



AGENDA FOR THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee are summoned to a meeting to be held remotely by Zoom on **23 July 2020 at 7.30 pm.**

Link to meeting: <https://weareislington.zoom.us/j/96300802662>

Enquiries to	:	Ola Adeoye
Tel	:	020 7527 3044
E-mail	:	democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched	:	15 July 2020

Membership

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan (Chair)
Councillor Sue Lukes (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Theresa Debono
Councillor Troy Gallagher
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche MBE
Councillor Gary Heather
Councillor Ben Mackmurdie
Councillor Marian Spall
Rose Marie McDonald (Resident Observer) (Co-Optee)
Dean Donaghey (Resident Observer) (Co-Optee)

Substitute Members

Councillor Vivien Cutler
Councillor Osh Gantly
Councillor Sara Hyde
Councillor Jenny Kay
Councillor Roulin Khondoker
Councillor Nurullah Turan

Quorum is 4 Councillors



A. Formal Matters

Page

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declaration of Substitute Members
3. Declarations of Interests

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest*** in an item of business:

- if it is not yet on the council's register, you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent;
- you may **choose** to declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is already in the register in the interests of openness and transparency.

In both the above cases, you **must** leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If you have a **personal** interest in an item of business **and** you intend to speak or vote on the item you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent but you **may** participate in the discussion and vote on the item.

- *(a) **Employment, etc** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of your expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of your election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between you or your partner (or a body in which one of you has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences**- Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which you or your partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

This applies to **all** members present at the meeting.

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
5. Chair's Report
6. Order of Business

1 - 6

7. Public Questions

For members of the public to ask questions relating to any subject on the meeting agenda under Procedure Rule 70.5. Alternatively, the Chair may opt to accept questions from the public during the discussion on each agenda item.

B. Items for Decision/Discussion	Page
1. Mini-Scrutiny Review (Private Rented Sector) witnesses evidence - Safer Renting	
2. Scrutiny Review (Major Works) - Draft Recommendations - To follow	
3. Review of the Council's New Programme - 12 Month Report Back	7 - 30
4. Quarterly Review of Housing Performance Report (Q4 2019/2020)	31 - 36
5. Work Programme 2020/2021	37 - 38

C. Urgent non-exempt items (if any)

Any non- exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgent by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

D. Exclusion of press and public

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the remaining items on the agenda, any of them are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt or confidential information within the terms of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in the Constitution and, if so, whether to exclude the press and public during discussion thereof.

E. Confidential/exempt items **Page**

F. Urgent exempt items (if any)

Any exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgently by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

The next meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee will be on 8 September 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Islington

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 23 June 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee on 23 June 2020 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** O'Sullivan (Chair), Lukes (Vice-Chair), Debono, Gallagher, Heather, Mackmurdie and McDonald (Co-Optee)

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan in the Chair

165 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Spall and Hamitouche.

166 **DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item 2)**

None

167 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Item 3)**

None

168 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 4)**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 March 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

169 **CHAIR'S REPORT (Item 5)**

The Chair stated that Councillor Hamitouche was unwell and would not be attending the meeting that evening. The Chair added that on behalf of the Committee he would like to extend his best wishes for a speedy recovery, and thank her for the outstanding contribution she has made to the work of the Committee

The Chair also stated that this was the first virtual meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee, and that with regard to the future draft work programme, which would be considered later in the agenda he would like to propose the following –

- Additional scrutiny evidence to be received by the Chair/Vice Chair on the Capital Works and the Private Rented sector scrutiny reviews, and a written report be presented to the Committee thereon, summarising such evidence, with a view to reporting recommendations on these reviews at the next meeting;
- Consideration be given to a scrutiny review on Partners, especially in relation to the end of PFI2 and the possible arrangements for the properties coming back 'in house', and consideration be given to additional items on the work programme on Housing Associations and Homelessness. The Chair also

stated that there is a Task and Finish Group being established on how the Council's Housing stock can be made carbon neutral by 2030, and he felt that consideration should be given to this early next year by the Committee

RESOLVED:

- (a) That a vote of thanks be accorded to Councillor Hamitouche for her work on the Committee, and to wish her a speedy recovery from her illness
- (b) That the additional items raised by the Chair above, and the proposal for additional evidence in relation to the Capital Works and Private Rented sector be agreed
- (c) That it be noted that the proposals by the Chair in respect of a new Scrutiny topic, and additional items for agendas, as referred to above, be considered at the meeting in September

170 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item 6)

The Chair stated that the order of business would be as per the agenda.

171 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 7)

The Chair outlined the procedure for public questions

172 IMPACTS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO HOUSING SERVICES DURING THE PANDEMIC - PRESENTATION (Item B1)

The Corporate Director of Housing, Maxine Holdsworth, was present for discussion of this item and made a presentation to the Committee, copy interleaved.

During consideration of the presentation on COVID 19 the following main points were made –

- Staffing – the first 2 weeks of lockdown coincided with the last 2 weeks of the annual leave year. This reduced staffing levels to 70% but by mid-April this had risen to 85%. During May/June staff levels have remained stable at around 90% each working day. Only 13 staff have required a COVID 19 test since testing was made available to Council staff. Around 500 staff are working from home and there are just over 400 staff are on site or in the office (the vast majority in Estate Services, Repairs, and Tenancy Management).
- Maintaining Caretaking services – Caretaking service able to deliver service business as usual. Cleaning and disinfection increased in frequency to reduce virus spread risk. Staff require PPE to continue to work safely on estates. Staff adapted to new ways of working. Repairs staff redeployed to communal areas team to carry out communal work and support, whilst demand for repairs decreased
- Day to day repairs – Staff require PPE to work safely, and are amending procedures to keep themselves/residents safe. Council teams and contractors continued to deliver gas and heating repairs during lockdown. Staffing levels

had been good throughout. The service was now reopening to dealing with non-urgent repairs as residents are starting to report these.

- Continuing challenge to Gas compliance – Gas compliance was dropping due to lack of access. Some residents did not want to allow access to Gas Engineers in their home. Without means of enforcement persuasion is the only tool available.
- Income collection – Rent arrears have risen sharply. Some tenants had cancelled direct debits. The Government has suspended evictions and notice periods have been extended.
- Tenancy Management – Services have been adapted to enable home working for some staff whilst an office presence is maintained. Processes have been adapted to ensure safety. Property viewings are being conducted through video, and sign-ups over the telephone. Home visits were only arranged in an urgent situation.
- Continuing challenges – Collection of rent was an ongoing challenge. The Council had lobbied Government for an end to No Recourse to Public Funds. Individual debt was increasing quickly and HRA income loss will mean compensatory savings will need to be made elsewhere.
- Homelessness – There had been a surge in temporary accommodation placements, with an additional 250 singles accommodated. There was also increased demand for supported housing and support services. Services had moved to largely remote delivery, with a core team at 222 Upper Street and at reception centres. Temporary accommodation had to be accessed quickly and costs were higher than normal. Funding provided by the Government was inadequate to fully cover the council's costs. Exit strategies had been developed for each individual. The Council was lobbying government over clarity and further support for roughsleepers, and for those with No Recourse to Public Funds
- Challenges in Housing Allocations – Government rules dictated only urgent moves between 24 March-18 May 2020. Safety requirements stopped viewings so Choice Based Lettings had to be suspended. Of 50 properties let to 6 May, 6 were category 'A' welfare, 9 overcrowded, 5 under occupiers, 19 homeless, 8 others. It was anticipated that Choice Based Lettings would resume in September. New build properties would start to become available for letting soon.
- Supporting/shielding and Vulnerable households – The Director of Homes and Communities was leading the We Are Islington helpline. Staff from across the Council had been redeployed and trained to help deliver service. Deliveries of food, medicine, and utility top ups were arranged to support those shielding or vulnerable. The service went live on 21 May and received 10,000 calls to mid-June. Requests for help peaked in mid-May, and they have reduced to 25-40 requests a week. Sobell Leisure Centre had been utilised for food and meals distribution. Food deliveries were being made in partnership with the voluntary and community sector. A new CRM system had been developed to support We Are Islington. Arsenal had been very supportive throughout and discussions were taking place with them as to future developments.

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 23 June 2020

- Preparing for end of PFI 2 – A PFI end of contract board had been set up within Housing to oversee end of PFI2 contract and new arrangements for service delivery to these properties. Board included the Executive Member, senior Housing officers, and representatives from Digital Services, Legal, Finance, and Communications. It was essential to ensure that homes are returned in good condition and services handed over seamlessly. Arrangements were in place for a survey of PFI2 properties that was scheduled for April 2021. A communications plan, risk register, and programme plan had been developed to help monitor progress, mitigate risk, and ensure communication with residents is clear and timely.
- Members congratulated housing staff on the level of commitment shown during the pandemic, and felt that an awards ceremony or other recognition should be given to staff to recognise their efforts.
- It was noted that call centre staff at Brewery Road were working from home, and this has boosted the 'out of hours' offer for repairs.
- Some capital programme works had continued during COVID 19, however before all programmes restarted sites had to be COVID secure. The new build programme is back on 8 sites but anticipated finish dates may need to be amended due to social distancing measures on site.
- In response to a question on No Recourse to Public Funds, it was stated that a lot of work had taken place and many people had been accommodated. A programme of support was in place, and a triage system was in place to direct people to appropriate pathways, and additional staff had been taken on to assist the team. There was access to specialist legal and immigration advice. A total of 293 rough sleepers had been accommodated and 43 of these were NRPF or EA nationals. It was noted that details of the triage/pathways referred to could be discussed following the meeting and that Housing would contact Councillor Lukes thereon.
- A Member stated that he would wish to congratulate the Assistant Director of Housing Property Services, and the Repairs Team, on the excellent work that they had carried out during the pandemic, and added that he had received feedback from a number of residents to this effect.
- In response to a question, it was stated that payment of rent directly from DWP for tenants on Universal Credit only applied when the Council made an application once a tenant had fallen into arrears.
- Staff were carrying out tenancy welfare checks, however this was only being carried out in person when staff had not responded to e mails etc.
- In relation to videos for property viewings, this is seen as an additional service for tenants, and it was appreciated some tenants may have difficulties accessing these due to lack of available IT. Discussions were taking place to involve community organisations in offering access to IT and supporting the digital inclusion of residents.
- In response to a question it was stated that a number of adjustments had been made to ensure vulnerable staff were protected from COVID 19, including risk assessments, looking at functions and roles of individual staff, and discussions were taking place with staff on risk factors
- With regard to availability of PPE, it was stated that there had been problems but at no stage had it not been available to staff where required. The Council

had made a decision to centralise the purchase of PPE through the Emergency Planning Team, and there were supplies available, although these are not being stockpiled.

- It was noted that originally it was only NHS/Care staff eligible for COVID-19 testing and testing for local government staff was introduced at a later date. In terms of immunity, it was still not clear whether you could be re-infected, and such matters could have potential staffing implications in future.
- A member referred to the lack of voids/temporary accommodation in the south of the borough. It was stated the Council owned and managed 3 temporary accommodation sites in the borough, and one was located in the south.
- Reference was made to the issue of Council Tax Bands being higher on new build properties. It was stated that there was a formula applied when assessing Council Tax Bands on new builds, and this could be circulated to Members.
- A Member expressed concern that agency staff employed by Arsenal F.C. had not been furloughed. It was stated that this issue would be discussed outside of the meeting.
- In response to a question, it was stated that that there had been no increase in the level of voids during lockdown.

The Committee thanked officers for their contribution.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the presentation be noted;
- (b) That Arsenal FC be contacted re: the issue of agency staff, as referred to above;
- (c) That information on the calculation for new build properties Council Tax Bands, as referred to above, be circulated to Members;
- (d) That the Director of Housing contact Councillor Lukes in relation to triage and pathways for NRPF, as referred to above.

173 WORK PROGRAMME 2020/2021 (Item B2)

It was stated that the draft work programme for the next two meetings could be agreed however, due to the ongoing COVID 19 situation, and Annual Council now not being held until September, with the appointment of new Membership to the Committee, the consideration of a scrutiny review topic, and the future meetings work programme should be deferred until the September meeting

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be agreed, as stated above, and further considered at the September meeting

The meeting ended at 8.55 p.m.

CHAIR



Report of: Executive Member for Housing and Development

Meeting of:	Date:	Ward(s):
Housing Scrutiny Committee	23 July 2020	All

Delete as appropriate	Exempt	Non-exempt
------------------------------	---------------	-------------------

Page 7

SUBJECT: Housing Scrutiny Review of the council’s New Build Programme – Executive Member response – 12-month update on recommendations

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 On 18th October 2018, the Executive agreed a report from the Housing Scrutiny Committee about their review of the council’s New Build Programme. The report highlighted 3 recommendations to improve housing services to improve the delivery of genuinely affordable housing.
- 1.2 This report updates the Housing Scrutiny Committee on work carried out by the New Build Team (NBT) to meet the recommendations of the original scrutiny report and outlines future work to improve services to vulnerable residents.

2. Background

- 2.1 In December 2017, the Housing Scrutiny Committee started a review looking at the council’s new build programme in comparison with other boroughs.
- 2.2 The main objectives of the review were to:

- Review the principles underpinning the council’s new build programme.
- Review the design, build and environmental standards of the council’s new build housing.
- Assess the obstacles to developing more council housing in Islington.
- Evaluate the decision making process for how new council housing developments are identified and progressed.
- Assess the level of resident involvement in the new build process.
- Consider how new build properties are allocated.
- Evaluate the performance of the new build team.
- Compare the council’s approach to new build in other London boroughs.

3. 12-month update on Recommendations

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
<p>Recommendation 1 - Islington Council should consider if it can enhance public engagement and consultation processes in advance of significant new build schemes. This could include holding community events, the appointment of local residents to community liaison positions and co-designing aspects of the scheme that will have a direct impact on local residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council’s New Build Team (NBT) have extensive experience of delivering effective consultation on new build sites with years of good practice fed into the process. This has resulted in the successful delivery of new build sites over the last 10 years with significant resident buy in. However, as the programme has expanded with schemes becoming larger and more complex, it is timely to review the consultation processes. • The council’s new Housing Strategy, which is currently in development, will include the council’s strategy for developing new homes. The strategy will include a communications plan for the new build programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Setting out a positive and consistent articulation of our new build programme and its benefits to all residents. ○ Establishing a process for demonstrating resident support for the new build programme and our 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NBT have funded a dedicated Communications Officer to co-ordinate consultation and communications across the new build programme, their duties have included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drafting a communications plan for the new build programme (see appendix X) ○ Drafting Consultation Plans for individual schemes ○ Support project managers responses to residents and members (this has been vitality important to provide comfort to residents following the outbreak of Covid and construction sites being mostly closed then re-opened again, that their health and safety is considered paramount to the council) ○ Ensuring information from contractors to residents is in plain English, consistent with council messaging and policy and provided in a timely manner. ○ Support the consultation process through liaising with the new build, design and print team in the production of the materials • The way the NBT consults with residents regarding new schemes has been reviewed and a new ‘virtual’ consultation process has been signed off by the New Homes Board (see appendix 1) which addresses the challenges posed by consulting during lock down and beyond. Some of the key features of this new approach are as follows:

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
	<p>approach to balloting, in line with the requirements of the GLA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establishing a communications plan outline for all schemes in development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The overall aim is for residents to be engaged in the process from initial feasibility to letting new homes as well as raising awareness of the council’s new build programme amongst residents in the borough. To facilitate this there will be additional communication resources for the new build team as part of the ‘turbo-charging’ of the team. We are also exploring community co-design as a way of fully including residents in the co-design of schemes. We are looking at ways in which we can engage harder to reach residents so we hear from as many residents as possible. ● The majority of the council’s programme is on its estates and we need to ensure that new build schemes are a means to ensuring wider estate improvements that benefit existing tenants and residents. Working closely with our colleagues in Housing Property Services, Homes and Communities and Communications, we will work together to ensure that we address wider issues on estates such as anti-social behaviour, design issues and repairs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ‘Virtual’ face-to-face consultation e.g. via Zoom or alternative digital platform suitable for resident participation and engagement ○ Via paper and/or phone for all residents and not just those without internet access/digitally able ○ Via printed materials displayed at a communal area on an estate for residents to view safely in their own time ○ Accessibly – providing flexibility to ensure all residents have reasonable opportunity to have their say, whether they are online or not ○ Worked with colleagues in Planning, who have already undertaken large events via platforms such as Zoom for planning committee meetings, to understand some of the challenges this new way of working has <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The first round of virtual consultations is due in the autumn and the effectiveness of this kind of consultation will be continuously reviewed to ensure all residents’ voices are being heard and listened to.
<p>Recommendation 2 - Islington Council should work with other local authorities to lobby for relaxed restrictions on the use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The council has lobbied MHCLG individually and as part of the North Sub-Regional Group of Local Authorities and via the North London Directors Group. Lobbying was also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Following the relaxation of the HRA borrowing rules whereby councils were no longer required to keep their debt within pre-determined limits, the council swapped the vast majority of its private sale homes to homes for social rent

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
of Right to Buy receipts and HRA borrowing.	<p>undertaken via London Councils and the Local Government Association. The Lead Member for Housing has also raised this issue with the Deputy Mayor for Housing at the GLA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobbying from Local Authorities appears to have paid off. In May 2018 the GLA released a new prospectus, solely for developing Local Authorities. The Building Council Homes for Londoners programme is dedicated to supporting councils to increase their capacity to deliver new-build programmes in recognition of the key role Local Authorities will play as providers of new genuinely affordable housing. As well as offering grant rates well in excess of that available to Housing Associations, the GLA’s Right to Buy Ring-fence Offer enables council’s with unspent RTB receipts to effectively bank them with the GLA rather than lose them to Government. Islington has opted into that Offer and already saved £7m in unspent RTB receipts which would have been lost and is now available for the council to bid for via the GLAs online bidding system. • An addendum to the Building Council Homes for Londoners programme was published in July 2018 and sets out how councils can bid for £500 million additional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing. Unlike grant funding, the council is able to use both the HRA Borrowing funding and RTB receipts funding together. The deadline for applications is 30th 	<p>(please note, therefore it was not necessary for the council to access HRA borrowing funding via the GLA). This meant a further 131 new homes developed by the NBT would be available for local residents in need of genuinely affordable housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council can access RTB 1-4-1 receipt funding from the GLA rather than the MCHLG which provides a higher level of subsidy for the new build programme than the traditional grant funding. This has provided an extra £7m of subsidy into the programme that has helped maintain the level of new social rented housing delivery following increasing costs in the construction sector due to Brexit and subsequently Covid. • However, despite the difference in administration of RTB 1-4-1 receipts, the key principles of the funding remain the same, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding only provides 30% of the cost of constructing a new social rent home ○ Funding cannot be used with any other form of grant funding ○ Funding is provided on a 3yr cycle whereby if it is not used it must be returned to central Govt. or punitive levels of interest are applied. • The council continues to lobby for relaxation of these key principles which affect its ability to maximise the supply of genuinely affordable housing. In the last 18 months the NBT has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Continued to lobby the MHCLG to ease restrictions through the North London Directors Group, London Councils and Local Government Association ○ In partnership with other LAs, lobbying via The Housing Forum and Futures for London ○ Raised the impact of the restrictions consistently with the GLA at quarterly meetings and at senior director level

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
	<p>September 2018 and Islington fully expects to take advantage of this funding stream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, there are still restrictions around cross subsidy between funding streams and a maximum of 30% of the construction cost of a social rent home which affects the council's ability to maximise genuinely affordable housing development. The council will continue to lobby vigorously to ease these restrictions as set out in the draft Housing Development Strategy. 	
<p>Recommendation 3 - Islington Council should consider how it can support or incentivise housing associations to deliver a greater amount of new affordable housing on development sites, especially smaller housing associations that have surpluses and work in the borough.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTB receipts have been available to housing associations for several years now, however, the only social housing provider that has applied for RTB receipts is the City of London. The GLA has confirmed that RTB receipts held as part of the Ring-fence offer can be offered to housing associations. • The 19th June Breakfast with the Leader Session on 19th June was attended by 10 of the leading developing registered providers (RP's), including, Peabody, Hyde, Islington and Shoreditch, Newlon and Guinness; the aim of the meeting was to encourage the RP's to build more social housing in the borough. As well as reiterating the council's affordable housing priorities, associations were reminded that RTB receipts are available and the council is keen to utilise those receipts to increase the supply of genuinely affordable homes in the borough. A follow up meeting has been arranged in September 2018. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTB receipts continue to be available for RP partners to increase the supply of genuinely affordable homes. However, due to the council's own new build programme utilising these receipts their availability is significantly reduced. There has been some take up by other social housing providers. For example, the council has worked closely with the City of London on their Richard Cloudesley School site and has made available up to £7m of RTB receipt funding toward the provision of 66 homes for social rent. • The borough site finder exercise has been completed. As large and medium sized sites are brought forward into the programme, the NBT will ascertain whether there is any RP stock either adjacent or in the direct vicinity of any new development proposals. Should that be the case, the NBT will engage with the RP to establish whether there are any joint development opportunities between the two sites. • The borough site finder has also identified smaller potential development sites. Though the majority of are on the council's housing estates and therefore not appropriate to dispose of to another social landlord, there are a small number on the edge of estates or not on estates where this

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the draft Local Plan there is a stronger requirement for developers to bring a registered provider ('RP') on board early in the development process to ensure the correct mix of tenures and sizes of homes. It is crucial RPs are brought in early as possible as on many occasions developers wait till they have planning permission before engaging housing associations and the affordable housing offer may not be in line with the borough's priorities regarding suitability and quality of affordable housing. It is worth noting that the majority of the borough's affordable housing is delivered as a result of requirements of S106 agreements relating to residential development schemes whereby housing associations are presented with the % of affordable housing on the scheme rather than having any involvement in viability negotiations themselves. • The borough has commissioned an exercise to look at potential development opportunities across the borough. Part of this exercise will involve ascertaining what surrounds these development opportunities. Any opportunities to work with adjacent housing association's estates to maximise genuinely affordable housing supply will be pursued. • The council has worked with Barnsbury HA and Keniston HA to bring forward small sites using a larger housing association development partner and will continue to support smaller housing associations who 	<p>might be appropriate. A paper was taken to the New Homes Board agreeing to identify where these sites were and to report back on whether it may be appropriate to dispose to an RP (Appendix 2). The NBT continues to communicate with the boroughs smaller, local RPs such as Barnsbury and ISHA to make sure they are aware of the status of these sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Local Plan still seeks pro-active engagement with registered providers ideally at pre-application stage to ensure the correct quality and mix of affordable homes are provided.

Recommendation	Response to Recommendations – Exec response	What we have done over the past 12 months and future plans
Page 13	<p>have ambitions to increase the number of genuinely affordable homes within their property portfolio through new development.</p>	

4. Implications

4.1 Financial Implications

Recommendation 1: The new communications officer post (0.5 FTE) is included in the HRA budget at a cost of £25k

Recommendation 2: The abolition of the borrowing cap enabled the Council to extend its borrowing & facilitate the swap of 131 for sale properties to social rented properties.

The introduction of the GLA RTB receipt ring fence extended the time the Council has to use its RTB receipts from 3 years to 6 years as such this allowed the Council to swap GLA grant, which provides a lower rate of funding, for GLA RTB ring fenced receipts leveraging in an additional £7m.

Recommendation 3: The Council currently has a very healthy pool of RTB receipts available, which allowed us to make available £7m to the City of London to support the provision of 66 social rented units. However, time restrictions on the use of receipts and our own ambitious future new build plans mean it is very unlikely that we will continue to have a surplus RTB receipt capacity to support other providers.

4.2 **Legal Implications**

The council is under a duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the goals identified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of s149(1) of the Equality Act:

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The council is also under a duty to make reasonable adjustments to the delivery of its housing services to ensure that disabled and vulnerable people can use the services and can communicate and engage with the Homes and Communities division.

Consideration of the council's equalities responsibilities is evidenced in the responses to the recommendations made by the Housing Scrutiny Committee.

There are no specific legal implications arising out of this report. Legal advice and support is provided as necessary in relation to housing new build schemes including in respect of the use of rtb receipts and the making of such receipts available to other social housing providers for the provision of social housing in Islington

4.3 **Environmental Implications**

There are no significant environmental implications related to the recommendations outlined in this report, although making information for residents available in a variety of formats, as well as on-line, may involve the printing of leaflets

4.4 **Resident Impact Assessment**

The council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations, between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it (section 149 Equality Act 2010). The council has a duty to have due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages, take steps to meet needs, in particular steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, and encourage people to participate in public life. The council must have due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

A Resident Impact Assessment (RIA) has not been completed at this stage. Where the proposals in the report may have equalities implications for residents, RIAs will be undertaken. For example, an RIA would be completed as part of consideration of moving more services on-line.

Appendices: Appendix 1 – New Build Resident Consultation Paper for New Homes Board (June 2020)
Appendix 2 – Small Sites Delivery Options Paper for New Homes Board (March 2020)

Background papers: N/A

Final report clearance:

Signed by:

Executive Member for Housing and Development

Date:

Report Author: Stephen Nash, New Homes Programme Manager
Tel: 020 7527 6337
Email: stephen.nash@islington.gov.uk

Financial Implications Author: Lydia Hajimichael
Tel: 020 7527 5160
Email: lydia.hajimichael@islington.gov.uk

Legal Implications Author: Helen Coyle
Tel: 020 7527 3082
Email: helen.coyle@islington.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting of:	Date:	Agenda item:	Wards:
New Homes Board	17 June 2020	2e	All

SUBJECT: New Build Team resident engagement during Covid-19**1. Synopsis**

- 1.1 To note the practical issues resulting from Covid-19 and in particular guidance on social distancing and restrictions placed on groups gathering, in relation to the New Build Team (NBT) undertaking resident consultation in respect of proposed new build development projects.
- 1.2 Under S105 of the Housing Act 1985 the Council is required to ensure the participation of tenants in decisions which will substantially affect their homes. Failure to comply with S105 can render a decision made by the Council subject to judicial review and could ultimately result in the decision being quashed.
- 1.3 This report sets out the New Build Team's proposals for adapting its approach to resident engagement in order to both fulfil the Council's obligations under S105 of the Housing Act 1985, and to ensure robust and meaningful consultation with residents likely to be affected by the Council's new build projects.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 NHB are asked to note the contents of the report and provide comment on the proposals and/or suggestions for consideration.

3. Background

- 3.1 The NBT have a well established approach to resident engagement. When a potential new build opportunity is identified and the decision made that new homes could be built, the NBT Project Manager will identify any stakeholders that may need prior notice/information/input about the proposals before a consultation with residents takes place. These include staff inside the council e.g. communities team, planning officers, tree officers etc. and external organisations and recognised resident groups e.g. TRA,

local charities using any of the sites that will be affected, community gardening groups etc. The number of stakeholders involved varies depending on the size of the scheme.

3.2 The current format of NBT consultation is briefly described below:

- If it is the first consultation on an estate we will write to residents saying we are considering building new homes on their estate, that it's very early days and we will invite them to a consultation event to discuss ideas and understand what they want/need and what the problem areas are e.g. ASB, lack of play areas etc. Where we are already in the process of consulting with residents we would send out a newsletter, a few weeks before the consultation event outlining where we are in the new build process, what has already been done and what the purpose of the upcoming consultation is
- About a week before the consultation event residents receive a flyer inviting them to attend the event, posters are put up around the estate and on any ENBs
- The PM will contact any stakeholders such as a TRA/TMO to notify them of the event
- The event is run by the PM and the architects. It usually last about 3-4 hours running from late afternoon to early evening as a drop-in event
- Feedback is collected at the event and via SURVS (online questionnaire). Usually around 3 weeks is allowed for the feedback
- Within a week of the event a newsletter and questionnaire is distributed to residents asking for their feedback and to ensure anyone who couldn't make the event can still feedback
- The information from the questionnaire is used to feed into the next stage of the consultation process and if this is not the final consultation event the process is repeated from stage 1.

3.3 Ward councillors and Councillor Ward are given advance copies of all correspondence before it is distributed to residents.

2. New Resident Engagement Approach

4.1 Traditional resident engagement events which are typically organised in a venue local to the proposed development are not going to be feasible for the foreseeable future. The logistics challenges and Covid-19 risks around organising and managing a safe public gathering of this nature are considered too great at the present time.

4.2 What we are proposing to do:

- 'Virtual' face-to-face consultation ve.g. via Zoom or alternative digital platform suitable for resident participation and engagement
- Via paper and/or phone for all residents and not just those without internet access/digitally able
- Accessibly – providing flexibility to ensure all residents have reasonable opportunity to have their say, whether they are online or not

4.3 'Virtual' consultation

Zoom (or equivalent) will be used to host a virtual consultation event with the NBT Project Manager and appointed architects. Proposed process outlined below:

- Attendees to pre-register so we have a virtual sign-in sheet
- Provide attendees the opportunity to pre-submit questions
- Invite attendees to 'join' at specific times so each event can be run to an agreed timetable e.g. design presentation followed by questions
- Consider the appropriate number of virtual sessions to allow people to join at various times. This will provide flexibility for residents as well as help us to avoid people joining a session late and potentially having to repeat parts of a presentation etc. Spreading out the number of participants will help ensure the sessions are more manageable
- A designated moderator with the ability to mute mics, monitor comments/questions and remove anyone acting inappropriately will 'manage' the session
- We will investigate what measures we need to put in place to allow the sessions to be recorded
- Newsletters, flyers and posters will be used to promote the consultation event and provide necessary joining instructions
- We will consider whether digital presentations should be hosted on the council's YouTube channel so they can be viewed outside of the consultation events for people unable to make the date and time of the event
- Staff from other departments will be asked to provide responses to any pre-submitted questions that may not be directly linked to the proposed development, such as repair or maintenance issues.
- We are liaising with other departments who have already trialled this type of format for feedback as to what works and what doesn't e.g. Planning and Licencing
- We will refresh the council's website to be clear about how we are running consultation events during the coronavirus outbreak

4.4 **Printed materials, e.g newsletters**

We will continue to utilise a variety of existing methods to reach as wide a group of residents as possible such as:

- Produce a detailed newsletter and incorporate more of the information that would typically have been displayed at the consultation event
- An expanded newsletter will provide sufficient information about the proposed development to residents with limited or no internet access
- Offer residents the opportunity to sign up to an e-newsletter to receive all future comms by email as well as hand-delivered
- Provide all necessary contact details for residents to speak with the Project Manager
- Printed survey forms will be included with the newsletter as per the current approach

4.5 **Gathering feedback**

- NBT will continue to ask residents for their feedback and suggestions at each stage of the process, so we can understand what works well and where we can make improvements or changes

- NBT will give residents a longer period to respond with their feedback and/or complete the survey e.g. 4 weeks instead of 3 weeks

4.6 **Advantages of the new approach**

- We are hopeful that the new methods will be more inclusive and may help us reach a larger number of residents and provide us with a wider representation of views
- Adapting the approach now will help us to avoid delaying projects in the programme that have not yet concluded resident engagement prior to planning submission
- Trialling new ways of communicating with residents and stakeholders could lead to a long term, positive change in how we work and how we engage
- It is not always possible to find appropriate venues for holding resident consultation events within easy and accessible reach from the proposed development site and a 'virtual' approach could be the most appropriate way to reach residents regardless of Covid-19

4.7 **Disadvantages of the new approach**

- It could be more time consuming with additional phone calls, production of more detailed newsletters etc.
- There may be cost implications of producing presentations for a digital format, expanded newsletters - though this could in part be offset against venue hire costs etc.
- We could miss out on people who may have attended an event but may not be willing or able to engage remotely
- We could get interest and feedback from people not directly affected by the proposals

3. Legal Implications

5.1 If consultation is not carried out in accordance with s105 then the Council risks a challenge to a decision on the grounds of:

1. the decision being made illegally, e.g. the statutory consultation requirements were not followed, failure to take account of the Public Sector Equality Duty (see below); or
2. there is procedural impropriety; also referred to as breach of natural justice, which arises where in making a decision basic rules of natural justice were ignored, or where there was a failure to act with procedural fairness towards a person or to observe procedural rules that are expressly laid down by legislative instrument e.g. the council does not follow already published consultation arrangements.
3. The Court has not ruled previously on whether e-consultation is valid, but *Kendall v Rochfield District Council 2014* and *R v The Boundary Committee 2009* albeit on different statutory consultation requirements strongly suggest that it will not be sufficient alone. Although technologies have developed further since 2014 and specific groups can be targeted online, we would not advise relying on this form of consultation alone.

4. The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus)(Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings)(England and Wales) Regulations 2020 (see below) means a virtual meeting would now constitute a public meeting so where we have already published consultation arrangements specifying public meetings these could proceed as virtual meetings provided we can put in place the necessary arrangements for participation. Protocols for planning meetings have already been devised using Zoom and the LGG has published some precedent guidelines for conducting virtual meetings.

5.2 The prospects of success for a claimant based on 1 and 2 above will vary on a case by case basis and how the Court responds to actions taken by councils at this time which is unknown. Where consultation is already under way and the arrangements have been published then they should not be departed from, other than by way of an extension of the response time. We can where necessary still begin s105 consultation, However, the extent to which we can make as much provision as possible to allow resident participation by a number of means such as virtual meetings, on line and hard copy questionnaires, project manager phone calls, hard copy mail outs will narrow our risk of challenge considerably but we cannot be sure at this time that it will completely remove the risk.

5.3 The Coronavirus Act 2020

On 25th March 2020 the Government made the above Act, which afforded power to the Government to introduce Secondary Legislation to address the issues raised during the Covid-19 pandemic. Following this *The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus)(Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings)(England and Wales) Regulations 2020* came into force on 4th April 2020 and is valid, subject to review until May 2021.

These regulations confirm that being 'present' at a meeting includes access to a meeting through remote means including (but not limited to) video conferencing, live webcast, and live interactive streaming. Where a meeting is accessible to the public through such remote means the meeting is open to the public whether or not members of the public are able to attend the meeting in person. As such, a virtual meeting would represent a public meeting.

Report Authors:

Alistair Gale - Deputy New Homes Development Manager

Emma Bangar - Senior Strategic, Comms & Engagement Officer

Helen Coyle - Chief Property & Development Lawyer

This page is intentionally left blank



New Homes Board Report	Date: 2nd March 2020	Ward(s): All
-------------------------------	--	---------------------

SUBJECT: HRA SMALL SITES DELIVERY OPTIONS

1.	Synopsis
1.1	There are a number of small sites held within the HRA identified as possible development opportunities by the New Build Team (NBT) but which are not currently in the new pipeline programme for development for both resource, outcome and financial reasons. Further to the report submitted on 4 th September 2019, this paper offers more detailed analysis of small sites and their development potential, options to consider to bring these sites forward for development, specifically those that might be suitable for development by a third party, and a matrix to recommend a development route for individual schemes.
1.2	For the purposes of this report, small sites are defined as sites with the development potential of up to 25 new homes which is consistent with the GLA definition of small development sites.
2.	Background
2.1	From its inception, the council's New Build Team (NBT) has historically delivered small sites and still have a very small no. of these sites within the current programme.
2.2	However, small sites are more often than not just as difficult to deliver as larger sites and can take up an equal amount of a project manager's time to deliver as well as causing significant disruption to residents. Though these sites had previously been 100% social rented, financial pressure on the HRA has meant that the actual number of affordable homes on small sites would have to be reduced so the gain to the council is further minimised. The unattractiveness of developing small sites was exacerbated by the growth of the new build programme in terms of both number and size of sites.

2.3	In 2018 the council decided to 'turbo charge' the new build programme to increase the number of new genuinely affordable homes delivered. To focus resources to achieve an ambitious new programme and because of the financial context mentioned above, the NBT decided to further reduce the number of small schemes delivered and focus on larger sites that could deliver greater numbers.
2.4	However, the NBT has an historic pipeline of small sites which are on a long list for future potential development. The Islington Site Finder exercise identified approximately 27 locations with development site opportunities of 25 units and under. Each location often comprises several distinct development opportunities with different characteristics – these total c.60 opportunities. As the NBT intends to focus on medium to large schemes there are now an increased number of small development opportunities that are unlikely to be exploited in short or medium term.
2.5	As recommended by the September New Homes Board, more detailed analysis of the individual sites has been undertaken, to better understand the characteristics of the sites and to establish whether there is a preferred route to development.
3.	Recommendations
3.1	<p>The recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To approve the approach used to establish whether an individual site should be developed. • To review the external route to delivery of those opportunities. • Agree the matrix.
4.	Islington Small Sites: Approach
4.1	<p>In establishing how the NBT could take forward the delivery of the Islington Small Sites, it has been necessary to break down each site into its particular characteristics. A matrix of attributes has been created, out of which the following factors have been considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of a site within an estate (i.e. whether it is separate, on the edge, or within an estate); • The nature of the development proposal and its likely impact on existing residents (i.e. building above occupied flats or on a stand alone site with separate highways access); • The loss of different amenities (i.e. mature trees, landscape, play or parking areas).
4.2	These factors have been scored and a matrix generated which ranks the opportunity and impact of development of the individual sites, as well as identifying those that could potentially be delivered by third-party organisations (e.g. small housing association, or community groups); or whether a site should not be developed outside of the context of a wider estate redevelopment.
4.3	It should be noted that the sites have only had initial planning advice and outline massing studies, which may mean they are not deliverable or may deliver fewer new homes than anticipated.

5.	Islington Small Sites: Typical Characteristics & Recommendation
5.1	<p>Roof-Extensions or 'build-over' – c.15 opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of single or double additional floors of housing, possibly suited to prefabricated modular construction. • The creation of new dwellings within existing pitched roofs. <p>Issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can this type of work take place in an occupied block? • What are the impacts of enabling works such as extending services (including lifts) into the new units, or relocating existing services (including tank rooms, etc.)? • Relatively few additional units are generated. • Ideally undertaken alongside future full block refurbishment or redevelopment works. <p>Outcome:</p> <p>Not suitable for delivery by third party through disposal as the Council needs to integrate management of the property with the existing asset. However, officers are exploring the potential to increase capacity through working in partnership with a roofspace development specialist Apex. The Council would effectively pre-purchase completed homes at an agreed price with Apex managing development of the homes with funding from the GLA and Homes England. This will be the subject of a future report.</p>
5.2	<p>In-Fill Blocks – c.30 opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of in-fill blocks in gaps to the street frontage. • The addition of in-fill block within estates, on car parking or other hard landscaped areas. • The addition of sideways 'block-extensions'. • The addition of single-houses or extension blocks besides access routes into estates. • The demolition of single storey buildings to create a block in keeping with the scale of other estate buildings. <p>Issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does an in-fill block remove valuable estate amenity areas (landscape, play, parking)? • Does an in-fill block on a street frontage add to the streetcape? • Can an in-fill or sideways 'block extension' within an estate be built without undue impact on existing residents? • Does the location of an in-fill block allow effective transfer of ownership of land to a third party owner (and developer), without negatively impacting the rest of an estate? <p>Outcome:</p> <p>Generally not suitable for development by a third-party owner, unless separately located on the edge of an estate.</p>
5.3	<p>Stand alone (non-estate) Sites – 5 sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small plots on a street frontage that could be developed. • Under-utilised community centres that could be redeveloped. • Council facilities that could potentially be vacated and the site redeveloped.

	<p>Issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are facilities used, and is permanent change of use accepted? <p>Outcome: Suitable for development by a third-party owner.</p>
6.	<p>Delivery Options</p> <p>The September Small Sites Briefing Paper identified the following methods of development. Now the small sites have been reviewed in more detail, the appropriateness of these options have also been reviewed.</p>
6.1	<p>Disposal via the GLA's Small Sites Programme</p>
6.1.2	<p>The GLA's Small Sites programme aims to provide a streamlined service for public sector landowners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bring small, publicly-owned sites forward for housing-led development; and • invigorate new and emerging 'sources of supply' including small developers, small housing associations and community-led housing groups.
6.1.3	<p>The GLA provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support to bring small public-sector sites forward for development; • online marketing to c.1,200 organisations, with basic agency support, for efficiency and greater reach to small developers and community groups; and • standard contracts for easy comparison of bids and minimal negotiation with small developers.
6.1.4	<p>The GLA has just launched a third round of funding for site surveys and due diligence work, with a closing date of 20 April 2020 and has welcomed a bid by Islington council.</p>
6.1.5	<p>The council would be able to include <u>covenants limiting the use of the site to delivering affordable and/or community-led housing</u>, where this would not ordinarily be delivered on very small sites via the planning system. The GLA will confirm to the council that a covenant requiring affordable housing provision can also include future nominations being given to the council.</p>
6.1.6	<p>Particular issues that the council will want to be assured of are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the appropriate number of future nominations that a site disposal will generate. • Satisfaction that any selected small developer is committed and resourced to work with the council to minimise any impacts of development and future management on the council's existing tenants and leaseholders. • Satisfaction that a small developer is not profiting excessively from the council's site disposal (this should be mitigated through the GLA's standard contract documentation) • Comfort that the council's procurement requirements are being satisfied by utilising the GLA's Small Sites programme.
	<p>Recommendation - Suitable route for any disposal of small sites</p>

6.2	Disposal directly to RPs
6.2.1	Prior to the creation of the council's new build programme, surplus sites were often disposed of to RPs to develop affordable housing.
6.2.2	Sites were sold at a discounted price to increase the proportion of affordable homes delivered on the sites. The discount was calculated by a formula that valued each nomination the council would receive over subsequent years. The formula is still in existence and need updating in terms of the current financial value to the council of each nomination it would receive, if it is to be reused.
6.2.3	Recommendation - Suitable route for any disposal of small sites
6.3	Disposal by auction to provide funding to the council's New Build Programme
6.3.2	This would be a straight forward disposal via auction to maximise the receipt to directly increase the proportion of affordable housing delivered in the New Build Programme. For the limited number of sites which would involve the demolition of current housing stock, this would require the completion of a small decant programme prior to marketing.
6.3.3	Recommendation - Suitable route for any disposal of small sites
6.4	Package up deliverable sites for Contractors on New Contractor Framework
6.4.1	The council's new Contractors Framework is due to become available during early 2020. Sites where it would be feasible for the NBT to develop in a future programme could be packaged up as a single contract to make more attractive through potentially reducing the cost of project management on a per-unit basis.
6.4.2	Recommendation – due to the very small number of sites suitable for disposal this would not be a viable route.
6.5	Remove sites from active consideration, realising as part of future programmes
	Sites which are not considered able to support viable development, given their location or the negative impact that their development would have on estate residents, could be removed from active consideration. The potential for development could then be realised if wider estate regeneration or redevelopment becomes necessary at a future date, or when the NBT has sufficient resources to address the smaller sites.
7.	Recommendations
7.1	The recommendations are:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To approve the approach used to establish whether an individual site should be developed. • To review the preferred route to delivery of each opportunity identified, specifically those highlighted as suitable for 3rd party delivery in Section 7. • Agree the matrix as a suitable mechanism for identifying development potential of small sites and whether that development should be undertaken internally or externally.
Report Authors:	
	Stephen Nash – New Homes Development Programme Manager
	Jonathan Fitch – New Homes Funding and Acquisitions Manager

This page is intentionally left blank



Housing Directorate

222 Upper Street, London, N1 1XR

Report of: Executive Member for Housing & Development

Meeting of	Date:	Ward(s):
Housing Scrutiny Committee	23 rd July 2020	All

Delete as appropriate	Exempt	Non-exempt
-----------------------	--------	------------

SUBJECT: QUARTERLY REVIEW OF HOUSING PERFORMANCE (Q4 2019/20)

1. Synopsis

- 1.1. Each year the council agrees a set of performance indicators and targets, which, collectively, help us to monitor progress in delivering corporate priorities and working towards our goal of making Islington a fairer place to live and work.
- 1.2. Progress is reported on a Quarterly basis through the council's scrutiny function to challenge performance where necessary and to ensure accountability to residents.
- 1.3. At the end of 2019/20, 4 of the 13 of the Housing performance indicators were on target or better than target, with homelessness and repairs services performing well. Delays due to Brexit uncertainty affected the new build programme and developer housing market, with the pandemic also affecting the handover of a scheme due in March 20. Housing register moves were slightly off target but level with last year. The rise in universal credit related rent arrears is a concern and will be a focus for the year ahead.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. To note progress to the end of 2019/20 against key performance indicators falling within the remit of the Housing Scrutiny Committee

3. Background

- 3.1. The council routinely monitors a wide range of performance measures to ensure that the services it delivers are effective, respond to the needs of residents and offer good quality and value for money.

4. Quarter 4 update on Housing performance

4.1. This report contains an update on Housing indicators at the end of Quarter 4:

Objective	PI No.	Indicator	Frequency	Q4 Actual	Target 2019/20	On/Off target	Same point last year	Better than last year
<i>Increase supply of and access to suitable affordable homes</i>	H1	Number of genuinely affordable new homes (social rented or shared ownership) completed by the Council	Q	63	96	Off	60	Yes
	H2	Number of genuinely affordable new homes (social rented or shared ownership) completed by Developers*	Q	89	315	unknown	164	No
	H3	Number of planning permissions agreed for new council housing	Q	0	3	Off	80	No
	H4	Total number of new council homes (net growth taking into account new homes and homes sold through right to buy)	Q	28	41	Off	54	No
	H5	Number of severely overcrowded households assisted to relieve their overcrowding	M	144	150	Off	133	Yes
	H6	Number of under-occupied households that have downsized	M	152	160	Off	161	No
<i>Ensure effective management of council housing stock</i>	H7	Percentage of LBI repairs fixed first time	M	87.7%	85.0%	On	81.2%	Yes
	H8	Major works open over three months as a % of Partners' total completed major works repairs	Q	17.0%	15.0%	Off	18.0%	Yes
	H9	Rent arrears as a proportion of the rent roll - LBI	M	3.9%	3.75%	Off	2.9%	No
	H10	Rent arrears as a proportion of the rent roll - Partner properties	M	3.7%	3.25%	Off	2.9%	No
<i>Reduce homelessness</i>	H11	Number of households accepted as homeless	M	348	400	On	203	No
	H12	Number of households in nightly-booked temporary accommodation	M	316	350	On	390	Yes
	H13	Number of street homeless supported into accommodation*	Q	105	45	On	39	Yes

Note: H8, H9, H10, H12 are end of month snapshots.

* Collection of these indicators have been paused due to Covid-19. Figures presented are the end of Q3 figures.

Increase supply of and access to affordable housing

- 4.2. Twenty-four affordable new homes were completed this quarter.
- 4.3. This leaves our end of year position slightly behind the target. This is due to two schemes (Redbrick and Belfont) falling behind schedule due to delays with sub-contractors. Redbrick handover (55 units due in March) was delayed because of the Covid19 pandemic. However, half of the Kings Square development was handed over ahead of schedule, which alleviated this to some extent.
- 4.4. We have not received the figure from external developers on the number of genuinely affordable new homes completed by developers in Q4. At the end of Q3 the figure was ahead of the Q3 target.
- 4.5. No planning permissions were agreed for new Council housing. This indicator ends the year slightly below the target set at the start of the year, of completing planning permission for three new homes by

the end of the year. This scheme is Mersey Garages, which has required redesign work following deferral at Planning Committee. The revised scheme is expected back at Committee in Quarter 1 of 2020/21.

- 4.6. The net growth of council homes this quarter was 14 (H4). This is below the target for the year, as a result of the delays described in the previous indicators.
- 4.7. 33 severely over-crowded households were assisted to relieve their overcrowding this quarter, giving an end of year total of 144, slightly below the end of year target, but an improvement on last year's achievements.
- 4.8. 152 under-occupying households have been supported to downsize this year, including 34 in the past quarter. This is slightly below the target for the year.

Effective management of council housing stock

Housing Repairs

- 4.9. Repairs performance has continued to improve, from 87.4% at the end of the previous quarter to 87.7% at the end of this quarter. This is significantly better than the same point last year, where first time fixes were at 81.2%.

Partners' Repairs

- 4.10. Major repairs are more complex repairs carried out by Partners often of higher value and are often delayed by requirements such as Leaseholder consultations, scaffolding works, building control consultation and the issue of party wall notices. It is not possible to deliver 100% of major repairs within the 3 months due to statutory timescales, however Partners aim to keep the number of works exceeding 3 months to a minimum and monitor those exceeding the 3-month period. These repairs are monitored separately as they are not included in the measure of the resident satisfaction for day-to-day repairs.
- 4.11. At present, 17.0% (16 out of 90) of major works have been open for more than three months.
- 4.12. The remaining repairs are delayed due to a range of reasons, including:
Works in progress; Access issues; Authorisation; Section 20 consultation/challenge process; Building Control/Conservation/Planning; Third Party delay/Legal process/Disrepair/party wall and utility companies' issues; Temporary move/decant required; Works completed but awaiting post inspections.

Rent Income Collection

- 4.13. Rent arrears have continued to rise, from 3.6% of the total rent roll at the end of December 2019 to 3.9% at the end of March. This is slightly above the target for this year.
- 4.14. This is a continued consequence of the switch over to Universal Credit.
- 4.15. The switch over to Universal Credit is also affecting Partners rent collection; however, the increase in their rent arrears has been smaller so far. Partners' collection needs to track that of the council in order to avoid performance penalties. Partners have performed well throughout this period.

Reduce homelessness

- 4.16. The number of households accepted as homeless is better than the profiled target.
- 4.17. The current figure of 348 is above the equivalent position last year, which is as expected given that the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act last April makes the process of working with cases longer.
- 4.18. We have seen an increase in the number of households in temporary accommodation since the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act in April 2018. The length of stay in temporary accommodation has increased due to the Act's requirements in terms of deferred decision-making and the extra liaison required.
- 4.19. However, the team has successfully worked to reduce the number of households in nightly-booked accommodation. This indicator is down from 336 at the end of June 2019 to 316 at the end of September. This is ahead of the end of year target.
- 4.20. The collection of the street homeless indicator by CHAIN has been paused this quarter, due to Covid-19. However, the team has done a great deal of work to house rough sleepers in temporary accommodation.

Appendices: None

Background papers: None

Final Report Clearance:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Holden', written over a faint dotted line.

Signed by

DATE 13/07/20

Corporate Director of Housing

Report collated by: David Clifford, Principal Public Health Intelligence Specialist, Public Health, with input from relevant leads in the Housing Directorates.

This page is intentionally left blank

HOUSING ON SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

SCRUTINY TOPICS AND WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21

23 JULY 2020

- 1) Mini -Scrutiny Review 2019/20: Private Rented Sector – Witness Evidence (Safer Renting & Renters Rights London)
- 2) Main Scrutiny Review 2019/20: Capital Works – Draft Recommendations
- 3) Review of the Council’s New Build Programme – 12 month report back
- 4) Quarterly Review of Housing Performance Report (Q4 2019/2020)
- 5) Work Programme 2020/21

8 SEPTEMBER 2020

- 1) Mini -Scrutiny Review 2019/20: Private Rented Sector – Draft Recommendations
- 2) Main Scrutiny Review 2019/20: Capital Works – Final Report and Recommendations Witness
- 3) Executive Member Annual Report (2019/2020)
- 4) Work Programme 2020/2021

13 OCTOBER 2020

- 1) Mini -Scrutiny Review 2019/20: Private Rented Sector - Final Report and Recommendations
- 2) Work Programme 2020/2021

23 NOVEMBER 2020

- 1) Work Programme 2020/2021

12 JANUARY 2021

- 1) Work Programme 2020/2021

19 APRIL 2021

- 1) Work Programme 20220/2021

28 JUNE 2021

1) Work Programme 2020/2021