



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

**Date:** TUESDAY, 12 JANUARY 2021  
**Time:** 1.00 pm  
**Venue:** VIRTUAL MEETING – ACCESSIBLE REMOTELY

**Members:** John Fletcher (Chairman)  
Mary Durcan (Deputy Chairman)  
Randall Anderson  
Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman David Graves  
Dhruv Patel  
Susan Pearson  
William Pimlott  
Peter Bennett  
The Revd Stephen Haines  
Jason Pritchard  
Ruby Sayed

**Enquiries:** Rofikul Islam  
Rofikul.islam@cityoflondon.gov.uk

### **Accessing the virtual public meeting**

**Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:**  
[https://youtu.be/VMyC7Pzu\\_Hg](https://youtu.be/VMyC7Pzu_Hg)

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the

**John Barradell**  
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

# **AGENDA**

## **Part 1 - Public Reports**

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To approve the public minutes and summary of the meeting on 30 November 2020.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 1 - 10)

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Members are asked to note the Sub Committee's Outstanding Actions List.

**For Information**  
(Pages 11 - 12)

5. **PETS POLICY REVIEW**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 13 - 34)

6. **HOUSING ESTATE PARKING MANAGEMENT REVIEW - PROGRESS UPDATE**

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

**For Information**  
(Pages 35 - 40)

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

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

9. **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**

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2020.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 41 - 42)

11. **WATES LIVING SPACE**

The Head of Asset Management to be heard.

**For Information**

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

13. **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, 30 November 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub  
(Community and Children's Services) Committee held at VIRTUAL MEETING –  
ACCESSIBLE REMOTELY on Monday, 30 November 2020 at 1.45 pm

**Present**

**Members:**

John Fletcher (Chairman)  
Mary Durcan (Deputy Chairman)  
Randall Anderson  
Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman David Graves  
Susan Pearson  
William Pimlott  
Peter Bennett  
The Revd Stephen Haines  
Ruby Sayed

**Officers:**

Rofikul Islam	- Town Clerk
Gemma Stokely	- Town Clerk
Emily Garland	- Remembrancers Office
Paul Murtagh	- Community and Children's Services
Liam Gillespie	- Community and Children's Services
Michael Gwyther-Jones	- Community and Children's Services
Jason Hayes	- Community and Children's Services
Aqib Hussain	- Chamberlains Department

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Jason Pritchard.

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

There were no declarations.

**3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes summary of the meeting held on  
Monday, 30 September 2020, be approved as a correct record.

**Matters arising**

**Presentation on the Repairs and Maintenance Service**

A Member noted that the virtual presentation on the Housing Repairs and Maintenance Service (a service provided by Wates) was listed for today's meeting, but there is no mention of the virtual presentation on the agenda. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, noted that the presentation had been deferred, and it will be presented to the Committee in the first meeting of 2021.

#### **Estate Inspections Performance**

A Member noted that the latest figures of the Estate Inspections Performance are not updated on the City of London's website. The Member asked if the communication's team had updated the website accordingly. The Head of Housing Management noted that the information had been passed onto the Communications Team, who is responsible for putting up the information on the website. It was noted that the Communications Team is slightly behind schedule and the Head of Housing Management agreed to chase this up and ensure that the information is updated.

#### **4. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, went through the listing and updated the committee.

#### **Tenancy Visits**

This was reported to the Committee in March 2020, and a further report will be provided to the Committee in its future sittings.

#### **New Portsoken Community Centre**

The Committee was informed that the Members of the Grand Committee had received several reports on the New Portsoken Community Centre. The first report stated that the Department for Community and Children's Services would be responsible for the community centre's governance until there are some stability and reliability. The second recommendation to the Grand Committee was that an elected Member from the Court of Common Council would sit on the advisory board for the New Portsoken Community Centre.

The Chairman mentioned that a number of issues are still of concern to the local resident

, such as the use of the Green Box. It was agreed that the Community Centre's purpose is not changing, and for the future, the local residents will have a say in how the New Portsoken Community Centre will be run. This should alleviate any community fears.

A report on the governance and staffing structure of the New Portsoken Community Centre will also be presented to the Grand Committee, as well as the Sub-Committee.

#### **Great Arthur House – Cladding Works**

The Committee was informed that the City of London has now received a court hearing date for March 2021. A day has been set aside by the court, but the City of London awaits to hear any further updates.

### **Climate Action Strategy – Funding**

A Member asked if there has been any further update on the Climate Action Strategy – Funding available for the Committee, which comes to an end in May 2021. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, advised the Committee that around £8million worth of funding for housing projects are available. In terms of how the funding can be accessed remains uncertain, and Officers are working with the Chamberlain to address the matter. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, agreed to return to the Committee on this after the meeting. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, also agreed to bring a report to the Grand Committee and the Sub-Committee on the matter.

The Deputy Chairman asked if the Climate Action Strategy should become a standing item for the Committee. The Chairman of the Grand Committee agreed to raise the matter with the Chair of the Policy and Resources and provide a direction to the Committee on a later date.

A Member raised a question on if the Committee was eligible for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Funds for some of the development works within the estates of the City of London.

The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, responded that there are two approaches to this. In terms of the Climate Action Strategy – Funding, the Corporation is very vested in this. The Community and Children's Services is working with colleagues in the Chamberlains to see if the funding can be accessible. Additionally, Officers are also assessing to see if the City of London can also apply to the revised Green Deal which the Government has announced. The Committee was assured that Officers are exploring both internal and external funding sources. If the City of London cannot access the external funding, the Department can direct residents (leaseholders) to appropriate sources to access the funds.

Another Member noted that the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood funds had been applied for by a local community group, which is a rolling program, and there is no deadline for applying. The Member informed the Committee that they had raised a question to the local MP on the Green Homes Grant and whether the City of London can access the Green Deal; the Member agreed to share the MP's communication to the wider Committee.

The Chairman of the Grand Committee noted that the City of London could not apply directly for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Funds and this needs to be driven by the leaseholders themselves.

### **5. FIRE SAFETY UPDATE - HRA PROPERTIES**

The Committee received a report from the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Fire Safety Update – HRA Properties.

The Committee was informed that the sprinklers works are due to go out to tender soon. There had been some delay, due in the main to the complexities

with Great Arthur House and its listed status. The Committee was also informed that further Fire Risk Assessments (FRA's) will be undertaken next year. Following a corporate procurement exercise, a new supplier, Turner Townsend, has been appointed to carry out future FRA's.

It was noted that in March 2020, the Department undertook the installation of a temporary door set at one property in Great Arthur House so that, the original door set could be removed and sent away for destructive fire testing to assess its level of fire and smoke resistance. The notional expectation for a door set of this type and age is 15 to 20 minutes fire resistance; however, in this instance, the door set failed in less than five minutes.

A Member raised serious concerns that the test failed in less than five minutes and stressed the need to escalate the development of the Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP) policy. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, reminded Members that the door set had failed so quickly due to the construction of the fanlight above the door. He also reminded Members that urgent and immediate action had been taken to upgrade the fanlights. It was noted however, that a few residents had denied us access to do this work.

A new fire alarm system was also installed in Great Arthur House some time ago and, the fire safety signage was updated. Residents had been written to advising of the changes and the work that had been done. The Committee was assured that Officers had reacted very quickly to address the issues identified at Great Arthur House.

The Member also noted that there was a power outage in Basterfield, and residents reported fire sparks; the Member asked if the fire extinguishers can be added in communal areas and if this is not the policy, can the matter be confirmed. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services advised that it is not normally considered necessary to provide fire extinguishers in common parts of blocks of flats. Such equipment should only be used by those trained to use it and, it is not considered practical or appropriate for residents to receive such training. In terms of the Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP), the Committee was assured that a report would be presented to the Committee in the New Year. The Chairman of the Grand Committee noted that concern had been raised with the new signage in the Barbican blocks and asked if there were similar problems in our HRA properties. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, confirmed that the HRA properties' signs are all correct and verified by an independent consultant. The Committee was further reassured that there are no issues with regards to the HRA properties fire signage.

This was followed by another Member who asked if an update on the fire sprinkler installation completions can be provided. The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, advised the Committee that the relevant Department is working towards an installation date by October 2021. The Committee was further reassured that if there are any delays with the work, the Committee will be notified of the reasons for the delays.



**RESOLVED** – That the Committee noted the report.

6. **HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME - PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Housing Major Works Programme – Progress Report.

The Committee was informed that the Petticoat Tower - balcony doors and windows work has been progressing well and due to complete by the end of the week; however, due to the announcement of a second lockdown, further completions such as the fire door replacements were subject to delay. . The Committee was further informed that the resident satisfaction levels for the balcony doors and windows are at 98% to date.

The Chairman thanked the Officers for their hard work on the project.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee noted the report.

7. **HOUSING UPDATE AND RISK REGISTER**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Housing Update and Risk Register.

The Committee was informed that this is a report which comes to the Committee twice a year, but, due to lockdown measures causing some Committees to be cancelled, one reporting cycle was missed.

The Deputy Chairman asked if there has been an increase in the housing registering since the last reporting. The Head of Housing Management responded that since the last reporting, the housing register's figures have increased. The City of London carries out an annual census, in which the Department sends out an update request to all those on the application list, and the returns are that assessed accordingly. For this year, the department is sending out the request to all the applicants. The current 839 applicants are anticipated to be reduced in numbers by the next cycle of reporting.

This was followed by another Member who asked for future reporting on void properties and turnover time. The Head of Housing Management agreed to have the request included in future reporting.

The Committee was further advised that normal letting activities have resumed back to physical viewings taking place, although some of the signups have taken place virtually. The new process is COVID-19 secure, and a number of emergency rehousing applications were granted to those who were in desperate need.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee noted the report.

8. **HOUSING MANAGEMENT POLICY REVIEW UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Housing Management Policy Review Update.

The Committee was updated that the Department is working towards the review of several policies. The existing policies have been updated where required and submitted to several Committees for its approval.

A Member asked if the Parade Policy can also be included in the reviewing list of policies. The Committee agreed to keep the Parade Policy on the action tracker. Another Member asked when publishing policy documents if the expiry or renewal dates can also be included in the document too.

The Chairman noted that once all the actions so far have been completed, the Committee will look to explore the review period for the policies.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee noted the report.

9. **DOWNSIZING (SHIFT ALLOWANCE) POLICY REVIEW**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Downsizing (Shift Allowance) Policy Review.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee approved the revised Downsizing (Shift Allowance) Policy for use by the Housing Service.

10. **DECANTS POLICY REVIEW**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Decants Policy Review.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee approved the Decants Policy for use by the Housing Service.

11. **HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME - HOUSING DESIGN GUIDE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Housing Delivery Programme – Housing Design Guide.

The Committee was informed that the Housing Delivery Programme – Housing Design Guide will be the new brand for the City of London for its new social housing development in the future.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee authorised the use of the 'Housing Design Guide' to inform the City's housing delivery programme and acknowledged the comprehensive guidance and standards which are contained in the primary guidance document and the supporting appendices

12. **COMBINED PRE-GATEWAY 5 PROJECT CLOSURES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk on the Combined Pre-Gateway 5 Project Closures.

The Committee was informed that this is a corporate process to close down projects that are still in the Gateway system but, will not be progressed. The Committee was advised that that the two projects concerning the Department of

Community and Children's Services are the Gullies and Drains Cleaning and Windsor House Paths, Water Mains, and Boundary Walls.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee considered and approved the two projects submitted by the Department for Community and Children's Services for closure.

13. **DRON HOUSE WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND COMMON PARTS REDECORATIONS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services on the Dron House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations.

The Committee was informed that this the first of multiple estates which were due to have their windows replaced. As this was the first project of its kind which went to tender, lessons were also learned from the process, and the learning will be taken forward. The Committee was updated that the costs were inflated as the planning officers had asked that aluminium windows framed installed.

A Member asked what justifications were given by the planners for switching from UPVC to aluminium. Officers advised that as some of the estates became conservation areas and as such, the revision of materials was required. Officers assured the Committee that the planners were challenged on several occasions. The Member agreed to work with the Head of Major Works to discuss this outside the meeting for future works.

The Deputy Chairman asked if aluminium will last longer than UPVC. The Programme Manager Responded that where we have metal cases, we are able to repair them easier than UPVC. The Head of Major Works agreed to bring a report to the Committee in the future.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee appoint AD Construction to deliver the window replacements and estate wide redecorations programme.

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

There were no questions.

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**  
**Electrical failure Battersfield House**

The Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services informed the Committee that there was an incident of a power failure at Basterfield House. The cause of the power failure was due to a power supply issue that was not the responsibility of the Corporation. Operatives were currently on site testing all residents' properties to ensure they remained safe. The heating contractors were also on-site, and mobile heaters were provided to residents who had asked for them. Work continued into the weekend, and Officers were on standby to assist residents where possible. Four vulnerable families were identified, and they were offered additional support. One family was put up in a

hotel for a few days. Officers continue to work on the site and have been in touch with the leaseholders, too, and had offered advice regarding insurance matters.

One of the lifts is still out of action, as the telephone in the lift is out of order and is being serviced.

The Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services noted that one of the residents has been of immense help to the team and the residents. Officers will be in touch to thank the particular resident.

The Chairman asked if the incident's costs can be claimed from the insurer or the supplier. The Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services responded that the City of London can claim from the insurers and residents who were affected would be supported to cover the costs of their damages. Additionally, the leaseholders will also be able to claim for the damages directly from their insurers.

A Member thanked the Property Services Officer, Nicola Twinn, who has been providing excellent support for the residents and Officers. The Member further commented that many appliances were damaged by the power surge and asked if it would be possible for the Corporation to make a joint claim, as leaseholders will have much more difficulties in making a claim. The Assistant Director of Barbican & Property Services agreed to look into the matter after the meeting.

### **Housing Safety - Compliance**

The Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services informed the Committee that the Community & Children's Services had an internal audit carried out on Housing Safety. It was noted that fire safety was not part of the audit as, this is being done as a separate audit. The Housing Safety Audit had been concluded successfully however, one of the audit recommendations was that Members needed to have more of an oversight of our performance relating to housing safety.

As part of the KPI process, we do see the Department's performance in relation to gas safety, but we do not see the performance in other areas such as legionella, asbestos and electrical testing.

The Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services advised that in future, he will be presenting a report, every six months, to this Committee advising on performance on all aspects of housing safety.

## **16. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**Item**

**Paragraph**

**17. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes summary of the meeting held on Monday, 30 September 2020, be approved as a correct record

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no other business.

**The meeting ended at 15.11**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Rofikul Islam**  
**Rofikul.islam@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)  
Action Tracker**

Date Added	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsible Officer	Target Meeting Date - HMASC	Update
22/07/19	Tenancy Visits	Members requested a themed report, setting out how the data was being used and where improvements had been made.	Liam Gillespie/ Dean Robinson	March 2021	
16/09/19	New Portsoken Community Centre	A report to HMASC setting out recommendations for governance.	Carol Boswarthack / Simon Cribbens	March/May 2021	
20/11/19	Fire Safety	Update on progress with sprinklers and other fire safety measures.	Paul Murtagh	November 2020	Included in agenda for 30 November meeting.
20/11/19	Member Estate Visits	Members to visit North and South Estates preferably before or after HMASC meeting.	Liam Gillespie / Town Clerk	As soon as possible after May 2021	Following election of new HMASC Members.
20/11/19	Great Arthur House – Cladding Works	Members to receive report on next stages in legal process including, legal costs to date and potential future costs.	City Surveyor / Comptroller / Paul Murtagh	As soon as possible after Court of Appeal hearing	Court of Appeal Hearing expected in January 2021 but, likely delayed due to Covid-19.
20/11/19	Housing Policies – Renewal Timetable	Report listing out all Housing Policies and, their respective renewal dates.	Liam Gillespie	November 2020	
20/11/19	Pets Policy - HRA	In light of the findings of research into social isolation, Pets Policy to be reviewed and submitted to HMASC for approval.	Liam Gillespie	March 2021	
20/11/19	Parades Policy - HRA	A draft Parades Policy be developed and presented to HMASC for approval.	Liam Gillespie	November 2020	Deferred indefinitely by HMASC (to be removed).
30/09/20	Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP)	Members to receive a report on PEEPS for our residents.	Paul Murtagh / Liam Gillespie	May 2021	

**Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)  
Action Tracker**

30/09/20	Climate Action Strategy - Funding	Members to receive a report on the implications of the Corporation's Climate Action Strategy including available funding and projects.	City Surveyor / Paul Murtagh	May 2021	Corporation has published its Climate Action Strategy. Officers working with City Surveyor on implications for Housing.
30/11/20	Presentation from Whyte Constructions	To be presented to the Committee on the meeting of 12 January 2021.	Liam Gillespie	January 2021	
30/11/20	Estate Inspections Performance	To update the City of London's website with the updated information from post February 2020.	Liam Gillespie	January 2021	
30/11/20	Report of Climate Action Strategy - Funding	Following the discussions with the various Chairs, to agree a way forward in terms of reporting to the Committee.	Paul Murtagh	January 2021	
30/11/20	Review Period of Policies	Once all the actions so far have been completed, for the Committee to explore the review period for the policies.	Liam Gillespie	March 2021	



<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Dated:</b> 12/01/2021
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	
<b>Subject:</b> Pets Policy Review	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	N
<b>If so, how much?</b>	£
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	N
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community and Children's Services	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management	

## Summary

The Housing Division's Pets Policy has been re-evaluated as part of the ongoing housing management policy review. A resident consultation exercise was held which generated 348 responses from residents.

More than half of residents who expressed a firm opinion were in favour of retaining the current policy on dog-free estates. Officers propose that the current policy is retained, though Members may wish to indicate whether they think further consultation is required on this issue in future.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve the reviewed Pets Policy for use by the Housing Division
- Indicate whether further consultation is considered necessary on any aspect of the Policy

## Main Report

### Background

1. The Pets Policy was last approved by this Sub-Committee in 2017. It was reviewed as part of the project to refresh our housing management policies, which started in 2018.

2. Historically, residents on City of London housing estates were not permitted to keep cats or dogs, other than assistance dogs, with some limited exceptions. Other pets have been allowed for many years without permission being required.
3. In recent years, following resident consultation, the policy was relaxed in relation to cats and residents may now keep up to two house cats, though the prohibition on dogs has remained in place.
4. Previous consultations on the issue of dog ownership have resulted in most residents supporting the dog-free estates policy.
5. We consulted residents again in October and November 2020 on the current policy and the results are contained in **Appendix One**.

### **Current Position**

6. We received 348 responses to the question about dog ownership; 49% of respondents were against dog ownership, 45% were in favour. The remaining 6% did not express a preference either way.
7. Across all estates, most respondents favoured retaining the current policy on dog ownership, though Members will note that the result was very close (155 in favour of dog ownership, 171 against).
8. The picture varied by estate, with some estates being in favour of allowing dog ownership. In some cases, however, this is based on relatively low numbers of responses.
9. The results on exotic pet ownership were clearer, with almost 70% of respondents on all estates in favour of retaining the current prohibition.
10. A summary of comments made by respondents is contained in **Appendix Two**. Some themes emerge:
  - Those in favour of dog ownership tend to point to the health and wellbeing benefits of dog ownership, especially for isolated people or children and families
  - Those against dog ownership tend to be concerned about nuisance caused by irresponsible dog ownership, fouling of green spaces and animal welfare concerns around keeping dogs in flats with no outside space
11. It can also be noted from the comments that some residents want a 'no pets' policy and expressed regret that cats had been allowed.

## **Proposals**

12. Given the result of the consultation in relation to dogs, it is proposed that the current policy on dog ownership is maintained until the policy is next reviewed. The draft policy is submitted on this basis.
13. Approving the draft policy would not prevent officers from conducting further consultation on the issue of dog ownership at an appropriate point in the future, should Members consider this desirable. This could take the form of a more in-depth consultation, with independent facilitation and a more detailed discussion with residents around the themes that emerged from the recent consultation. Any consultation exercise could include some proposals from the Housing Division on how it might manage dog and cat ownership among residents, were the policy to be relaxed.
14. Many local authorities allow dog ownership subject to permission being sought first. Any permission is normally conditional on the breed of dog being suitable for the type of home in question, and the owner looking after the welfare of the dog and ensuring it does not cause a nuisance. This approach aims to balance animal welfare and housing management considerations with the enjoyment that residents would get from keeping a dog.
15. It will be noted that the policy in relation to sheltered housing is that neither dogs nor cats are currently permitted. This issue could also form part of any future consultation exercise, given the potential benefits of pet ownership to the wellbeing of people who live alone (as many of our sheltered housing residents do).

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

16. This policy supports the Housing Strategy outcome of “well-managed estates that people are happy and proud to live in”, as it assists officers in effectively managing pet ownership which, if not managed properly, can adversely affect residents’ enjoyment of their homes and estates.

## **Conclusion**

17. Following a consultation exercise, the Housing Division’s Pets Policy is re-submitted for approval. A majority of respondents to the consultation supported the existing policy in relation to dogs, though the picture differed by estate.
18. The Policy has been submitted on the basis that the position on dogs remains unchanged, though Members may wish to consider whether they consider that further consultation might be desirable in relation to dog ownership or any other aspect of the Policy.

**Appendices:**

- **Appendix One:** summary of responses to consultation
- **Appendix Two:** respondents' comments
- **Appendix Three:** draft Pets Policy (version 2.0)

**Liam Gillespie**

Head of Housing Management  
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: [liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

**Results of Housing Pets Policy Consultation**  
**October and November 2020**

**1. Would you like residents on your estate to be allowed to keep a dog?**

Overall result (all estates):

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>PERCENTAGES</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>6%</b>

Result by estate:

<b>Estate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Yes %</b>	<b>No %</b>	<b>Don't Know %</b>
Avondale	21	34	8	33.3%	54%	12.7%
City of London Almshouses	3	3	0	50%	50%	0%
Dron House	1	11	0	8.3%	91.7%	0%
Golden Lane	26	37	4	38.8%	55.2%	6%
Holloway	7	6	1	50%	42.9	7.1%
Horace Jones House	6	8	0	42.9%	57.1%	0%
Isleden House	1	7	1	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%
Middlesex Street	32	25	2	54.2%	42.4%	3.4%
Southwark	10	17	1	35.7%	60.7%	3.6%
Sydenham Hill	3	3	0	50%	50%	0%
William Blake	13	4	2	68.4%	21.1%	10.5%
Windsor House	13	4	2	68.4%	21.1%	10.5%
York Way	19	12	1	59.4%	37.5%	3.1%

**2. Would you like residents on your estate to be allowed to keep exotic pets (e.g. reptiles, spiders)?**

Overall result (all estates):

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>PERCENTAGES</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>

**HMA SC 12/01/2021**  
**Pets Policy Review**  
**APPENDIX ONE**

Results by estate:

<b>Estate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Yes %</b>	<b>No %</b>	<b>Don't know %</b>
Avondale	12	46	5	19%	73%	8%
City of London Almshouses	3	2	1	50%	33.3%	16.7%
Dron House	1	10	1	8.3%	83.4%	8.3%
Golden Lane	18	42	6	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%
Holloway	3	9	1	23.1%	69.2%	7.7%
Horace Jones House	1	11	1	7.7%	84.6%	7.7%
Isleden House	0	8	1	0%	88.9%	11.1%
Middlesex Street	19	34	6	32.2%	57.6%	10.2%
Southwark	5	22	1	17.9%	78.6%	3.5%
Sydenham Hill	2	1	3	33.3%	16.7%	50%
William Blake	1	14	3	5.6%	77.8%	16.7%
Windsor House	2	15	1	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%
York Way	4	20	8	12.5%	62.5%	25%

## Comments from Pets Policy consultation respondents

### October-November 2020

once dogs are allowed the estate will become untidy and why should I put up with barking and poo everywhere	There are a lot of cats and foxes that come onto the estate and leave mess along pathways and rip open bin bags, I don't know why dogs are not allowed as long as they are cared for and controlled in the correct manner.
Personally, I would prefer if the City Corporation had not allowed cats. In fact, I would prefer a no-pets policy. None whatsoever.	Pets should be allowed but small ones and they're not allowed on the grass or mess on the estate
Cats should be allowed. Provided they are house trained.	An evaluation of changes to pet policy will only be valid in my opinion if options are considered as to how you are to manage having pets on estate. It requires active management and is not just a question of adopting a principle that says we'll have cats but not dogs. There are great positives especially for the elderly of for example having one companion pet. At the moment there are an increasing number of dogs on the green and yet currently there is a no dogs policy. There are significant issues in my opinion of the current policy being discriminatory. It is perfectly reasonable for there to be small dogs in flats providing it is well managed and clear to tenants what responsibilities are. It should be based on size of property and competency of owner. Perhaps having attended good pet owner course. Dogs trust I believe has good guidance
Cats perhaps	I would create an exemption for helping animals, but the right to quiet enjoyment is paramount when living in close proximity. Exotic animals have no place in a domestic environment, in my view.
It is not really fair to keep dogs in flats, especially larger dogs, and if they start barking, it will be disturbing for the whole block. Guide dogs and hearing dogs are an exception.	You should allow pets, they are Beneficial to people's loneliness and mental health. I wouldn't mind A small dog.
Dog mess	I have a tortoise, no noise and no mess
We voted against the allowance of cats as per previous experience proved that to be a problem on our particular estate, i.e. they were very much not kept indoors. Whilst I'd love a small dog myself it seems only fair to vote no if cats are not allowed, although I suspect the same problems would not arise.	I agree and Happy without pets in the estate.
No pet flats to small	Pets are lovely to have if you live a big house with a garden. Living in a block of flats would cause more noise nuisance if a dog is always barking, plus some residents will probably let their dog's roam around the estate. IE balconies front and back grass plus they will be urinating, and leaving faeces everywhere. Not fair to residents and children around and living in the block.
would love to be able to have a pet	Pets are part of family and specially now more and more people feel lonely/ isolated and struggles with it
If cats can roam around the state doing what ever they want, dogs should be able to as well. Dogs are also supervised by owners	
Dogs and exotic pets is not a problem for me but not to big dogs to live on flats	
Any relaxation of the No Dog Rules (there are no private gardens on the Estate as far as I am aware ) leads to general abuse, such as "I am just visiting the friend, the community areas/ gardens etc". Tenants keep to the rules so 'visitors' should do so as well.	
Dogs cause hygiene and health issues, public areas are treated as defecation areas.	
Don't have any due to small flat but know loads of people would love too	
I have grown up with dogs my whole life, we desperately want a dog and I think with certain rules in place the policy should be changed, maybe have a 3 strikes complaints procedure, residents have to sign an agreement, control their dog at all times, make it so no dogs are to be exercised on the estate grounds or have a designated area for dogs to be exercised.	

My daughter has type 1 diabetes and although she is well at the moment she would benefit from a medical assistance dog which she would not be eligible for from a charity.	I have lived on the estate for 38 years and there has always been cats roaming around the estate when it clearing states no pets in the lease. I have always wanted a dog but not allowed. I would worry that if allowed people would take advantage and buy big dogs or dogs that bark all the time.
I think the nature of the estate is not conducive to allow pets. If for instance dogs are allowed and someone gets bitten, there is the possibility of a lawsuit. If some pets such as reptiles are allowed, there will be a case of why not allow dogs. I think the status quo should be maintained.	I want a small dog
Recently, I have seen many dogs within the Avondale Square (daytime and evening, especially on weekends where the state office is close) regardless of the pets policy in place. Spoke to few residents and they have boldly said they own the dog (not a guide dog) and only take it for a walk when the office is close and they had it for over a year so clearly they rules does not apply to them.	Dogs promote good mental health, give company to those who are alone and promote exercise. All of these things are especially important in the current climate. We are very confused as to why some tenants are allowed dogs are others not. About time this rule was changed, dogs would not be detrimental to the environment
To be fair the policy only states that you no allow to have dogs but there isn't a clear reason to back that policy or provide a reason behind. Also if this policy is in place then it's very difficult when there are not enough signs to let people aware of this policy as you walk into the park.	this Estate does not have proper gardens to allow people to correctly keep Dogs.
I personally don't see the reason why you do not allow residents have small dogs with some clear guidelines to maintain cleanliness around the state, other Local Authorities do allow dogs.	A ridiculous rule. Having a dog only enhances the wellbeing of their owner.
Dogs up to medium size are fine in flats.	Dogs if are small. No exotic pets at all.
City of London yearly budget report in the website is not user friendly. Information in pdf is a picture and not searchable by key word. It has restricted the reader to find information in a 200-300 pages document efficiently.	I think residents should be allowed to keep pets such as dogs... We are now in 2020 & it is about time for City of London to relax their rules.
No dogs or exotic animals should be kept as they are noise and will soil our gardens	COL would ask residents to take a photo of the dog and put in the residents file. This way they can identify the owners. People already have dogs in the estate so it make easier for the office but let the dog owners know that it is not allowed to walk dogs on the estate .
This place is not farmhouse which need to surround with pets but central London. I don't like pet.	it is time for residents to be allowed to keep dogs on the estate. I'm thinking small dogs...pls let us keep dogs but make a rule as to which breed is allowed
Every one should be allowed to keep dogs as it helps them with there mental and over all health	The residents do not take responsibility for their cats roaming up and down balconies, they are not house cats! They mark their territories up my front door and outside my flat and also poop, the possibility of dogs on the estate again fills me with dread for the same reasons. I've lived here for 40 years, we had dogs around here once and we voted against having them because of the noise, dog poop, and urine. We had dangerous dogs, dogs at home alone barking all day. These flats are bad for sound, I can hear my upstairs neighbours going to the toilet!!
Dogs are inappropriate pets to be kept in small apartments. Reptiles, spiders, etc. require specialist care and are beyond the capabilities of most members of the general public. I happen to be an expert on reptiles and amphibians and not even I would keep them.	People living on the ground floor used to let the dogs out to roam in the park and garden. People on balconies would walk to the front and let them go through the fence to the garden areas if the park was busy; this will happen now the gate to the park is locked.



<p>You can set as many rules as you like, not everyone will stick to them and it will cause issues.</p> <p>The kids who door knocked recently to get signatures to allow dogs basically pulled on heart strings and no one really considered the issues it would cause.</p> <p>Please bear my comments in mind.</p>	<p>Children learn about unconditional love, loyalty and real friendships from having a pet dog.</p> <p>Of course dogs come with difficulties - usually as a result of bad owners, But with strong and enforceable rules and penalties this can be addressed.</p>
<p>Regular checks need to be made because some residents ARE keeping dogs in flats.</p>	<p>I think dogs should be allowed in line with council and other HA. This is an outdated policy.</p>
<p>as far as they follow the government rules about pets</p>	<p>I think a small dog is fine but owners just need to be made responsible for their pet(s). It is unfair that the City are taking away our choose to have or not have a dog, for example.</p>
<p>No pets please.</p>	<p>think should be aloud but tough policies should be enforced and kept too</p>
<p>Dogs barking, the flats aren't soundproofed well enough.</p> <p>Hygiene wise, where can owners take dogs to walk etc without spoiling our small green spaces .</p> <p>If there were lots of dogs it would cause noise pollution.</p> <p>I'd love a dog but would hate it if it barked and disturbed my neighbours.</p>	<p>Because they don't clean up there dogs mess</p>
<p>Small dogs only</p>	<p>I have pet budgies and I don't know how I would have managed the lockdown and even now being aware that at my age it is better to stay at home. The budgies need care and cleaning daily, but they also keep me on my toes and happy.</p> <p>If I didn't have them I would have loved to have a cat. I know my neighbour who recently moved was hoping for a cat. I think pets can make a difference to elderly people's happiness. I do also realise that they require care and attention that might require help from family members to help out.</p>
<p>Should relax your rules &amp; allow at least small dogs</p>	<p>I don't think animals should be kept in cages.</p>
<p>The problem is not the Pets, it's their Owners who don't know how to look after them properly.</p>	<p>I have nothing against pets but people do not look after them properly, they are left alone and cause a nuisance.</p>
<p>I think it would be good for people's emotional and physical well being to have a dog if they can care for it.</p>	<p>I don't mind dogs or cats.</p>
<p>Some tenants have cats that are outside and not kept in the home. I had the back door open and the cat came in my home.</p>	<p>My daughter really wants to have a dog, the dog very helpful company but some neighbour's so nasty and noisy. I don't think that will be a good idea.</p>
<p>Smaller dogs, not large breeds.</p> <p>Some people live alone or suffer mental health problems.</p> <p>It has been proven that dogs have a positive impact on individuals well-being and are a great support to people.</p>	<p>Yes to dogs...but only small dogs!!!</p> <p>I want a dog so badly I will have to move out if City of London does not allow residents to keep dogs</p>
<p>Pet like Cats or birds no problem</p> <p>But dogs sorry</p>	<p>If you're a responsible dog owner I don't see why we can't have a dog.</p>
<p>Dogs need space</p>	<p>Dogs in general should not be permitted on our estate unless they are working dogs, i.e. guide dogs/hearing dogs etc. I am definitely against exotic animals, inner city dwellings do not provide suitable surroundings for such animals anyhow.</p>
<p>Dogs are a great way to get neighbours to talk to each other. Many people see dogs as an excuse to talk to strangers or people they don't know very well. and help with social isolation. Children can connect with elderly dog owners by offering to take the dogs for walk or earn (extra) pocket money for taking dogs out.</p> <p>The health benefits of dog ownership are well documented, with reduced heart rate, blood pressure, helping with loneliness. It also helps create a sense of routine for senior citizens and helps those with dementia. This is in addition to the health benefits of taking exercise to walk the dog.</p>	<p>In theory it would probably be okay to allow residents to keep small pet dogs however in practice I don't think it would be a good idea. My concern is that the size of the flats</p>

may be too small for medium to large size dogs. Also some dog owners may not be responsible and clean up after their dog if it makes a mess in the communal areas, which wouldn't be fair on all the other residents who have to use the communal areas.	walking a dog would benefit many people, I work in a veterinary practice and know the impact a dog can have on a persons well being. It could implemented the way that other councils do and have a size/weight limit on the dog for those living in flats.
cats ok	There are people that they already have dogs. The same happened before the City allowed to have cats, a lot of people they had them before. It is quite discriminatory to people with mental health issues the policy of not allowing to have dogs since there is isn't a official body in the uk that grants the recognition of therapy dogs. The city if London should be pioneer in this
pet would create too much noise, and litter as most owners will not be responsible enough to clean up after their pets	Just don't like pets
there's plenty of evidence to show that having pets is good for people & community but City of London wouldn't care about this. We are being asked but the decision not to have pets has been decided already!!!	I am very against pets being allowed. I used to think cats should allowed in the flats, not outside, but cats are seen roaming on the podium and defecating on the gardens, against the estate rules. So now I say no pets at all and have stopped gardening.
owners need to prove they are responsible and can control their animal. i.e. barking, clearing up fouling etc.	I'm happy with the pets policy but it would be nice if it was enforced.
I think that a pet in small flat is not good idea because the pet need more space .	I find it unfair that sheltered residents are not allowed house cats, when it is permitted for general needs residents ON THE SAME ESTATE. This seems to be a contradiction of your Equal Opportunities Policy.
Cats should be allowed	This is an enclosed estate with very little outside space for dogs. We live close together. Unfortunately dogs bark and as COL doesn't follow its own policy of no wooden flooring, they will create noise running on floors also. Also, although owners may well pick up what their dogs excrete we live on a small estate where a lot of children use the podium and I've never seen an owner disinfect afterwards. We live in the City of the City. There are some places that are just not viable for dogs. Also if you start to allow other exotic pets, the COL want be able to control this and other animals will start being kept
I have seen people with small dogs on my estate, but I don't know if they moved here from another council and were allowed to keep their dogs as an exception. We all no "exotic" pets escape from homes and these should absolutely be NOT allowed at all. People put other people at risk without thinking. I think having 2 cats is OK, but certainly no more, and the residents should keep the council informed they own cats.	Dogs would be a terrible idea
Despite being a private estate. increasing number of residents are using their dogs for walking around the estate. This should be forbidden. City as a landlord should provide special area for residents to take their pets for exercise. Signs need to be put up for fouling and cleaning with enforcement of fines - as not all dog owners are responsible.	Can disturb the elder people and pets requires best cleaning and safety measures
Noise and health issues.	Pet policy? Surely you should be concentrating on the maintenance of the estate?
We wish that pet policy change because our daughter dream is have a dog, we think a small dog can bring her happiness and joy. We promise to provide appropriate care for our pet.	As I have multiple mental illnesses, a small dog would provide the companionship that I need (especially as I am highly allergic to cats).
I don't mind residents have dogs as long as they don't bring them out for their needs in the garden down stairs	I don't see the problem at all why it should be forbidden to keep pets
Dogs and cats, I considered them as house pets, other wild animals are to be living in the wildlife.	Domestic pets, especially dogs bring so much joy and companion. It will be really good to see children walking their dogs to
I think the current policy is outdated most other London councils allow dogs - I believe that this is detrimental to individuals mental health. Owning a dog makes exercise fun and the social interaction that comes with	

improve their independence and responsibilities. This will be a great opportunity to overcome children's live style.
I feel this is human right. Issues, if any that would arise from owning one of these pets should be dealt with on an individual basis.
pets dogs for the right families which can provide responsibility and daily exercise take dog for walking to the parks
During lockdown is has become increasingly noticeable that people outside the estate bring their dogs to exercise here - with the inevitable urination and sometimes worse, and not everyone clears up after their animals. We don't have a lot of green space - children should be able to play on it, residents sit and relax on it without the risk of dog mess. If residents are allowed to keep dogs then it is even harder to stop non-residents bringing their dogs on. Also not everyone feels comfortable about dogs, even when on leads.
Our flats are not acoustically insulated dogs can be noisy even if only barking when someone comes to the door. Dogs also need exercise to allow them to toilet and not all owners pick up and there are now a number of small S children on the estate who use our open space. The estate has not got enough space for this and some owners may not have time to exercise them off the estate
Dogs have been proven to help with supporting loneliness, mental health, and as long as the owners are responsible and dogs are appropriate size for the accommodation I do not have any issues. I welcome anything that makes people have a better quality of life especially I this very challenging time.
I do not believe that most dogs are suitable Pets to be kept in small flats in inner Cities, this is cruel for most dogs who need space to run about., the only exception would be working dogs such as guide, hearing and other medical assistance dogs
Aside from guide dogs or similar, I think it is cruel to keep a dog in flats where the only outside space is a balcony. Our flats are not well soundproofed and the potential noise from dogs barking would be very disturbing. The idea that someone in a nearby flat would have an exotic pet horrifies me. Please don't change the pets policy without further consultation. Many people don't have access to Facebook so a policy change based on responses to this survey

could not be called representative of most residents views.
As having a small child we would love to have a dog specially on the winter where there is not much entertainment for kids
Every dog should be registered for a fee and DNA taken from dogs so owners allowing fouling can be fined and brought to book. The fee could pay for testing. Other small pets should be allowed as long as they do not cause a nuisance or damage the estate.
If the flats were ground level sure
I like pets but feel if people had dogs some would not be responsible and would let their dog bark and not pick up their mess.
Prefer not to have dogs around the estate. Urinating and barking is not very hygienic...
Reptiles and spiders should not be kept as pets. Some owners are very irresponsible and these pets have a tendency of escaping which could cause havoc in the building.
I don't want a pet but others may.
Should be allowed but the owner must take the dog of the east must not let it mess on the grass and the walk way
When moving to one of City of London houses we had to get rid of our beloved 5 years old Labrador, we asked City of London for the permit to keep him until he is alive, but permit was not given even after finishing all stages of the complaints. It is impossible to describe the psychological trauma for to all 4 family members we had at the time and we still feel it. Our kids are still very sensitive when talking about dogs. We were too poor to rent our self at that time, so we took the decision to find another home for our dog and keep the home for our family. It is very hard to write this text now.... even after 5 years. We always were sure that British people love dogs and they do care about the animals. This situation we will remember until the end of our days... there is no way to get rid of the trauma we had. Of course I would get change the pet policy and allow 1 dog per property.
I would oppose residents being allowed to keep dogs, because of the potential noise within the buildings and the potential excrement inside and outside buildings. There is already a problem with people - or their animals - urinating, defecating and vomiting in communal areas. I believe this would get worse if people were allowed to keep dogs.
All residents should be allowed to have dogs if they look after them correctly and

clean up their mess and those who don't should have them removed	Loneliness is an issue in London. I think dogs should be allowed to be kept although I appreciate that the potential for antisocial behaviour from irresponsible dog owners is potentially a problem.
I am allergic from pets	Keeping pets will foul up the common areas. I don't think that all the residents will pick up after their pets.
I sit on the podium every other day and I have seen 11 different cats over the summer months roaming around the Estate.	It seems absurd that dogs can't be kept on the Estate - what an old fashioned viewpoint. Dogs are not a nuisance animal. Please allow dogs.
Dogs should be allowed, as long as they are trained and well kept.	Policy says cats should be kept inside. Doesn't happen they foul all over the estate
I believe it is not good practice to have pets or reptiles in block of flats such as our states. Also it's not safe as pets can spread designs and densely populated estates like us will not cope, if anything may happen due to pets being escapes from someone's flats and injure someone.	Please allow dogs, it is sad that no-one can officially have a dog
I don't want the policy changed, and I would like more prominent signage discouraging non-residents from walking their dogs on the estate.	It would be amazing to have the possibility to keep small dogs on estate
I think it's fine as it is.	Estate not appropriate for dogs
The houses are no noise proof	Dogs would create a barking issue on the estate. we have enough noise from the residence and roads already.
Due to the small park next to the building, there are already an enormous number of dogs in the area and plenty of dog waste (much of it cleaned up but plenty that's not - something you really notice when you have a toddler!). Flats are close together with lots of windows left open at the back because it is safe so noise from dogs would be very noticeable. No control over type of dog if you allow them and that risks everyone's safety.	would love to have a small dog.
People love animals which is fine but they need to be responsible to their pet without disturb other resident. But exotic animal it's a bit scary keep in the flat.	I don't think pets live happy life in the flat.
If residents can keep cats, then i think dogs should be allowed too	Regarding exotic pets: as long as they are looked after and happy creatures I'm not against it. And of course that they do not escape too easily.
I would love to own a house cat or a dog and thinking of single old people some of these pets can own companionship to the elderly and single people. considering reptiles etc I have no desire for these but each to their own.	Am not and animal lover and will never be... Please keep your policy alive... No dogs, animals apart from guide dogs.
Of course, any disability pet I have no issues with at all..	why not, if person takes a good care.
The estate is not suitable for dogs as there is no open space nearby.	A resident caretaker on sight is essential. To have not continued with that correct and needed service after Frank Heggie left, has changed things drastically.
I would love to have a small dog or to move somewhere with a garden	No thanks
Unfortunately, I am not a lover of Animals. So no much to tell you	Not every pet owner is very responsible. So there could be fouling on estate. And dogs barking all night.
The dogs are very good companions and for people suffering from depression is the better help we can have. The corporation must to put de rules about the breed and size allowed.	I really do think it's so important that dogs are allowed . My son and myself suffer with extreme anxiety and I really believe from lots of research that it would be extremely beneficial to have a dog. For people who are alone and don't have much contact with the outside having a dog can help in so many ways. I'm very passionate about this. It really is such a shame we are not allowed. Everyone should have the option to have a pet or their choice! If then problems occur then it's on that individual everyone should have the opportunity! Please rethink the policy I would give anything to have a dog for my son! He doesn't leave the house at all socially this would help in so many ways. Please.

I think having dogs is a lovely idea.	even one small dog. Some people are allergic to cats. Especially important for those who are lonely in these times and would rather the company of a dog. Dogs are cleaner, can be kept on leash when out the house. Cats roam estate freely and defecate everywhere whereas dogs don't, owners pick up after them. Could allow dogs but ban them on the podium for residents on the podium who wouldn't want them there making noise. Thank you for your time.
I don't think it's fair residents aren't allowed to have dogs.	Should only be dogs suitable for small flats and for residents on the podium we could ban dogs from being allowed there. It's not fair that residents can have multiple cats but not even one dog. During this difficult and for many very lonely times, it would be a huge help, especially for those who prefer dogs or are allergic to cats. Dogs are also cleaner as they can be kept on a leash and owners would pick up after them, whereas cats walk the estate freely and defecate everywhere.
The current pet policy allowing cats and small mammals, fish and birds is fine as stands. Multiple dogs living on the estate is a noise liability and, also might increase fouling in communal areas. Noise travels across flats through a block already, due to communal pipes and construction. So "no," unless for medical/disability needs. Tortoises which are classed "exotic" are not problematic, nor are many lizards. Snakes and arachnids are not a good idea, very worrying, would frighten many if escapes.	I have wanted a dog for many years. Will be very beneficial in this difficult time.
I don't want to allow any pets in our estate	The flats are small in Great Arthur house but allowing for a household to have one cat or a flat-friendly dog would be great especially at the moment given COVID. I think so long as people got a pet that is suited to living in smaller living spaces and were well cared for, I don't see it as a problem.
none	I've found that the presence of dogs often leads to a lot of noise and dog mess. That's what happened in my last block of flats and I'm really against having to deal with that again.
I think the smaller breeds of dog would be fine. Dogs are good company for the elderly. Also, for many years now, research has shown having a dog has a very positive effect on the immune systems of children (0-11 approx.), as well as teaching them responsibility. Generally, there are both mental and physical health benefits - daily walking for example - not to mention the social aspects in meeting other dog owners on their estates. On the flip side, there's also the need to ensure all dog owners be made aware of their responsibilities in keeping their pets, for the consideration of other, non pet owning residents. And that owners are held totally accountable. Registering the pet with the relevant CoL estate office, ensuring tagging and providing a small pet care pamphlet?	I will love to have a small dog as a pet, because my family love them.
can't guarantee tenants will clean up after them and control barking and disruption to neighbours.	Everyone should have a choice in what animals they want to care for. As long as they are taking care of them I believe all animals should be allowed!
I believe that having pets can be good for your well-being as it can get you out and about, meet new people and it's a good way of teaching your children to be responsible by having a role in caring for an animal. I do believe that if you're going to have a dog you should have to register it with city of London so that if there are any problems it will be easier for city to deal with and no walking dogs on estate for toilet breaks and all dogs should be on the lead whilst on estate grounds.	I would love a dog.
Estate is already noisy. A big NO to dogs - the noise would be a nightmare as is the risk that residents would let their dogs foul the public areas	I believe the policy needs updating. Dogs should be allowed providing their owners are fully responsible. This goes for other animals too.
Voted yes to dogs, as long as it's a dog suitable for small flats. Makes no sense residents can keep several cats but not	Dogs and cats are company for people who have no one Therefore they should allow them
	Yes to exotic pets as long as they're kept in secure cages etc
	Majority of dog owners will let their dog poo on the estate and some dog will wee in the stairwell so why should council cleaners clean it. Some tenants like me work shifts so some dog will start barking when the

owners are at work so people will be woken up and that's not fair	smaller pets as it's not the same. A dog can also be beneficial to a family as well as individuals and that is a proven fact.
I think is difficult have a dogs, cats or any exotic pet, because the flat is small place for the pet their need more space .	Dogs should be allowed on the estate so long as there are rules that you are allowed one and the noise level and cleanliness is adhered to. Also no large dangerous dogs.
Concerned by dogs fouling shared space and particularly about the signals to non residents that it is ok for them to use the estate for dog walking. This already happens. The acoustics in our flat are already poor with noise from neighbours above and adjacent easily transmitted. Likely noise from dogs within flats would make this already poor situation worse.	Existing pet policy has already led to cats(?) fouling the community areas of the estate. I would not wish to see anything that would increase this.
I am a veteran who suffers from PTSD, i have been informed by the charity i got help from that i should get s dog as this would help me with my PTSD.	I'm not sure. My concern is that I'm often finding excrement outside my flat even though the policy is currently for no pets. It depends where residents were allowing animals to urinate and how that would be monitored. Drainage and cleanliness needs to be carefully considered as well as noise.
I am happy with the policy as it is allowing for cats and guide dogs as well as small domestic pets. Thank you!	I would love a small dog but unfortunately there are residents that would take advantage of this and have large dangerous barking dogs.
I do think that people on this estate should be allowed to keep small dogs as well as currently being allowed cats. There are lots of small dog breeds categorised by the kennel club by size and weight. Most small dog breeds are the same size as cats. I do not think that large breads should be allowed to kept in these small flats though.	Obviously still have rules against untrained dogs that bark and such
There are a multitude of local places to walk dogs around Horace Jones House.	I have mixed views in this. Firstly he Boise dogs make barking. That is a fact that can't be stopped and the bigger the dog the bigger the bark. Leaving a dog unattended all day whilst at work and it barking will not be fair to the neighbour. Then there is picking up the mess behind it. Not all owners are responsible. Also the size of the dog. Do you say yes. It only knee high, people will always push their luck and do what they want. I do understand though the pleasure a dog can bring to someone also as a companion. Will it not be in the corporations best interest to say no and leave it at that. It is just something extra that will need to be policed. Tenants will just have to respect it and homeowners have a choice not to buy here.
Most other housing associations including Southwark Council allow dogs as pets.	Most pets need exercise and this is not possible on my estate
Dogs can provide great company to people living by themselves which Horace Jones House is mostly made up of 1 beds. Especially given the period of lockdown we have just gone through. Many people would have appreciated the company of a dog.	But only small to medium digs there is no room in a flat fir a big dog
The private part of the estate are allowed to keep dogs which is obviously up to One Tower Bridge and individual landlords and house owners. However I feel it puts another divide amongst the community and builds feelings of resentment amongst residents. There are already so many clear ways we are treated differently to the residents of One Tower Bridge and seeing them walk there dogs daily is another thing that residents feel they are not allowed.	You cannot trust dog owners to pick up dog mess
Pets are Not to be allowed in the estates.	Guide dogs and mental heath assistance dogs only
Dogs, or at least small dogs, should be allowed to be kept on the estate as well as cats. Some people may be allergic to cats and would like the option of a dog and not	Yes I'm all for having a pet such as a dog or a cat some people live on their own and could do with the company but what I wouldn't like if the owners to let the animals use the grass the play area for the children as the toilet by all means have a pet but take the dog over to the park do not allow your pet to use the grass area downstairs as it's toilet .

<p>Pets make mess and smell</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. indoor</li> <li>2. on estate e.g. on green were small children play health and safety</li> </ol> <p>Should not be allowed as estate is not checked on everyday bases</p>
<p>residents should be allowed to keep small dogs &amp; maximum of 2 per household</p>
<p>It's been demonstrated that pets are beneficial to older people. I'm not prepared to keep a cat in while I live in a large green space. It's unfair to the cat and it means I have to keep doors and windows shut all year round. We have rats at the back of the property; a cat would solve rodent problems. My small terrier died four years ago and I long for another, such good companions. Lockdown would have been so much easier with a dog. This is the first time in my life I've had no pets and it's a sad and lonely place to be. My last, private landlord had no problems with pet ownership and it's the one thing that would encourage me to leave here.</p>

<p>I would like to have a very tiny dog such as a Chihuahua</p>
<p>I would like to be able to have a small dog, I think we should have the freedom to have small dog . a Pet always brings loads of joy in any household, is the dream of every kid to have a dog and is an amazing company for lonely people.</p>
<p>I can't have a doormat because of cats urinating on it. I don't think it's fair to keep a dog in a flat and I don't want them running around the podium. There would be an increase of dog mess as well as cat mess and it's not fair on the cleaners. Dogs bark and I don't want to be kept awake listening to that. I'm also petrified of snakes so reptiles are a big no for me. People can't be trusted to look after their pets, as demonstrated by the last cat owners who let their cats defecate around the estate.</p>
<p>Some tenants already have a dogs in the estate and they don't clean after pupils</p>
<p>Dogs should be allowed</p>

This page is intentionally left blank





**City of London Corporation**  
**Department of Community & Children's Services**  
**Housing Service**  
**Pets Policy**

---

Approved by:	<i>Housing Management &amp; Almshouses Sub-Committee</i>
Original Approval Date:	<i>May 2017 (v.1)</i>
Review Date:	<i>November 2020</i>
Re-Approval Date	<i>January 2021 (v.2 – this version)</i>
Next Review Date	<i>January 2024</i>

## **1. Purpose and scope**

- 1.1 We have this policy because we want residents to know our approach when they wish to keep pets in their home. This policy reinforces the provisions in our tenancy and lease agreements relating to pets.
- 1.2 This policy applies to residents of all tenures living on estates managed by the Housing Division. Some differences apply to sheltered housing and these are explained in the policy.

## **2. Policy aims and objectives**

- 2.1 Our aim is to encourage responsible pet ownership and to prevent residents from allowing their pets to cause a nuisance and annoyance to others. We will achieve this aim by:
  - Limiting pet ownership according to the type property occupied
  - Having a clear and simple process for residents to make a request to keep a pet
  - Communicating information on responsible pet ownership
  - Taking action when residents do not comply with their tenancy or lease conditions

## **3. Service standards**

- 3.1 When we deal with resident's requests to keep pets we will:

- Respond to requests within 10 working days
- Where we grant permission, explain the pet owner's responsibilities
- If we refuse permission, we will explain the reasons
- Take prompt action if a resident allows their pet to cause a nuisance or annoyance.

## **4. Legal and regulatory obligations**

- 4.1 This policy will help us to comply with the following regulatory requirements:
  - Tenancy standard – we must have clear and accessible policies which outline our approach to the management of tenancies
  - Neighbourhood and community standards – we must keep the neighbourhood and communal areas associated with our homes clean and safe.

- 4.2 There are no direct legal obligations arising from this policy. However, this policy will ensure that we act when residents do not comply with their legal obligations as a pet owner.

## 5.0 Our approach

We want all tenants to enjoy living in their homes and we recognise the benefits that responsible pet ownership can bring. However, we must ensure that controls are in place to prevent irresponsible pet ownership which can cause suffering to animals and a nuisance or annoyance to others. Residents who wish to keep a pet must ask our permission first, providing details of the pets that they wish to keep.

In exceptional circumstances, we may consider variations to this policy. Any variation will depend upon an individual's circumstances. Our decision and reasons for the decision will be provided in writing to the relevant parties.

### 5.1 Permitted pets

#### ***General needs rented and leasehold properties***

In line with our tenancy and lease conditions, we will only allow residents to keep pets that we regard as suitable, and in such numbers that we consider reasonable.

**Cats** – Up to two indoor cats or 'house cats' are permitted per property. Cats must not be allowed to roam in any indoor or outdoor communal areas, or to cause a nuisance.

**Dogs** – Registered guide dogs, hearing dogs and other assistance dogs will be permitted in any property. They must be registered with an accredited organisation.

- Residents who live in a flat or a maisonette are not allowed to keep a dog other than a registered guide, hearing or assistance dog as above.
- Residents living in a house with a private enclosed garden are permitted to keep one dog of their choice provided that the breed, size and temperament of the dog is suitable.

**Other animals** - Small domestic pets such as hamsters, caged birds and fish are permitted to be kept. Exotic or wild animals are not permitted to be kept.

## ***Sheltered Housing and Almshouses***

Cats and dogs are not permitted in our sheltered housing, which includes the City of London and Gresham Almshouses for the purposes of this policy.

### **5.2 Residents responsibilities**

Any permission to keep a pet is subject to the following conditions and responsibilities:

- Residents must ensure the health and welfare of their pets at all times
- Residents must comply with all legal obligations relating to the ownership and control of their pets and not keep any breed banned by law
- Residents are also responsible for the behaviour and control of any animal they own or those owned by visitors to their home. They must not allow their pets to cause a nuisance or annoyance to others or cause damage to property
- All dogs, including registered assistance dogs, must not be exercised on City of London estates and communal areas, and must not be allowed to cause a nuisance to others.
- All dogs, including registered assistance dogs, must be kept on a lead at all times when being taken through a City of London estate and must not be tethered to any land owned by us
- Residents must not keep any pets on balconies or communal walkways

Residents must not undertake the following activities from their home:

- Breeding of animals.
- Sale of animals.
- Hoarding of animals – this involves keeping an excessive number of animals as pets without having the ability to properly house or care for them

### **5.3 Dealing with nuisance from pets**

We will take appropriate action where residents do not comply with these conditions or their obligations and responsibilities as a pet owner.

Pet nuisance includes but is not limited to the following: allowing pets to roam unattended; fouling; noise; smells; damage caused by animals; injuries caused by animal; aggressive animals.

We aim to resolve problems informally and by agreement. However, where the problem is serious or persistent, we may take legal action to enforce our tenancy or lease conditions and remove the pet or animal from the property.

## **6. Responsibilities, monitoring and performance**

- 6.1 Overall responsibility for this policy and its implementation rests with the Head of Housing Management. The Head of Housing Management will ensure that staff receive the appropriate training and support to achieve the aims of this policy. Where needed we may establish appropriate operational procedures.
- 6.2 Monitoring of the implementation of this policy and our performance in dealing with issues relating to pet ownership will be the responsibility of senior management within the Housing Division.

## **7. Associated policies**

- Anti-Social Behaviour Policy
- Tenancy Management Policy

## **8. Document Management**

Policy title	Pets Policy
Date created	May 2017 (v.1)
Policy owner	Head of Housing Management
Authorised by	Housing Management and Almhouses Sub-Committee
Date authorised	
Review period	3 years
Date of next review	

<b>Consultation and assessment</b>	
Customer consultation	Residents have been consulted on this policy. Any substantive changes to this policy will result in further consultation.
Equality Impact Assessment	This Policy has been subject to a full Equalities Analysis. We permit assistance dogs in line with disability requirements. The policy allows for the needs of individual residents to be considered.
Data Protection Impact Assessment	Not required. Minimal risk of data breaches. Use of personal data covered by our privacy statement.

<b>Document review history</b>			
<b>Version</b>	<b>Date amended</b>	<b>Date approved</b>	<b>Key changes</b>
1.0	N/A	February 2017	Original document
2.0	November 2020		Routine policy review. Document format amended and updated but policy approach unchanged.

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	12/01/2021
<b>Subject: Housing Estate Parking Management Review - Progress Update</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	<b>4, 12</b>
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>Y/N</b>
<b>Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services</b>	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author: Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management</b>	

## Summary

The Housing Service manages 1,060 parking facilities across its estates, including garages, parking bays and motorcycle parking. Weekly charges from these facilities are a significant source of income to the Housing Revenue Account, though void rates are high (approximately 40%) and it has been identified that our processes for managing these facilities need to be refreshed and modernised.

In mid-2020, a review of our management of these facilities was commissioned and a parking consultancy has now presented us with a report containing recommendations for the future of estate parking on City Corporation housing estates. This update report is intended to bring Members up to speed with the project and explain how officers will use the recommendations made in the review report.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report

## Main Report

### Background

1. The City Corporation manages 1,060 parking facilities of various types across its social housing estates. These facilities are provided to users under individual licence agreements. Each facility attracts a weekly charge which varies across different sites, and by facility type.

2. Previously, the charges regime was reviewed annually, and the fees were altered depending on demand at each site. However, this system produced several anomalies and charges tended to differ drastically between estates.
3. It was also noted that some locations have high numbers of empty facilities (around 40% across all sites). This perhaps not surprising on those estates falling within the Congestion Charge zone, though high void rates have also been noted on some estates outside that area. It is possible that this is partly due to our estate parking charges being significantly higher than local street parking tariffs for residents.
4. Our management processes have not been reviewed for many years. A system of paper permits is still used, which is administratively complex and in need of modernisation. From a resident perspective, the process of applying for parking or buying temporary permits (e.g. for visitors) is also less straightforward than it should be and involves submitting hard copies of documents or visiting an estate office. Some lapses in administrative processes have resulted in complaints from residents which have been upheld.
5. In response to these and other issues, a review of our management of estate parking facilities was commissioned and The Project Centre Ltd was appointed in May 2020 to carry out this work.
6. The review was intended, among other things, to:
  - Review current processes and documentation
  - Consider how processes could be improved from a customer service perspective
  - Recommend ways in which voids could be reduced and income maximised
  - Provide recommendations on IT systems for parking management
  - Benchmark and review our charging regime, with recommendations for different possible approaches
  - Look at alternative uses for vacant or under-used spaces
  - Advise on parking enforcement options
7. The consultants visited each site, speaking to staff about how parking is managed and any issues they encountered. They examined the parking facilities and looked at possible improvements, such as new layouts, additional spaces, or cycle storage facilities.
8. A desktop study was also completed to examine our charging regime and compare this against several other local authorities in London.
9. Finally, IT solutions for estate parking management were considered and recommendations made for possible improvements.



## **Findings**

10. Some key findings of the review were:

### ***Facilities***

- Many sites have inadequate bay markings, and some are worn away entirely
- Several sites have insufficient visitor and contractor bays, or none at all
- There are significant opportunities to provide more contractor, visitor and resident parking by creating new bays or reconfiguring existing facilities
- Several estates have poor provision for cycle storage but there are many suitable sites for improved secure cycle storage (hangars and lockers)

### ***Barriers and security***

- While some car parks had barriers or similar, these were often unreliable or in some cases completely defective and no longer used
- Some car parks had no barriers and were subject to unauthorised parking and, in some cases, issues like fly-tipping
- Many estates had only “Sheffield” stands for bike parking, rather than more secure bike hangars or lockers
- While there were some incidents of theft or vandalism, estates were generally felt to be safe for parking and storing bikes

### ***Charges***

- The City’s estate parking charges are all higher than local authority on-street parking permits, sometimes significantly so (at one estate it was triple the cost of local on-street residents’ parking, on others it was double)
- Most local authorities apply a standard charge across all their housing estates, with only one other council in London identified as having a similar regime to the City Corporation’s (Westminster)
- Some authorities’ (including Southwark and Islington) charges vary based on vehicle emissions, in support of their aims around improving air quality

### ***Enforcement***

- The current enforcement regime is felt to be inadequate as it relies on a private enforcement officer being present to witness a contravention and issuing a penalty notice, which is not effective in preventing unauthorised parking or misuse of our land

## **Proposals for next steps**

11. It is proposed that officers now use the review and its recommendations to design and deliver a project to implement improvements in several key areas:

- **Charging regime:** formulate detailed proposals and models for alternative charging structures, including the possibility of emissions-based charging, with a view to increasing income and reducing void losses
  - **Enhanced facilities:** draw up detailed proposals for improvements on each site, with associated costs (additional or reconfigured parking bays, improved cycle storage facilities, renewed bay markings)
  - **IT improvements:** ascertain the cost of implementing a system to enable better management of parking facilities, including electronic payments and permits for residents, visitors and contractors, doing away completely with paper applications and physical parking permits
  - **Customer service:** create a system where residents and other car park users can obtain electronic permits via an online portal or similar, without the need to submit hard copies of documents or visit an office in person
  - **Security:** formulate proposals to implement effective security infrastructure at each site to prevent or minimise unauthorised parking or misuse of our facilities, including use of automated barriers or similar
  - **Enforcement:** implement a suitable enforcement regime for each site to minimise unauthorised use, without the need for enforcement in person where feasible
12. This project is of course conditional on funding being available for the various elements, some of which would require significant investment by the HRA at an amount to be determined. The project could be designed in such a way as to be deliverable in stages, to spread costs.

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

13. The improvement of our estate parking management regime supports our corporate aims of providing the facilities that our communities need and managing our land and public spaces effectively.
14. The improvements would also support the Housing Strategy outcomes around providing well-managed estates.

### **Conclusion**

15. A review of estate parking management has identified many areas in which our current practices and procedures can be improved, to provide a better service to residents and reduce administrative tasks.
16. The review has also underlined the need to make changes and improvements to our car parks, to provide better facilities to users and potentially increase income.

17. Officers intend to use the recommendations to formulate a project to address some key priorities, with a view to creating better managed facilities, more customer-focused processes and a more sensible scheme of charges designed to maximise income to the HRA and reduce void losses.

**Liam Gillespie**

Head of Housing Management  
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: [liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

T: 020 7332 3785

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