HOUSING STOCK AND HOUSING NEED TASK GROUP – 24 MAY 2012

The meeting of the Housing Stock and Housing Need Task Group will be held at 5.30pm on Thursday 24 May 2012 in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Mrs Watson
Chairman

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes
   To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2012.

2. Apologies
   To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest
   To receive declarations of:
   (a) personal interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

   (b) prejudicial interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

   (c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a prejudicial interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a personal interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.
4. Review Report – to agree the review report, including consideration of resource requirements to implement the action plan.

5. Shortlist of schemes with potential for re-designation (two papers attached).

**PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION**

There is no business involving exempt information to be transacted.

**Membership of the Task Group:**

Councillors Coles, Ms Edwards, G Francis, Gillias, Mahoney, Ms Robbins, Roodhouse, Srivastava and Mrs Watson (Chairman)

*If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Veronika Beckova, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail veronika.beckova@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.*

*If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.*
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1. RECOMMENDATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Selective redesignation of council housing stock be carried out to improve fairness for younger single people, in line with the appended action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Size rules be amended to enable single people and small families to bid for larger properties than those for which they are currently eligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>An element of housing for younger single people be included in the Pettiver Crescent redevelopment (already implemented).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discussions be held with preferred partners with the aim of ensuring that that a larger proportion of properties on new-build schemes are available to younger single people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explicit consideration be given for inclusion of housing for younger single people in all future new-build schemes that include an element of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Task Group

Resources for actions 1-6 in Appendix 1 need to be agreed and will be discussed at the meeting.

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

In March 2011 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board placed this review in the Customer and Partnerships Committee’s 2011/12 work programme. The Head of Housing had suggested the subject as a response to changes in the profile of the council’s housing stock and the changing landscape of housing need.

2.2 The one-page strategy

Customer and Partnerships Committee agreed a one-page strategy on 23 June 2011.

The ‘one-page strategy’ is the name given to the scoping document for the review. It defines the task and the improvements being aimed for and how these are going to be achieved. The review’s one-page strategy, received by the task group on 12 July 2011, is as follows:

What is the broad topic area?
Housing stock and housing need

What is the specific topic area?
To consider how well RBC’s housing stock meets the needs of different groups of people and make recommendations on how to rectify any mismatch. This review is not about allocation criteria: it is
about whether all household groups (for example, single people under 60) are getting a fair deal in relation to the designation of the housing stock.

What is the ambition of the review?

For Rugby’s housing stock to meet housing need fairly without unbalancing any neighbourhood.

How well do we perform at the moment?

There appears to be a balance in favour of older people and an unjustifiable shortage of accommodation for people without children below the age of 60.

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?

Housing associations operating locally. The information about housing applicants that is required should be available from data that is already held.

What other help do we need?

Intelligence from housing research combined with data already in the council’s possession is likely to be sufficient to meet the information needs of the group. There will be issues of competing pressures on the time of officers.

How long should it take?

The review will be in two stages:

1. What does ‘fair’ or ‘fairer’ look like? Where are we now?
2. How fair is it possible to get, and how do we get there?

The first meeting of the task group will draw up a timetable of work, which is likely to fill the whole of the 2011/12 municipal year.

What will be the outcome?

- An understanding of the profile of groups living in the council’s stock
- An understanding of the profile of groups who need housing
- An assessment of whether the way in which the stock is used is fair to the various groups
- Some recommendations about whether some of the stock should be let to different client groups than the ones to whom it is let now. If so, some sense of over what period of time this change should take place and to what degree should rebalancing take place.

2.3 Alignment with the Corporate Strategy

The review relates to the following corporate priorities:

*Priority 1.2: Facilitate the provision and upkeep of good quality housing to meet local needs and to cater for the growth of Rugby.*
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fact-finding

To develop the evidence base for the review, the task group considered a wide range of data with a view to identifying themes. This included analysis of the housing stock, tenants and the waiting list, both across the whole borough and relating to particular neighbourhoods.

3.2 Background papers

The task group papers for this review can be found online at www.rugby.gov.uk, clicking on agendas, reports and minutes near the foot of the page and then selecting all committees. The minutes provide an account of discussions that went beyond the scope of this report but which provided useful contextual information.

During the course of the review, the task group has built up a body of statistical evidence, which is attached in the Information Digest at Appendix 2.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Fairness

As the ambition of the review is for Rugby’s housing stock to meet housing need fairly, it is important to define fairness. The task group has considered some of the factors that characterise a mismatch between housing need and the designation of council housing stock. These include the following:

4.1.1 The level of unmet housing need in different age groups

It is apparent that the availability of sheltered stock and of one-bed general needs housing is inversely proportional to the demand for each of these types of accommodation. Approximately one third of the housing stock is sheltered and only 8% of the stock is one-bed\(^1\) general needs accommodation. In June 2011, out of 1,025 live applicants registered on UChoose:

- 434 (42%) were aged 16-25
- 159 (15%) were aged 56-65

But from April-June 2011, the following lets were made:

- 7 one-bed general needs flats
- 15 two-bed general needs flats

---

\(^1\) The conventional abbreviation of bedroom to bed is used in this report, so, for example, a two-bed flat is a flat with two bedrooms.
• 33 one-bed sheltered flats
• 1 two-bed sheltered flat

During this period, advertised sheltered one-bed flats exceeded advertised one-bed general needs flats by a ratio of more than four to one.

4.1.2 Age of council housing

Most of Rugby’s council housing was built at a time when the greatest unmet need was for housing for families and older people.

4.1.3 The effect of the Right to Buy on the stock profile

The Right to Buy has had the effect of reducing the amount of general needs family housing. Sheltered housing is excluded from the Right to Buy and has therefore become a disproportionately large part of the housing stock.

4.1.4 The increase in void times in different types of property

Average monthly void days have been increasing (see Part 4.5 of the Information Digest) and the average target void time of 28 days has not been met.

4.1.5 Hard-to-let properties

Hard-to-let properties recorded in 2010/11 are listed in Part 2 of the Information Digest.

4.1.6 Location

Single-person accommodation is almost non-existent in rural areas, and is instead concentrated mainly in multi-storey blocks in the town.

Part 3 of the Information Digest shows the geographical distribution of the council stock.

4.1.7 Size of property

Aspirations – linked to new practical considerations – have changed. Those for whom one-bed accommodation would once have been considered acceptable now aspire to two bedrooms to cater for visitors, family, medical needs and belongings.

4.1.8 A definition of fairness

The factors listed above provide a picture of how unfairness manifests itself. By deduction from this, the task group has defined fairness as:

• giving _people_ in _housing_ need _equal_ access to _social_ _housing_ regardless of _age_ and _location_; _and_

• _meeting_ _people’s_ _housing_ _aspirations_ including access to _a_ _variety_ of _property_ _types, sizes_ and _locations_, _e.g_ _rural_ _areas_ and _high_ _demand_ _area_
4.2 Council housing stock

The council has 3,944 properties, of which 1,444 are sheltered.
The above chart gives a not entirely realistic picture of the actual use of sheltered housing because, as a result of relatively low demand from the 60+ age group for which it was built, 17% of sheltered housing is tenanted by someone between the age of 50 and 59. A truer picture is therefore shown by the following adjusted chart showing actual use:
4.3 How fair is the present designation of stock?

There is a mismatch between the age distribution of applicants, the population of the whole borough and existing council tenants. A degree of mismatch is to be expected as yesterday’s younger applicants become today’s long-standing tenants. Moreover, many of those who apply during their twenties will eventually find housing in the private sector, and so the demand will naturally tail off.

The mismatch between the age distribution of current tenants and current applicants does not provide conclusive evidence of unfairness in the treatment of younger applicants. More persuasive evidence is provided by a comparison of the demand for certain types of property with the profile of the council housing stock. Whether the profile is for the “as built” purpose of the property or for the actual use (recognising that some sheltered housing is now let to 50-59 year olds) this shows significant discrepancies between the type of housing that is in demand and the quantities of such housing in the housing stock.

This is particularly marked in the case of single-bed accommodation for the under-sixties, where demand is high compared with the stock level. On the other hand, in the case of sheltered housing for the over-sixties and general three-bed accommodation, demand is lower compared with the stock level.
This still does not give the full picture because different types of housing may become available for reletting at different rates. The chart below shows a comparison of a breakdown of actual lettings compared with the housing register.
4.4 A case study – Lever Road, Hillmorton

The Task Group has explored the options for selecting areas where council housing may lend itself to redesignation.

There are 253 sheltered properties allocated to single people of retirement age in Hillmorton and no properties for single people under retirement age. Lever Road is not in high demand and provides an example of the type of development where some units could be considered for redesignation for younger single people. It is important to underline here that no decision has been taken in respect of this scheme: the case study just highlights some of the issues. The location map for this is on page 3 of the Information Digest.

Two and three storey blocks of sheltered flats with mixed occupancy.

26 two-bed flats
17 one-bed flats

Two hard-to-let flats during the year (on basis of time taken to relet).

Hilly area

Access to most blocks by steep paved staircase.
4.5 Size entitlement rules

Single people and couples who do not have 50% access to children from a previous relationship are not able to bid for properties with an additional bedroom. A relaxation of this aspect of the allocations policy might help to reduce this element of unfairness.

This is not simply a matter of changing the eligibility rules, as a fairly complex combination of factors needs to be considered. These factors include the following:

- Consideration of the implications of the Welfare Reform Act and how these can be managed, including pre-signup information and the potential for affordability assessments of applicants.
- Appraisal of two-bed stock to identify properties that single people and couples should and should not be enabled to bid for.
- Appraisal of three-bed stock to identify properties in which smaller families should and should not be able to express interest.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The task group has drawn the following conclusions from the evidence:

5.1 All property types are in demand
5.2 We cannot meet all needs
5.3 Single people aged 50-59 have had their options improved by redesignation of sheltered housing that was previously only for the over-60s, which council policy allows where there is no demand from the over-60s
5.4 Single people younger than 50 are the least well catered-for client group
5.5 The following options are available for dealing with unfairness

5.5.1 Redesignate some less popular sheltered stock for younger single people.

*The preparation of a shortlist of developments for possible redesignation or partial redesignation has been carried out. This will need to be subject to consultation with potentially affected tenants. Redesignation should be carried out gradually and its effects monitored and assessed before and if any larger scale redesignation takes place.*

5.5.2 Build new housing for single people

*An element of housing for younger single people has been included in the specification for the Pettiver Crescent redevelopment. Discussions could take place with preferred partners to explore the possibility of opening a larger...*
number of properties on new-build schemes to younger people. Explicit consideration should also be given to the options for younger single people in the affordable housing element within all future new-build developments.

5.5.3 Amend size rules to allow single people to compete for some larger accommodation

Consideration of amendment of the size rules should be given to offer greater flexibility and fairness to younger single people and small families.

5.5.4 Combination of the above
### Appendix 1 – Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations and Actions</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Selective redesignation of council housing stock be carried out to improve fairness for</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Regeneration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Options Team Leader</strong></td>
<td>20/08/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>younger single people.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 <strong>Prepare shortlist of schemes that could in principle be redesignated or part-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>redesignated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 <strong>Consult with potentially affected tenants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Regeneration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tenant Involvement Officer</strong></td>
<td>30/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 <strong>Begin pilot redesignations in selected schemes.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Regeneration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Options Team Leader</strong></td>
<td>01/01/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 <strong>Monitor impact of redesignations and report back to Cabinet.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Regeneration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Service Team Leaders</strong></td>
<td>30/08/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager/ Operational Housing Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. **Size rules be amended to enable single people and small families to bid for larger **</td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Regeneration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Options Team Leader</strong></td>
<td>19/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>properties than those for which they are currently eligible.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations and Actions</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Agree proposed revisions to size rules.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>30/09/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Seek Cabinet approval for a revised allocations policy.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>30/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  An element of housing for younger single people be included in the Pettiver Crescent</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Discussions be held with preferred partners to ensure that a larger proportion of</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Officer</td>
<td>31/04/14</td>
<td>Quarterly discussion to take place. Twice-yearly Covalent report to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>properties on new-build schemes are available to younger single people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>confirm that these have taken place. Distant due date set for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completion, though it may be expected to continue thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Explicit consideration be given for inclusion of housing for younger single people in</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Officer</td>
<td>31/04/14</td>
<td>Twice-yearly Covalent report – to provide note on how this has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all future new-build schemes that include an element of affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implemented. Distant due date set for completion, though it may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expected to continue thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations and Actions</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Report to Cabinet on a broader evaluation of the impact of the changes</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager/</td>
<td></td>
<td>31/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Housing Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Selective redesignation of council housing stock be carried out to improve fairness for younger single people, in line with the appended action plan.

2. Size rules be amended to enable single people and small families to bid for larger properties than those for which they are currently eligible.

3. An element of housing for younger single people be included in the Pettiver Crescent redevelopment (already implemented).

4. Discussions be held with preferred partners with the aim of ensuring that that a larger proportion of properties on new-build schemes are available to younger single people.

5. Explicit consideration be given for inclusion of housing for younger single people in all future new-build schemes that include an element of affordable housing.

Note to Task Group

Resources for actions 1-6 in Appendix 1 need to be agreed and will be discussed at the meeting.

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

In March 2011 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board placed this review in the Customer and Partnerships Committee’s 2011/12 work programme. The Head of Housing had suggested the subject as a response to changes in the profile of the council’s housing stock and the changing landscape of housing need.

2.2 The one-page strategy

Customer and Partnerships Committee agreed a one-page strategy on 23 June 2011.

The ‘one-page strategy’ is the name given to the scoping document for the review. It defines the task and the improvements being aimed for and how these are going to be achieved. The review’s one-page strategy, received by the task group on 12 July 2011, is as follows:

What is the broad topic area?
Housing stock and housing need

What is the specific topic area?
To consider how well RBC’s housing stock meets the needs of different groups of people and make recommendations on how to rectify any mismatch. This review is not about allocation criteria: it is
about whether all household groups (for example, single people under 60) are getting a fair deal in relation to the designation of the housing stock.

What is the ambition of the review?
For Rugby’s housing stock to meet housing need fairly without unbalancing any neighbourhood.

How well do we perform at the moment?
There appears to be a balance in favour of older people and an unjustifiable shortage of accommodation for people without children below the age of 60.

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?
Housing associations operating locally. The information about housing applicants that is required should be available from data that is already held.

What other help do we need?
Intelligence from housing research combined with data already in the council’s possession is likely to be sufficient to meet the information needs of the group. There will be issues of competing pressures on the time of officers.

How long should it take?
The review will be in two stages:
1. What does ‘fair’ or ‘fairer’ look like? Where are we now?
2. How fair is it possible to get, and how do we get there?

The first meeting of the task group will draw up a timetable of work, which is likely to fill the whole of the 2011/12 municipal year.

What will be the outcome?

- An understanding of the profile of groups living in the council’s stock
- An understanding of the profile of groups who need housing
- An assessment of whether the way in which the stock is used is fair to the various groups
- Some recommendations about whether some of the stock should be let to different client groups than the ones to whom it is let now. If so, some sense of over what period of time this change should take place and to what degree should rebalancing take place.

2.3 Alignment with the Corporate Strategy

The review relates to the following corporate priorities:

*Priority 1.2: Facilitate the provision and upkeep of good quality housing to meet local needs and to cater for the growth of Rugby.*
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fact-finding

To develop the evidence base for the review, the task group considered a wide range of data with a view to identifying themes. This included analysis of the housing stock, tenants and the waiting list, both across the whole borough and relating to particular neighbourhoods.

3.2 Background papers

The task group papers for this review can be found online at www.rugby.gov.uk, clicking on agendas, reports and minutes near the foot of the page and then selecting all committees. The minutes provide an account of discussions that went beyond the scope of this report but which provided useful contextual information.

During the course of the review, the task group has built up a body of statistical evidence, which is attached in the Information Digest at Appendix 2.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Fairness

As the ambition of the review is for Rugby’s housing stock to meet housing need fairly, it is important to define fairness. The task group has considered some of the factors that characterise a mismatch between housing need and the designation of council housing stock. These include the following:

4.1.1 The level of unmet housing need in different age groups

It is apparent that the availability of sheltered stock and of one-bed general needs housing is inversely proportional to the demand for each of these types of accommodation. Approximately one third of the housing stock is sheltered and only 8% of the stock is one-bed1 general needs accommodation. In June 2011, out of 1,025 live applicants registered on UChoose:

- 434 (42%) were aged 16-25
- 159 (15%) were aged 56-65

But from April-June 2011, the following lets were made:

- 7 one-bed general needs flats
- 15 two-bed general needs flats

---

1 The conventional abbreviation of bedroom to bed is used in this report, so, for example, a two-bed flat is a flat with two bedrooms.
• 33 one-bed sheltered flats
• 1 two-bed sheltered flat

During this period, advertised sheltered one-bed flats exceeded advertised one-bed general needs flats by a ratio of more than four to one.

4.1.2 Age of council housing

Most of Rugby’s council housing was built at a time when the greatest unmet need was for housing for families and older people.

4.1.3 The effect of the Right to Buy on the stock profile

The Right to Buy has had the effect of reducing the amount of general needs family housing. Sheltered housing is excluded from the Right to Buy and has therefore become a disproportionately large part of the housing stock.

4.1.4 The increase in void times in different types of property

Average monthly void days have been increasing (see Part 4.5 of the Information Digest) and the average target void time of 28 days has not been met.

4.1.5 Hard-to-let properties

Hard-to-let properties recorded in 2010/11 are listed in Part 2 of the Information Digest.

4.1.6 Location

Single-person accommodation is almost non-existent in rural areas, and is instead concentrated mainly in multi-storey blocks in the town.

Part 3 of the Information Digest shows the geographical distribution of the council stock.

4.1.7 Size of property

Aspirations – linked to new practical considerations – have changed. Those for whom one-bed accommodation would once have been considered acceptable now aspire to two bedrooms to cater for visitors, family, medical needs and belongings.

4.1.8 A definition of fairness

The factors listed above provide a picture of how unfairness manifests itself. By deduction from this, the task group has defined fairness as:

• giving people in housing need equal access to social housing regardless of age and location; and

• meeting people’s housing aspirations including access to a variety of property types, sizes and locations, eg rural areas and high demand area
4.2 Council housing stock

The council has 3,944 properties, of which 1,444 are sheltered.
The above chart gives a not entirely realistic picture of the actual use of sheltered housing because, as a result of relatively low demand from the 60+ age group for which it was built, 17% of sheltered housing is tenanted by someone between the age of 50 and 59. A truer picture is therefore shown by the following adjusted chart showing actual use:
4.3 How fair is the present designation of stock?

There is a mismatch between the age distribution of applicants, the population of the whole borough and existing council tenants. A degree of mismatch is to be expected as yesterday’s younger applicants become today’s long-standing tenants. Moreover, many of those who apply during their twenties will eventually find housing in the private sector, and so the demand will naturally tail off.

![Various age distributions compared](image)

The mismatch between the age distribution of current tenants and current applicants does not provide conclusive evidence of unfairness in the treatment of younger applicants. More persuasive evidence is provided by a comparison of the demand for certain types of property with the profile of the council housing stock. Whether the profile is for the “as built” purpose of the property or for the actual use (recognising that some sheltered housing is now let to 50-59 year olds) this shows significant discrepancies between the type of housing that is in demand and the quantities of such housing in the housing stock.

This is particularly marked in the case of single-bed accommodation for the under-sixties, where demand is high compared with the stock level. On the other hand, in the case of sheltered housing for the over-sixties and general three-bed accommodation, demand is lower compared with the stock level.
This still does not give the full picture because different types of housing may become available for reletting at different rates. The chart below shows a comparison of a breakdown of actual lettings compared with the housing register.
4.4  A case study – Lever Road, Hillmorton

The Task Group has explored the options for selecting areas where council housing may lend itself to redesignation.

There are 253 sheltered properties allocated to single people of retirement age in Hillmorton and no properties for single people under retirement age. Lever Road is not in high demand and provides an example of the type of development where some units could be considered for redesignation for younger single people. It is important to underline here that no decision has been taken in respect of this scheme: the case study just highlights some of the issues. The location map for this is on page 3 of the Information Digest.

Two and three storey blocks of sheltered flats with mixed occupancy.

26 two-bed flats
17 one-bed flats

Two hard-to-let flats during the year (on basis of time taken to relet).

Hilly area

Access to most blocks by steep paved staircase.
4.5 Size entitlement rules

Single people and couples who do not have 50% access to children from a previous relationship are not able to bid for properties with an additional bedroom. A relaxation of this aspect of the allocations policy might help to reduce this element of unfairness.

This is not simply a matter of changing the eligibility rules, as a fairly complex combination of factors needs to be considered. These factors include the following:

- Consideration of the implications of the Welfare Reform Act and how these can be managed, including pre-signup information and the potential for affordability assessments of applicants.

- Appraisal of two-bed stock to identify properties that single people and couples should and should not be enabled to bid for.

- Appraisal of three-bed stock to identify properties in which smaller families should and should not be able to express interest.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The task group has drawn the following conclusions from the evidence:

5.1 All property types are in demand

5.2 We cannot meet all needs

5.3 Single people aged 50-59 have had their options improved by redesignation of sheltered housing that was previously only for the over-60s, which council policy allows where there is no demand from the over-60s

5.4 Single people younger than 50 are the least well catered-for client group

5.5 The following options are available for dealing with unfairness

5.5.1 Redesignate some less popular sheltered stock for younger single people.

*The preparation of a shortlist of developments for possible redesignation or partial redesignation has been carried out. This will need to be subject to consultation with potentially affected tenants. Redesignation should be carried out gradually and its effects monitored and assessed before and if any larger scale redesignation takes place.*

5.5.2 Build new housing for single people

*An element of housing for younger single people has been included in the specification for the Pettiver Crescent redevelopment. Discussions could take place with preferred partners to explore the possibility of opening a larger*
number of properties on new-build schemes to younger people. Explicit consideration should also be given to the options for younger single people in the affordable housing element within all future new-build developments.

5.5.3 Amend size rules to allow single people to compete for some larger accommodation

Consideration of amendment of the size rules should be given to offer greater flexibility and fairness to younger single people and small families.

5.5.4 Combination of the above
### Appendix 1 – Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations and Actions</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selective redesignation of council housing stock be carried out to improve fairness for younger single people.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>20/08/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Prepare shortlist of schemes that could in principle be redesignated or part-redesignated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Consult with potentially affected tenants</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Tenant Involvement Officer</td>
<td>30/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Begin pilot redesignations in selected schemes.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>01/01/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Monitor impact of redesignations and report back to Cabinet.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager/Operational Housing Manager</td>
<td>Housing Service Team Leaders</td>
<td>30/08/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Size rules be amended to enable single people and small families to bid for larger properties than those for which they are currently eligible.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>19/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations and Actions</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> Agree proposed revisions to size rules.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>30/09/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> Seek Cabinet approval for a revised allocations policy.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing Options Team Leader</td>
<td>30/11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> An element of housing for younger single people be included in the Pettiver Crescent redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Discussions be held with preferred partners to ensure that a larger proportion of properties on new-build schemes are available to younger single people</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Officer</td>
<td>31/04/14</td>
<td>Quarterly discussion to take place. Twice-yearly Covalent report to confirm that these have taken place. Distant due date set for completion, though it may be expected to continue thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Explicit consideration be given for inclusion of housing for younger single people in all future new-build schemes that include an element of affordable housing.</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Officer</td>
<td>31/04/14</td>
<td>Twice-yearly Covalent report – to provide note on how this has been implemented. Distant due date set for completion, though it may be expected to continue thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations and Actions</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Report to Cabinet on a broader evaluation of the impact of the changes</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Regeneration Manager/ Operational Housing Manager</td>
<td>31/01/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Stock and Housing Need Task Group

Shortlist of schemes with potential for re-designation

SCHEMES 1 TO 4

The following schemes, currently in use for sheltered housing, have been identified as having potential for re-designation for general needs having taken into account the following factors:

- their location, design, accessibility and parking provision are not particularly well-suited to the needs of older people;
- the flats within the schemes have begun to show signs of becoming difficult to let;
- some of the flats within the schemes have already been let to people younger than 60.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lawford Road/Victoria Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rounds Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clifton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deepmore Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jackson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Featherbed Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lever Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coton Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further details of schemes 1 to 4 are set out on the following pages. None of the schemes has a lift or a communal room.

Details of schemes 5 to 8 are contained in a separate document.
**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 12 flats, all one-bedroomed, on the ground and first floor.

- Access on either side of the scheme is via a gradient and one side also has a stepped entrance as shown above.

- The journey into town is around one mile long and uphill although there is a bus route.

- There is limited on-site parking.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has three tenants younger than 60.

- There have been two vacancies in the last two years.

- These attracted interest from one and five applicants respectively.

- They were let to applicants in the lower priority bands 3 and 4.
SCHEME 2 – ROUNDS GARDENS

**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 32 flats, all one-bedroomed, on the ground and first floor in two long blocks of 16 each.

- The blocks are located next to Rounds Gardens multi-storey flats.

- Access into town is by a steep hill although there is a bus stop nearby.

- There are occasional parking problems caused by non-residents leaving their cars and going shopping.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has eleven tenants younger than 60.

- There have been ten vacancies in the last two years.

- These vacancies attracted between 1 and 7 interested applicants.

- Seven of the ten vacancies were let to applicants in the lower priority bands 3 and 4.
SCHEME 3 – CLIFTON ROAD

**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 8 flats, all one-bedroomed, on the ground and first floor.

- The block is located next to Biart Place multi-storey flats and is adjacent to a pub.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has three tenants younger than 60.

- There have been three vacancies in the last two years.

- These vacancies attracted one, three and five interested applicants respectively.

- Two of the properties were let to applicants in band 2 and one was let to an applicant in the lowest priority band 4.
**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 18 flats, all one-bedroomed in three blocks. Two of the blocks have a ground and first floor while the third has four storeys as the top two floors are general needs maisonettes.

- The blocks are some distance from shops and local amenities although they are on a bus route.

- The scheme is about 2 miles from town.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has six tenants younger than 60.

- There have been eight vacancies in the last two years.

- These vacancies attracted between 1 and 5 interested applicants.

- Five of the eight were let to applicants in band 3 (low priority) or band 4 (no priority).
Housing Stock and Housing Need Task Group

Shortlist of schemes with potential for re-designation

SCHEMES 5 TO 8

The following schemes, currently in use for sheltered housing, have been identified as having potential for re-designation for general needs having taken into account the following factors:

- their location, design, accessibility and parking provision are not particularly well-suited to the needs of older people;
- the flats within the schemes have begun to show signs of becoming difficult to let;
- some of the flats within the schemes have already been let to people younger than 60.

1. Lawford Road/Victoria Street
2. Rounds Gardens
3. Clifton Road
4. Deepmore Road
5. Jackson Road
6. Featherbed Lane
7. Lever Road
8. Coton Road

Details of schemes 1 to 4 are contained in a separate document.

Details of schemes 5 to 8 are set out on the following pages. Details of each scheme are set out separately with photographs of the actual blocks of flats and scheme specific descriptions and statistics. These are followed by some pictures of the wider environment around the blocks of flats.

All of these schemes are in close proximity to each other. They are approximately two and a half miles from the town centre in a very hilly area and the walk to the local shops is generally hilly too. None of these schemes has a lift or a communal room.
SCHEME 5 – JACKSON ROAD

**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 8 one-bedroom sheltered flats, on the ground and first floor, in a single block.

- There is a stepped access to the front of the scheme, ramped accesses at both ends and only on-street parking.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has one tenant younger than 60, albeit a joint tenant with the other tenant being aged over 60.

- There has been one vacancy in the last two years.

- The vacancy attracted 2 interested applicants and was let to a band 2 case.
SCHEME 6 – FEATHERBED LANE

**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 2 blocks: one 8 unit block of one-bedroom ground and first floor sheltered flats; and one 7 unit block of five one-bedroom sheltered flats and two general needs two-bedroom maisonettes.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has two tenants younger than 60.
- There have been three vacancies in the last two years.
- These vacancies attracted two, two and three interested applicants respectively.
- Two of the vacancies were let to applicants in band 2 and one was let to an applicant in band 4.
SCHEME 7a – COTON ROAD (numbers 2 – 32 even)

**Scheme description**

- The scheme consists of 2 eight-unit blocks of one-bedroom ground and first floor flats.

**Key statistics**

- The scheme has three tenants younger than 60.

- There have been three vacancies in the last two years.

- These vacancies attracted one, two and two interested applicants respectively.

- Two of the vacancies were let to applicants in band 4 and the other was let to an applicant in band 1.
**Scheme description**

- Flats 1-17 is a four storey block consisting of 6 one-bed sheltered flats on the ground and first floor and 3 general needs maisonettes on the upper floors.

- Flats 19-37 is similar to the above except that it has an additional “basement” one-bed sheltered flat.

- Flats 64-74 is a three-storey block of 6 flats, with one “side” having 3 two-bed general needs flats and the other having 3 one-bed sheltered flats.

**Key statistics**

- 4 out of 6 tenants in flats 1-17 are younger than 60, 4 out of 7 tenants in flats 19-37 are younger than 60, and all 3 tenants in flats 64-74 are younger than 60.

- There have been four vacancies in the last two years.

- These vacancies attracted one, two, one and one interested applicants respectively.

- The vacancies were let to two band 1 and two band 2 applicants.
SCHEME 8a – LEVER ROAD (numbers 12-32 even)

Scheme description

- Flats 12-20 is a three-storey block of 5 flats, with one “side” having 3 two-bed general needs flats and the other having 2 one-bed sheltered flats.

- Flats 22-32 is a three-storey block of 6 flats, with one “side” having 3 two-bed general needs flats (one of which has been sold) and the other having 3 one-bed sheltered flats.

Key statistics

- Both of the tenants in the sheltered flats in flats 12-20 are younger than 60. One of the flats in 22-32 is currently vacant and both the other tenants are younger than 60.

- There has been one vacancy in the last two years (excluding the current void).

- This vacancy attracted one interested applicant.

- The vacancy was let to a band 1 applicant.
SCHEME 8b – LEVER ROAD (numbers 1-27 odd and 39-51 odd)

Scheme description

- This scheme consists of three blocks of flats (1-13, 15-27, and 39-51) all of which have the same arrangement: a split-storey block of 7 flats, with the rear part, on three levels, having 3 two-bed general needs flats and the front part on two levels having 4 one-bed sheltered flats.

Key statistics

- Two of the tenants in the sheltered flats in 1-13, none of the tenants in 15-27 and one of the tenants in 39-51 are younger than 60.

- There has been one vacancy in the last two years.

- This vacancy attracted one interested applicant.

- The vacancy was let to a band 3 applicant.
IMAGES OF SURROUNDING AREA