on women.
Transgender/ transexual			x	There is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on transgender/transsexual people.

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

<b>Pregnancy &amp; Maternity</b>			<b>x</b>	There is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on people on account of pregnancy or maternity
<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b>			<b>x</b>	There is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on people on account of marriage or civil partnership

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

Race	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
<b>Asian</b> (including Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Indian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Other Asian Background – please specify _____)			<b>x</b>	Resident BAME groupings are shown in Table 3 of the Appendix 1. In comparison to the Greater London community, there is a higher proportion of White residents and Black residents, and a smaller proportion of Asian residents at Mais House. There is no other data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on people on account of ethnicity. There are no known language or specific cultural requirements amongst the existing resident group at Mais House. All allocations of housing are made strictly according to housing need regardless of ethnic origin
<b>Black</b> (including Caribbean, Somali, Other African, Other black background – please specify _____)			<b>x</b>	As above
<b>White</b> (including English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, Other white background – please specify _____)			<b>x</b>	As above
<b>Mixed/ Dual heritage</b> (White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, Other mixed)			<b>x</b>	As above

Page 48

background - please specify )				
<b>Gypsies/Travellers</b>			<b>x</b>	As above
<b>Other</b> (please specify)			<b>x</b>	As above

Page 49  
 Dd) Identify the potential impact of the policy/service/proposal on disabled people:

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Physical Disability</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x medium</b>		Disability will be engaged because some existing residents have a disability or high support needs. Some residents have expressed concern about the burden of relocating and the process of moving home may impact negatively on some. Careful consideration will be given to residents personal requirements. Options and support for rehousing for these residents may require more time planning and resource to achieve satisfactory outcomes. The provision of new homes built to lifetime standards for existing and prospective tenants is expected to be broadly positive in terms of delivering better space standards and storage, and more adaptable and wheelchair accessible housing for people with disabilities.

Sensory Impairment	x	x medium		As above
Learning Difficulties	x	x medium		As above
Mental Health Issues	x	x medium		As above

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	x	x medium		Age will be engaged because most residents of sheltered housing schemes are aged 60 or over. The prospect of rehousing from Mais House is viewed with concern by some residents in terms of the burden of moving and loss of friends. In consultation, companionship and social interaction was viewed as more significant by older residents in sheltered housing than those in general needs. Careful consideration will be given to residents personal requirements. Options and support for rehousing for some residents may require more time planning and resource to achieve satisfactory outcomes. The future impact of the provision of new homes to lifetime standards for existing and prospective tenants is expected to be broadly positive in terms of delivering better space standards and more adaptable and age-appropriate housing. The number of older people in the City is growing more rapidly. Over the past decade number of people aged 60 and over grew from 1270 to 1500, an increase of 18%. This increase could rise to more than 25% by 2021.

Young People/children			x	Young people and children are broadly unaffected by the proposals. The allocation policy is likely to result in more older people being rehoused on one-bedroom accommodation providing more space for children and young people to visit older relatives.
-----------------------	--	--	---	--

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			x	There is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on people on account of sexual orientation
Gay Men			x	As above
Bisexual			x	As above
Heterosexual			x	As above

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			x	There is no data to suggest that the proposal would have a disproportionate impact on people on account of sexual orientation
Christian			x	As above
Hindu			x	As above
Jewish			x	As above
Muslim			x	As above
Sikh			x	As above

Other (please specify)			x	As above
------------------------	--	--	---	----------

h) As a result of completing Question 1 a-f above what is the potential impact of your policy?

High ⑤                      Medium    x⑤                      Low ⑤

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

All options and requirements for rehousing will be discussed in full on an individual basis with each resident and, if appropriate, their family. A range of options will be considered including general needs housing, extra-care provision and other sheltered housing. Residents will be supported by a dedicated project manager throughout the process who will refresh requirements to enable specific needs to be addressed.

The PM will explore the needs of the individual with them, working with the local authority and to find a solution which meets the needs and wishes of each resident as far as can possibly be managed. Every effort will be made to keep friends together where this is possible and the needs of the individual tenant will be paramount throughout. There will be consultation with existing residents around the features that we could consider incorporating into designs/works to increase suitability for older residents. The proposed scheme will be a lifetime homes scheme that will better support residents in remaining in their homes as long as possible. Residents decanted will have the opportunity to move back following work and there will be continued engagement with residents as plans develop. The provision of home loss and disturbance payments will ensure no residents will suffer financial loss or hardship as a consequence of their move.

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?

The policy actively promotes the development of new homes that will be more suitable to people with disabilities and older people. No evidence of unlawful discrimination has been identified to date in the adoption of this policy.

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

Lead Officer

Service Head

Date

Date

Date

Page 53

## Action Plan

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones	Officer Responsible	Progress
Gather data on housing and support needs for all affected residents	Housing Needs Survey	April 2016	Decant Programme Manager Sheltered Housing Manager	
Consult with residents about the features of the proposed scheme	Consultation	To be agreed	Development Manager Decant Programme Manager	
Develop range of rehousing options and supply	Allocations function	May 2016	Allocations Manager	

Appendix

The City has a relatively small Black population, less than London and England and Wales. Figures and changes since 2001 are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Ethnic Group 2001 and 2011

Source: Office of National Statistics© **Crown Copyright**

	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

Page 55

Table 2: Age bands of Mais House residents

Age	Number
60 – 69	19
70 - 79	16
80 - 89	13
90- 92	4

In comparison to the Greater London community, there is a higher proportion of White residents and Black residents, and smaller proportion of Asian residents at Mais House.

Table 3: Ethnicity of Mais House Residents

Ethnicity	% Female	% Male	% Total
White	23	56	79
Asian	0	2	2

Black	6	13	19
-------	---	----	----

## Appendix 3

**Mais House Residents Survey**  
**Summary of responses**

Total number of responses: 37

Residents' comments are unedited except where necessary to preserve anonymity.

Page 57	1.	Is it important to you to live in sheltered housing rather than a general housing estate? (* two respondents did not answer this question)	Yes 28	No 7
	2.	If you answered yes to question 1, what is important to you?		
		The monitoring alarm system	20	
		Support from a scheme manager	25	
		Daily checks	16	
		Secure building access	27	
		Something else (see comments below)	4	
		<i>'I am satisfied with the size of the flat I live in now. Anything bigger may be more than I can afford.'</i>		
		<i>'The above questions are very important to me.'</i>		
		<i>'Before I lived in Mais House I had to climb two flights of stairs in Mais House there are no stairs I have to use because with the lift it makes all parts easily reached.'</i>		
		<i>'Keep the scheme manager.'</i>		
	3.	What is important to you in the area you live in?		
		Friends within the building or in the area	16	
	Family living nearby	22		
	Good transport	31		
	Easy access to GP and health services	29		
	Local amenities for instance shops restaurants, cinema, library	28		
	Something else (see comments below)	7		
	<i>'Stability. I would like to continue life at Mais House.'</i>			
	<i>'I have been very happy here since I moved into my flat and when I have an</i>			

	<i>emergency the scheme manager and Link line have always come to my rescue.'</i>	
	<i>'Keep our scheme manager.'</i>	
	<i>'It is often very difficult to get an appointment at Wells Park GP. For the amenities mentioned above a bus is required.'</i>	
	<i>'Local football team that I support'</i>	
	<i>'Safe, quiet area.'</i>	
	<i>'Off road parking.'</i>	
4.	What kind of support do you consider you need to help you remain living independently?	
	No support	9
	Scheme manager as currently provided	27
	More support than you currently have at Mais house – if so what do you think you need? (See comments below)	4
	<i>'Under discussion at present.'</i>	
	<i>'Filling in important forms that need to be sent.'</i>	
	<i>'I need the scheme manager to help and advise me on the mundane things in life. As life goes on this can be valuable help'</i>	
	<i>'CCTV camera outside my flat.'</i>	
5.	Any other information you would like to tell us?	
	<i>'I am horrified at the thought of re-locating at this stage of my life. Mais House has provided the only stable address at which I have lived since (retirement) this has now rapidly disappeared.'</i>	
	<i>'I would like to stay here because we are all friends we are a close family. We help each other and support each other. We find the manager very helpful. She always supports us if we need help and helps us fill in forms and explains letters.'</i>	
	<i>'A new flat in Otto close would be very welcome, failing that I'm quite content with my accommodation size being as it is, however the windows and heating system do need sorting plus there seems to be quite a problem with various bugs, insects and clothes moths making an appearance from nooks and crannies here and there. Having a carpet doesn't help. I wish I had put in an alternative floor covering at the start as I am very quiet and respectful of those below me anyway.'</i>	
	<i>'I don't want to leave Mais House or my flat.'</i>	
	<i>'I had to take out a bank loan which I paid off over 18 months. Then I had to ask for a second loan which I am again paying over 18 months at £63 per month. I</i>	

	<i>need these loans to enable me to cover my living expenses. I am not spending wildly but my pension income is not great. I worry that I may not be able to pay my rent if the new flats are more expensive. I look forward to having an individual meeting.'</i>
	<i>'I do not want to leave Mais house. My flat and accommodation suits me. I am disabled and all the amenities I need are here at Mais House and in my flat.'</i>
	<i>'I would like a one bedroom sheltered housing property please.'</i>
	<i>'Keep the scheme manager.'</i>
	<i>'Keep the scheme manager.'</i>
	<i>'I would be very happy to move to the Almshouses in Brixton eventually. Not yet, it would be too much upheaval.'</i>
	<i>'Would like to stay on the estate. Would consider other areas depending what is on offer.'</i>
	<i>'I would rather stay in my home in Mais House but the uncertainty of what is going to happen when it will happen, for how long the disruption is like living on a precipice. During the first meeting Jacquie Campbell asked if we had any ideas of where we would like to move to. A flat in Lammas Green could solve my problem. Thank you.'</i>
	<i>'The only thing I need is a living room it gets a bit cramped when all the grand kids come to visit me.'</i>
	<i>'Emergency pendant only.'</i>

Page 59

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	25/04/2016
<b>Subject:</b> Tackling Social Housing Tenancy Fraud	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children’s Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report Authors:</b> Bob Jacks, Head of Estates Housing & Neighbourhoods Division  Chris Keesing, Anti-Fraud Manager Chamberlains Dept	

## Summary

This report provides Members with information of how the City of London (CoL) is investigating and tackling Social Housing Tenancy Fraud. It also provides an analysis of the cases investigated by the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team during the 2015/16 financial year.

Working closely with the Chamberlain’s Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team, we have successfully recovered 15 illegally sub-let CoL social housing properties during the 2015/16 reporting year. Four of these cases are currently with the Comptroller and City Solicitor for criminal prosecution.

Two fraud preventative measures have been introduced to strengthen the City’s due diligence activity in the social housing and right to buy application processes, with positive outcomes already obtained.

Positive liaison was recently carried out with colleagues from the Home Office Immigration Team, with an outline specification to undertake a joint exercise to identify social housing tenancy fraud and ‘no recourse to public funds’ fraud.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. This report provides Members with key information regarding the work that the Housing Service, along with colleagues from the Chamberlain’s Anti-Fraud and Investigation Team, is conducting to reduce fraud within our social housing provision.

## **Social Housing Tenancy Fraud**

2. Social Housing Tenancy Fraud continues to be a high fraud risk area. Officers from the Housing Needs, Benefits, Estate Management Teams and the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team continue to support each other to identify and investigate possible cases of fraud across all aspects of the housing service.
3. Checks carried out include those at initial housing application stage, through to civil/criminal investigations into breaches of existing tenancies. Successes in this area of work include:
  - a) Nine cases where subletting has been identified;
  - b) Two cases where the property has been abandoned;
  - c) Three cases where other social housing tenancy fraud was identified e.g. ownership of private property or holding a social housing tenancy elsewhere or where the tenant has no recourse to public funds;
  - d) One case of fraudulent succession.
4. Of the above, four cases are progressing with the Comptroller and City Solicitor for criminal prosecution owing to the severity of the frauds committed. Successful prosecutions are publicised as a deterrent exercise, in line with our Social Housing Fraud – Anti-Fraud & Prosecution Policy.

## **Housing Application Fraud**

5. The Housing Needs Team checks every application eligible for inclusion on the Housing Register through the National Fraud Initiative (NFI) Application Checker. The NFI Application Checker is an on-line tool that checks data provided by applicants against data held by other local authorities nationwide to aid the assessment of all new housing applications, and to prevent and detect fraud. This will immediately determine whether the applicant, or any declared member of their household, has a social housing tenancy.
6. This process also identifies whether the applicant has no immigration status and/or is claiming single person discount for Council Tax. Any positive checks are reviewed by the Chamberlain's Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team.
7. Since November 2015, when the NFI Application Checker was introduced, the Housing Needs Team has checked 97 applications, of which 44 are currently being reviewed by the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team. Not every application that flags areas of concern turns out to be fraudulent - it may be indicating that applicants have an application with another authority, but would not necessarily preclude an entitlement to apply for housing with the City of London. 10 fraudulent housing applications have been identified to date as a direct result of the NFI Application Checker.
8. The Housing Needs Team has additionally cancelled two further social housing tenancy applications following information received from the NFI checks. One applicant claimed to be a private housing tenant, whereas she

was the co-owner of the property and another applicant claimed to be living with a partner when in fact they were claiming single person discount.

9. The Housing Needs Team is also undertaking housing visits on all applications which show a high level of priority. This is to confirm that the applicants are living in the circumstances they claim. Visits are also undertaken to applications which are identified as having a level of concern, following initial processing, or where we need more detail about the household's living conditions.

### **Role of Housing Benefits Team in identifying tenancy fraud**

10. The Benefits Team takes proactive steps to identify any indication of tenancy fraud at all stages of the life of a benefit claim.
11. All new claims for Housing Benefit are checked against the rents system to identify that the claimant has a liability to pay rent. If there is a suggestion that the tenant doesn't live at the property, estate staff are notified. During the past year, a member of the Benefits Team identified, during an interview with a private tenant, that the landlord was a social housing tenant who was illegally subletting his property. The tenant was evicted from the property.
12. Benefit claims are reviewed on a regular basis and estate based staff are advised of any discrepancies that are noted. High risk claims are cross checked against the housing application to ensure that those declared on the benefit claim form match those declared on the housing application.
13. Recently, concern was raised about a subletting issue that was identified by cross checking information declared on a Housing Benefit claim against information held on Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) systems. Further investigation identified that the property, a studio flat, was being sublet to a family. The tenant is now in the process of being evicted from his property.
14. Since November 2014 Housing Benefit fraud has been dealt with by the DWP under the Single Fraud Investigation Service (SFIS). The SFIS is one service covering all welfare benefit fraud. Any cases of Housing Benefit fraud identified by SFIS that might involve tenancy fraud are notified to the City of London. In turn, this information would be passed on to estate staff to take appropriate action.

### **Right to Buy Fraud and Tenancy Inspections**

15. In addition to the NFI application checker referred to above, the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team also assisted with the introduction of a further due diligence measure in response to increased risk of fraud around the Right to Buy (RTB). A new, additional RTB form is now being used and forms a key part of the RTB application process.
16. This new form ensures that key information is gathered which assists the City to process RTB applications and ensures that only those that are eligible for

the RTB proceed. To further support this process, the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team undertake enhanced verification checks for each RTB application, with those indicating concern proceeding to full investigation by the team.

17. The Estate Management Team continues to undertake its programme of tenancy inspections across all the City's housing estates; this activity provides a further visual presence and acts as deterrent to those who may be considering sub-letting their homes. Any concerns identified during a tenancy inspection are reported to the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team for investigation.

### **Overall tenancy fraud detection rates 2015/16 and notional values**

18. The chart below provides a detailed analysis of the number of social housing tenancy fraud cases successfully concluded by the Anti-Fraud & Investigation team during the 2015/16 financial year, showing fraud types along with the notional value of concluded cases.

<b>Fraud Type</b>	<b>Completed Investigations 2015/16</b>	<b>Notional Value (£)</b>	<b>Investigation Value 2015/16 (£'s)</b>
<b>Social Housing Tenancy Fraud</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18,000 per property</b>	<b>270,000</b>
<b>Right to Buy</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>103,000 per RTB</b>	<b>103,000</b>
<b>Housing Application Fraud</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18,000 per application fraud</b>	<b>180,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>		<b>553,000</b>

19. The notional values associated to social housing tenancy fraud are nationally accepted, devised by the former Audit Commission's Counter Fraud Team's academic research of the cost of social housing tenancy fraud to the sector. This research, which formed part of the Protecting the London Public Purse 2015 report calculated a national average cost of housing a family in temporary accommodation for the period of one year at £18,000.

The notional value associated with right to buy fraud reflects the current discount that tenants are entitled to receive from the City of London Corporation following a successful right to buy application.

### **Proactive Anti-Fraud Activity (Home Office)**

20. The Anti-Fraud Manager met with a Chief Immigration Officer from the Home Office Immigration Enforcement team in January in order to explore a joint working initiative to tackle social housing fraud and No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) fraud across the City's social housing estates. A joined up approach to tackling this fraud risk for the City Corporation will enable us to take robust action against those abusing the City's social housing stock, whilst

colleagues from the Home Office Immigration Enforcement can take appropriate action against those who do not have the right to remain in the UK or to obtain support from public funds. A fraud drive proposal has been agreed and it is proposed that the exercise will start from April 2016.

## **Whistleblowing**

21. The City of London Corporation undertakes periodic publicity campaigns to raise awareness with residents and the public that they are able to report suspected cases of tenancy fraud (anonymously if they wish). A dedicated fraud hotline and email address, maintained by the Anti-Fraud & Investigation Team is in place to enable reporting of concerns; likewise the City's Whistleblowing Policy provides an alternative avenue for reporting concerns directly to the City of London.

## **Conclusion**

22. The City of London Corporation has a joined up approach to tackling social housing tenancy fraud; successful investigations have returned 15 social housing tenancies, this reporting year alone, that were either obtained by deception or being fraudulently abused, and have now been let to those in greater need. Recently introduced fraud initiatives in the housing application and RTB processes further strengthen the City's response to fraud in these areas with positive outcomes. The Benefits Team, whilst adapting to the introduction of the SFIS is committed to supporting the prevention and detection of social housing tenancy fraud.

## **Appendices**

- None

### **Robert Jacks, Head of Estates**

T: 020 7332 1916 | E: [robert.jacks@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:robert.jacks@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### **Chris Keesing, Anti-Fraud Manager**

T: 020 7332 1278 | E: [chris.keesing@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:chris.keesing@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee	25 April 2016
<b>Subject:</b> Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund (City Home Purchase Grants)	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community and Children's Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report Author:</b> Adam Johnstone, Strategy Officer	

## Summary

This report informs Members of the outcome of the City of London's City Home Purchase Grant scheme. The scheme used funds from the Government's Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund to offer Right to Buy eligible tenants up to £30k to purchase a home on the open market.

The City of London was allocated £600k from the Fund to support a maximum of twenty grants of £30k. The City has agreed a total of five grants to eligible tenants. These are all tenants from our stated priority groups of older tenants, those seeking to move for employment opportunities, and those who could only fulfil their ambition of home ownership with a Home Purchase Grant.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. The Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund was announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, George Osborne, on 20 February 2015. The Fund made £42 million available in 2015-16 for which English local authorities were invited to submit bids for funding to provide a local cash incentive scheme to Right to Buy eligible tenants.
2. The scheme provided a one-off cash payment, not exceeding £30,000 per application, to eligible tenants in place of their Right to Buy discount, to enable them to purchase a property on the open market. The objective was to provide tenants with the opportunity to purchase a property of their choice and in doing so free up a social property which could be re-let to new tenants.
3. On 27 March 2015 the Government announced the outcome of the bidding process. The City was one of 42 local authorities to be successful, and was allocated £600k to support a maximum of twenty grants.

4. Applicants needed to demonstrate their ability to purchase a home, a commitment to achieving a move within the 2015-16 financial year and that all members of the current household would be adequately housed after a move, with their existing home returned vacant to the City.
5. Following promotion of the scheme, the City offered a six week window of opportunity to bid, after which applications would be processed and prioritised.

### **Current Position**

6. The City received a lower than anticipated number of applications for City Home Purchase Grants. The scheme was promoted through a leaflet delivered to every general needs home in our stock, posters, information on the City's website and promotion through our tenant newsletter and on the Facebook pages for each of our estates. The number of enquiries increased after the first few applications were approved and the application window was extended until October to take advantage of the additional interest this generated.
7. A total of ten applications for City Home Purchase Grants were received from tenants. Of these, eight were accepted, one was rejected as the information provided was incomplete and one was refused due to issues with the applicant's tenancy. One applicant later withdrew, as they were unable to afford a property in their preferred area even with a City Home Purchase Grant.
8. Two purchases have already completed and two more were due to complete in the 2015-16 financial year. The final three applicants were not due to complete until the 2016-17 financial year. One of these is sufficiently far advanced to continue with their purchase, while the other two fall too far outside of the requirement for tenants to complete their purchases within 2015-16 for DCLG to allow them to proceed.
9. In line with Government criteria, the City's scheme aimed to prioritise bids from older tenants, tenants wishing to move closer to the labour market and tenants who could demonstrate that home ownership would be impossible without a City Home Purchase Grant. Of the five successful applications, one was from a tenant moving to take up an offer of employment. Based on their mortgage Agreements In Principle, the remaining four applicants would have not been able to afford to buy their City of London homes, even with a Right to Buy discount.
10. All but one of the successful applicants are leaving London, indicating that affordability remained an important constraint, even with a City Home Purchase Grant. The four applicants leaving London are buying homes in Hastings, Slough, Gravesend and Shrewsbury.
11. The successful applications came from tenants living in more expensive estates, either within the City of London or the immediate vicinity. Very high property prices may have meant these tenants were unable to exercise their Right to Buy and looked to City Home Purchase Grants as an alternative. A lack of take up



from tenants in more peripheral estates may reflect the fact that home ownership through Right to Buy is more attainable in these areas.

12. Five two-bedroom properties will be returned to the City and made available for re-letting. Despite offering a flat rate grant for all property sizes, applications to the scheme have been from tenants in family sized homes. This may also be because these tenants have found it harder to exercise their Right to Buy.
13. Due to the low volume of applications the administration of the City Home Purchase Grant scheme was accommodated within existing staff workloads. The absence of numbers that would require the prioritisation of eligible applications also limited the burden the scheme created. The City covered the cost of promoting the scheme and offered successful applicants a flat rate grant of £1,000 towards removal expenses.
14. The Government originally intended the Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund to run for two years. The scheme has now been cancelled a year early and will not operate after the 2015-16 financial year.
15. The City's low number of applications should be considered against the national context. Around a quarter of the council's with funding from the Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund failed to make any grants at all. Those that experienced the most success used the money to complement existing Cash Incentive Schemes. Southwark, which had been allocated funding for 75 payments in 2015-16 and had already approved 25 applications for 2016-17, was offering tenants up to £81,000 towards an open market purchase.
16. In the Housing and Planning Bill, the Government has proposed the sale of high value council homes as they become vacant. Given their concentration in the most expensive estates, it is likely that many of the properties released by the City Home Purchase Grant Scheme would have been sold under this policy. By encouraging tenants to vacate their homes before this policy comes into force, we will be able to make five lettings to people in housing need that may not otherwise have been possible.

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

17. The City's Corporate Strategy seeks a world class City which supports our communities through the appropriate provision of housing, and supports a safer and stronger City through supporting community cohesion. The City Home Purchase Grant scheme enabled five households to achieve their aspiration of home ownership and will enable at least five offers of suitable accommodation to be made to City residents or workers in housing need.

### **Conclusion**

18. The City Home Purchase Grant Scheme has seen a lower than anticipated take up from tenants. This has been the experience of most participating local authorities and widespread difficulties may have contributed to the Government's decision to end the Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund a year early.

19. Tenants who did apply for the scheme were living in family sized accommodation in the City itself or a short distance away. Very high property prices may have meant that Right to Buy was not affordable for these tenants and home ownership may not have been possible for them without a City Home Purchase Grant.

20. Most tenants receiving a City Home Purchase Grant used it to leave London, indicating that affordability remained a limiting factor. The scheme provided an effective way to assist our tenants into home ownership while maximising the stock available for new lettings to people in housing need. However, to operate at a larger scale, more substantial grant payments may have been required.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Case Study

## **Background Papers**

- Right to Buy Social Mobility Fund (City Home Purchase Grants)  
Simon Cribbens, Policy Development Manager (27 April 2015)

## **Adam Johnstone**

Strategy Officer – Housing and Adult Social Care

T: 020 7332 3002

E: [adam.johnstone@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:adam.johnstone@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

---

## **Appendix 1 – Case Study**

Mr and Mrs A lived in a two bedroom flat on the Golden Lane Estate. High property values in Central London meant they were unable to afford to buy their current home, even with a Right to Buy Discount. Using a City Home Purchase Grant, they moved to Slough in December 2015. Their former home has been re-let to a family on the homeless waiting list who had previously been living in temporary accommodation.

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Housing and Almshouses Management Sub Committee	25 April 2016
<b>Subject:</b> CCTV Installation in City Housing Estates	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community and Children's Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report Author:</b> Lochlan MacDonald, Asset Programme Manager	

## Summary

At its meeting on 18 January 2016, members of the Housing and Almshouses Management Sub Committee received and approved a report from the Director of Community and Children's Services to appoint a contractor to carry out the installation of a closed-circuit television (CCTV) system on the William Blake Estate.

The report generated interest and discussion amongst the members who, subsequently requested that a further report be brought back to this Committee outlining the City's overall approach to the installation of CCTV systems including the justification and benefits and the options for monitoring them.

## Recommendation

The Committee is asked to note the contents of this report and make any observations and comments as it sees fit.

## Main Report

### Background

1. In April 2014, Committee approval was given to appoint a specialist consultant to draw up proposals for increasing CCTV coverage across 7 of the City of London's housing estates as part of the City's HRA Investment Programme.
2. In order to assess the practicalities of installing a new CCTV system in terms of complexity, ease of installation, compatibility, cost, performance in use and response from residents, it was subsequently decided that the William Blake Estate in Lambeth would be used as a pilot project. The outcome of this pilot project will determine whether or not to proceed with installations on the other 6 estates identified.
3. The William Blake Estate was chosen for the pilot project because it is a relatively small estate and the cost of installation will be less than the other 6 estates. In addition, a survey of the estate carried out back in 2011 showed that 80% of the residents that responded to the survey were very much in favour of having CCTV installed.

## Discussion

4. The City of London has, in the past, adopted an ad hoc approach to the installation of CCTV systems on its housing estates, which means that some of its estates have the benefit of full coverage, some have partial coverage and some have no coverage at all.
5. The proposals for increasing CCTV coverage across 7 of the City of London's housing estates as part of the City's HRA Investment Programme will start to bring a more structured and uniform approach that will ensure, over time, that residents on all our estates will benefit from the installation of CCTV.
6. The 7 sites that are earmarked for new or upgraded CCTV installations have been previously prioritised on the basis of issues relating to criminal activity and anti-social behaviour and the requests and concerns of our residents and staff.
7. CCTV is widely recognised as an effective deterrent to criminal and anti-social behaviour. Officers have contacted the City of London and Metropolitan Police Forces to ask for their views as to whether they support the principle of CCTV as a deterrent and aid to prosecution but, disappointingly, no response has as yet been received. However, the Metropolitan Police has previously advised the City as follows:  
  
***“If CCTV is installed in prominent positions and supported by clear and obvious signage, this alone could put offenders off from committing crime. Also, the security and safety measures that come with CCTV bring a sense of comfort and reassurance to the local community, helping to force out crime and the fear of crime.”***
8. CCTV is considered an essential tool in aiding the identification and conviction of offenders. It helps clear up any misunderstandings between witnesses and gives courts a clearer understanding as to what has taken place.
9. In the context of the City of London's housing estates, the installation of new and the upgrading of existing CCTV systems will bring considerable benefits to our residents including:
  - a deterrent to potential crime – CCTV systems are widely acknowledged as contributing to a reduction in crime as potential criminals will choose to target areas that are not protected by security systems;
  - contributing to a safer environment;
  - a reduction in anti-social behaviour; and
  - reducing the fear of crime – knowing that they are well protected gives residents a greater sense of security.
10. Reliable and effective CCTV installations will also be of considerable benefit to City of London staff both in terms of their own safety when visiting and working on the various estates and also in terms of assisting with issues of anti-social behaviour and neighbour disputes.

11. At the last meeting of this Committee in January, there was a debate around whether or not the CCTV systems installed on our estates should be manned and monitored at all times so that incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour can be addressed and reported immediately. Whilst there is no doubt that 24-hour monitoring will produce the best results, it is felt that this is simply uneconomical and unnecessary in terms of the benefits that are likely to be achieved.
12. The cost of manning a CCTV system on a 24-hour permanent basis is extremely prohibitive and is something that is likely to encourage challenge from our leaseholders who are likely to be required to make a contribution through the service charge process.
13. Other measures can be combined with CCTV to help make areas even more secure. These can include improved lighting in public places, door entry systems and regular grounds maintenance to help prevent areas from becoming overgrown thus providing hiding places for miscreants. These additional measures will be considered as part of the agreed CCTV works.
14. The information Commissioner's Office has issued a detailed Code of Practice (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) covering CCTV and the use of personal information. There are strict rules as to who can have access to recorded images and it is essential that members of the public feel that CCTV is there for protection and is not seen as invading privacy.
15. The Data Protection Act and Protection of Freedom Act regulate how information is used, stored and accessed so that this may only be used for designated purposes. This applies to CCTV images as well as other forms of data and, as such, due consideration needs to be given to the regulations in the design and installation of new CCTV systems.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: A Data Protection Code of Practice for Surveillance Cameras and Personal Information (available online - <https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1542/cctv-code-of-practice.pdf> )

## **Background Papers**

Housing and Almshouses Management Sub Committee Report (18 January 2016)

Lochlan MacDonald  
Asset Programme Manager  
[Lochlan.macdonald@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Lochlan.macdonald@cityoflondon.gov.uk)  
020 7332 3939

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee	25/04/2016
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Public</b>
City of London Almshouses Refurbishment Programme	
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>For Decision</b>
Director of Community & Children's Services	
<b>Report author:</b>	
Paul Murtagh, Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services	

## Summary

The City of London Almshouses in Brixton are in need of extensive refurbishment. The cost of this work is estimated at £898,000. This report requests approval from members to make budget provision for the works and to commence with the necessary Gateway and procurement processes, with a view to the programme being carried out in a two year period.

The report relates only to the City of London Almshouses. The eight Gresham Almshouses on the same site will also be subject to a refurbishment programme, but the request for funding for these properties will be made to the Gresham Committee.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to approve, in principal, a two-year refurbishment programme for the almshouses, at an estimated cost of £898,000 and to request that the Assistant Director, Barbican & Property commences the procurement and Gateway processes with a view to appointing a single contractor to deliver the programme.

## Main Report

### Background

1. The City of London manages 42 Almshouses in Ferndale Road, Brixton, on behalf of the City of London Almshouses Trust. The responsibilities of trustees are enacted by the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee, who receive reports on the Almshouses and make decisions relating to matters of finance and policy.
2. Officers have highlighted on a number of occasions that the Almshouses, like most of the City's social housing stock, are in need of extensive refurbishment.

### Current Position

3. A stock condition survey of the Almshouses has now been carried out by an independent surveyor. Their report has identified that the following work is required:
  - Roof repairs
  - Windows replacement
  - Rewiring
  - External decoration
  - Internal redecoration
  - Brickwork Repairs
  - Gutter Repairs

4. The total cost of refurbishment for the City of London Almshouses is estimated at £898,000. The programme of work will include the eight Gresham Almshouses but they are not included in this report as they are the responsibility of the Gresham Committee.

## **Options**

5. On other estates the refurbishment programme will take place over a five-year period. Different elements of the work are being procured as separate contracts (eg one contract for window replacement over all estates).
6. However, there are particular circumstances which mean that a different approach is more appropriate for the Almshouses. The estate is very small, parts of it are listed and the residents are older, and some are vulnerable. The funding arrangements are very different from other estates as it is outside the Housing Revenue Account and there are no leaseholders.
7. There are, then, two options for the refurbishment of the Almshouses.
8. Option One is to programme the work over a five-year period and include the Almshouses in the procurement arrangements for the other estates, with different contracts for the different elements of the work.
9. Option Two is to programme the work over a two-year period and procure one contractor to deliver the whole refurbishment programme for the Almshouses.

## **Proposals**

10. Option One may offer some financial savings. However, because of the nature of the Almshouses (for example, it is likely that windows will need to be bespoke), these savings may be limited.
11. Option Two has the advantages that the work can be completed much more quickly and this will allow the disruption for residents to be minimised. It will also mean that the contractor can liaise directly with residents and the work can be scheduled with their needs in mind.
12. It is the view of officers that Option Two would be the most appropriate approach for the Almshouses and will be the best solution for residents.

## **Implications**

13. The refurbishment programme will require money to be drawn from the City of London Almshouses Trust reserves to cover the cost. The Chamberlain has confirmed that the total currently held in CoLAT funds is £1,599,005.

**Paul Murtagh Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services**

T: 020 7332 3015

E: [Paul.Murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk)



<b>Committees:</b>		<b>Dates:</b>
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee Residents Consultation Committee Barbican Residential Committee Projects Sub Committee		25/04/2016 31/05/2016 13/06/2016 29/06/2016
<b>Subject:</b> Water System Safety Works at Residential Housing Estates	<b>Gateway 3/4 Options Appraisal</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services		<b>For Decision</b>

## Summary

### Dashboard

Project Status	Green	
Time Line	Procurement – to December 2016 Gateway 5 / Authority to Commence Works – January 2017 Contractor Appointed – February 2017 Works Start - April 2017	
Programme status	Pending Approval of Gateway 3/4 – Options Appraisal	
Latest estimated cost of works	HRA Housing Estates £500,000	Barbican Estate £800,000
Expenditure to date	£4,000	
Total Project Cost	HRA Housing Estates £562,000	Barbican Estate £900,000

### **Progress to date (including resources expended and any changes since previous Gateway)**

The Gateway 1/2 report outlined a project approach to address the statutory requirement of risk assessments, monitoring & testing and the completion of remedial, minor and major works. An issue report was presented to the Residents Consultation Committee and the Barbican Residential Committee recommending separate procurement for Risk Assessment and Monitoring & testing contracts.

The statutory obligation to carry out monitoring, testing and risk assessments have now been completed, and form the basis of this report which seeks approval of the programme and budget prior to procurement for a contractor to complete these works.

### **Overview of options**

Option 1 – completing works reactively as they are identified. Any items which have been identified as high risk through the recent risk assessment programme must be completed as soon as reasonably practicable, items of a lesser risk may be completed as their risk level increases or items fail over the next 2-5 years.

Option 2 – completing a planned programme of works using the results of the risk assessments to prioritise the works.

### Proposed way forward

The proposed way forward is to proceed with Option 2.

### Procurement Approach

If the recommended option proceeds, the procurement approach will be to advertise the works as one contract openly on the City’s procurement portal.

### Table with financial implications

Description	HRA Housing Estates		Barbican Estate	
	Option 1: Immediate completion of High risk work items & reactive completion of remaining works	Option 2: Planned programme of all works	Option 1: Immediate completion of High risk work items & reactive completion of remaining works	Option 2: Planned programme of all works
Works Costs	£693,500	£500,000	£1,108,057	£800,000
Fees & Staff Costs	£86,687	£62,500	£138,057	£100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£780,187</b>	<b>£562,000</b>	<b>£1,246,564</b>	<b>£900,000</b>
Funding Strategy	HRA: £762,187 (30% recovery of £228,656)  Almshouses Trust: £12,000 (0% recovery)  City Fund – Spitalfields £6,000 (50% recovery of £3,000)	HRA £547,000 (30% recovery of £164,100)  Almshouses Trust £10,000 (0% recovery)  City Fund – Spitalfields £5,000 (50% recovery of £2,500)	City Fund and 96% proportional recovery (£1,196,701) from long leaseholders	City Fund and 96% proportional recovery (£864,000) from long leaseholders

Items in parentheses are proportional recovery from long leaseholders, as applicable depending upon location of work.

### Recommendations

1. Approval to proceed with Option 2.
2. Take note of the estimated budget of £562,000 for HRA Housing Estates and £900,000 for Barbican Estate.
3. Approval of the additional budget now requested to reach Gateway 5 (£25,000 for HRA Housing Estates and £40,000 for Barbican Estate).

### **Options Appraisal Matrix**

See attached.

### **Appendices**

(1) PT4 Procurement report.

### **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Jason Crawford, Asset Programme Manager
<b>Email Address</b>	Jason.Crawford@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	0207 332 3010

## Options Appraisal Matrix

	<i>Option 1 – reactive work</i>	<i>Option 2 – planned programme</i>
<b>1. Brief description</b>	Completing any high risk items immediately but dealing with medium and low risk items reactively – for example, as they become high risk or as items fail.	Using the results of the risk assessments to tender a 3 to 5 year works programme. This programme will address the works in priority order – addressing high, medium and low risk items.
<b>2. Scope and exclusions</b>	<p><b>Scope:</b> All water supply systems for which the City is responsible at the Barbican and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Estates. This includes communal hot/cold water storage tanks, communal pipework, individual hot/cold storage tanks and pipework in tenanted properties, hot/cold water tanks and pipework in estate offices.</p> <p><b>Exclusions:</b> Hot/cold water tanks, calorifiers and pipework within properties that are owned by long leaseholders.</p>	
<b>Project Planning</b>		
<b>3. Programme and key dates</b>	<p>Procurement – to December 2016</p> <p>Gateway 5 / Authority to Commence Works – January 2017</p> <p>Contractor Appointed – February 2017</p> <p>Works Start - April 2017</p>	
<b>4. Risk implications</b>	<p>High Risk Approach</p> <p>(1) Ensuring the safety of the systems that provide water is a statutory duty.</p>	<p>Medium Risk Approach</p> <p>(1) Ensuring the safety of the systems that provide water is a statutory duty.</p>

	<b><i>Option 1 – reactive work</i></b>	<b><i>Option 2 – planned programme</i></b>
	(2) Carrying out works reactively could put systems at risk while works are specified and procured.	(2) We are currently in a position where the risk assessments have identified the risk levels of all items of water equipment in our properties.  (3) Instigating a programme which addresses the works in priority order – high, medium and low – will ensure that following a fixed period of time no high or medium risk items will remain in our properties.
<b>5. Benefits and disbenefits</b>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory compliance is achieved – as each item of risk is identified and removed.</li> </ul> <p>Disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher cost by not procuring a large contract.</li> <li>• Need to procure any item over £10,000, causing delays to works.</li> </ul>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory compliance is achieved via a planned programme which addresses high, medium and low risk items in priority order.</li> <li>• Lower cost by procuring a larger contract.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Stakeholders and consultees</b>	<p>Members and Ward Members.</p> <p>Residents, including leaseholders via statutory Section 20 consultation.</p> <p>Departments of City Surveyor's, Comptroller and City Solicitor, Town Clerks and Chamberlain's (including City Procurement).</p>	
<b><i>Resource Implications</i></b>		

	<i>Option 1 – reactive work</i>	<i>Option 2 – planned programme</i>
<b>7. Total Estimated cost</b>	HRA Housing Estates £562,000	Barbican Estate £900,000
<b>8. Funding strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barbican Estate and Spitalfields properties - City Fund with a respective 96% and 50% proportional recovery from long leaseholders.</li> <li>• Almshouses - Almshouses Trust and there is no proportional recovery from long leaseholders.</li> <li>• HRA - The proportional recovery from long leaseholders across the HRA estates is estimated to be in the overall region of 30%; however this is likely to differ across individual estates and will be reviewed in greater detail at Gateway 5.</li> </ul>	
<b>9. Estimated capital value/return</b>	N/A.	
<b>10. Ongoing revenue implications</b>	There will be a minor decrease in annual costs. This is owing to the fact carrying out major works will reduce the risks in some locations (for example, replacing an ageing water tank with a modern one translates into a lower-risk item) Low risk items are not required to be risk assessed as frequently as higher risk ones.	
<b>11. Investment appraisal</b>	Carrying out works reactively is poor investment practice where works could be specified, prioritised and programmed.	Timely intervention to complete works reduces spend on reactive repairs and maintenance as unexpected failures occur less frequently.
<b>12. Affordability</b>	The works have been factored into the Asset Management plans for both the Barbican and HRA Estates.	
<b>13. Legal implications</b>	Water systems that include tanks or areas that are not regularly flushed with running water pose a risk of harbouring bacteria. There could be legal consequences where failure to monitor and maintain equipment has caused exposure to bacteria and led to illness.	

	<i>Option 1 – reactive work</i>	<i>Option 2 – planned programme</i>
<b>14. Corporate property implications</b>	It is important that the City's assets remain in good, safe and statutory compliant condition. Therefore all necessary action should be taken to ensure that assets are kept as such throughout the assets' lifetime.	
<b>15. Traffic implications</b>	The detail of the traffic plan for the installation phase will be agreed with the successful contractor.	
<b>16. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	Should pipework be replaced or re-configured this may improve water flow rates with a marginal reduction in pumping requirements and therefore energy. However, the work may also involve tasks such as adjusting settings on hot water equipment to achieve higher temperatures for safe storage. A consequence may be higher energy usage.	
<b>17. IS implications</b>	N/A.	
<b>18. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	The proposed works will not have an impact on equality or protected characteristics. The delivery phase of the works will be carefully planned and implemented in conjunction with residents to ensure no adverse impacts. Failure to deliver these works would have a higher potential impact upon the elderly and vulnerable as they are at greater risk of Legionellosis (which includes Legionnaires' disease, Pontiac fever and Lochgoilhead fever.)	
<b>19. Recommendation</b>	Not recommended	Recommended
<b>20. Next Gateway</b>	Gateway 5 - Authority to Start Work	Gateway 5 - Authority to Start Work

	<i>Option 1 – reactive work</i>			<i>Option 2 – planned programme</i>		
<b>21. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</b>			<b>HRA, Almshouses and Spitalfields</b>		<b>Barbican Estate</b>	
	<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Cost (£)</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Cost (£)</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>
	Staff Costs	Liaise with consultants and city procurement	£7,000	HRA £22,000 (30% recovery of £6,600)	£10,000	City Fund (96% recovery of £38,400).
	Consultancy	Design and specification of works.	£18,000	Almshouses Trust £2,000 (0% recovery)	£30,000	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£25,000</b>	City Fund – Spitalfields £1,000 (50% recovery of £500)	<b>£40,000</b>	
Items in parentheses are proportional recovery from long leaseholders, as applicable depending upon location of work.						



## PT4 - Committee Procurement Report

This document is to be used to identify the Procurement Strategy and Purchasing Routes associated with a project and only considers the option recommended on the associated Gateway report.

### Introduction

<b>Author:</b>	Michael Harrington		
<b>Project Title:</b>	Water System Safety Works at Residential Housing Estates		
Completing a planned 5 year programme of works using the results of the risk assessments to prioritise the works.			
<b>Contract Duration:</b>	5 Year	<b>Contract Value:</b>	£1.5 million
<b>Stakeholder information</b>			
<b>Project Lead &amp; Contract Manager:</b> Jason Crawford	<b>Category Manager:</b> Michael Harrington	<b>Lead Department:</b> Community and Children's Services	
<b>Other Contact</b>		<b>Department</b>	

### Specification Overview

#### **Summary of the Specification:**

Completing a planned programme of works using the results of the risk assessments to prioritise the works.

#### **Project Objectives:**

This programme will address the works in priority order – addressing high, medium and low risk items.

### Customer Requirements

<b>Target completion date</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>Target Contract award date</b>	<b>TBC</b>
<b>Are there any time constraints which need to be taken into consideration?</b>			
Not at this present time.			

#### **Efficiencies Target with supporting information**

To ensure an efficient contractor is appointed to provide this service to the City's customers and act as ambassadors on our behalf. We are also using this contract to drive engagement with suppliers to ensure we engage with the local communities and drive the City's Corporate and Social Responsibilities.

### City of London Initiatives

#### **How will the Project meet the City of London's Obligation to**

##### **Adhere to the Corporation Social Responsibility:**

We will positively promote the City's policy to the tendering parties to engage with the local communities.

##### **Take into account the London Living Wage (LLW):**

We will.

##### **Consideration for Small to Medium Enterprises (SME):**

This will be included within the Corporation Social Responsibility.

##### **Other:**

### Procurement Options

#### **Option 1: Below OJEU Tender**

##### **Advantages to this Option:**

- Allows us to engage with the market as a whole.
- Allows the City to build the specification it requires and work to the timescales it requires.
- Allows us to engage with SME's as opposed to using a framework, which stereotypically have larger suppliers appointed to them.

##### **Disadvantages to this Option:**

- Will take longer to engage with the market.
- Tender may be seen as too much of a strain on resources for parties to participate.

##### **Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:**

## APPENDIX 1

- No guarantee of the quality of responses returned.
- Responses could possibly be over OJEU threshold.

### **Option 2:** Appoint via a framework supplier

#### **Advantages to this Option:**

- Quicker engagement with the market.
- Pre-vetted suppliers on the framework.

#### **Disadvantages to this Option:**

- Less engagement with SME's
- Larger Suppliers will subcontract the work as opposed to having employees working directly on the project.

#### **Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:**

- The quality of the service and works carried out could be lower than expected.

### **Procurement Route Recommendation**

#### **City Procurement team recommended option**

Option 1: Below OJEU Tender – The budgets have been well worked and the possibility of an increased budget would require further Committee approval.

### **Sign Off**

<b>Date of Report:</b>	24/03/2016
<b>Reviewed By:</b>	David Downing
<b>Department:</b>	DCCS
<b>Reviewed By:</b>	Michael Harrington
<b>Department:</b>	<b>Chamberlain's Department</b>

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