

**HOUSING INITIATIVES WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL OFFICES  
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 2.00 pm on 8 MARCH 2010**

Present:- Councillor R H Chamberlain – Chairman.  
Councillors E L Bellingham – Smith, J E Hudson, J E Menell,  
D J Morson and S V Schneider.

Tenant Forum representative: Mrs E Rogers and Mr S Sproul.

Officers in attendance: M Cox (Democratic Services Officer) L Petrie  
(Housing Management Manager), J Snares (Housing  
Options/Homelessness Manager) and Suzanna Wood (Housing  
Strategy and Planning Policy Manager).

**HWG29 APOLOGIES**

It was noted that the Head of Housing Services was currently unwell and unable to attend the meeting. Members sent their best wishes for a speedy recovery.

**HWG30 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2010 were received, confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to an amendment to recommendation 5 in minute HWG26 that the final decision on the new allocations policy would be a recommendation to the Community and Housing committee.

**HWG31 BUSINESS ARISING**

**Minute HWG23 - Place Scheme update**

The Chairman asked whether the Government had agreed to the amendment to the scheme so that the grant could be used to fund the refurbishment work associated with Empty Dwelling Management orders. An update would be given at the Community and Housing meeting.

**HWG32 HOLLOWAY CRESCENT UPDATE**

The planning permission for the 5 bungalows had been granted and work was expected to begin on site in mid March. Officers were currently looking for a solution for the displaced parking and the residents would be consulted on the proposed plans.

The Holloway Crescent Task Group had had its first meeting. It was considering options for phase 2 at the site and would report back to the working group in due course.

**HWG33 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Working Group was given details of the figures on affordable housing delivery from 2006 through to the current year's programme. Members found this to be very useful information and asked for the schedule to be circulated to members of the Community and Housing Committee.

Councillor Menell said that she would like to see more schemes on parish council exception sites as those that had been built had been very successful. It was reported that Rural Housing Enabler in Essex would be sending a pack to all parish council's explaining the scheme and an associated event was being arranged. Councillor Menell asked if it would be possible to obtain copies of the pack to send to all district councillors.

**HWG34 UPDATE ON ALLOCATION POLICY AND CHOISE BASED LETTING SCHEMES SCHEME**

It was reported that the first phase of the consultation, to seek views on the major issues and the different options was now underway. For phase 2, it was expected that the draft allocations policy would be available by the end of the month and this would be subject to an 8 week consultation. This results of this and details of the proposed allocation policy would be considered at the Community and Housing Committee on 10 June and there would need to be a meeting of the working group before that date.

**HWG35 HERTS AND ESSEX HOUSING OPTIONS CONSORTIUM**

The working group was advised that discussion that had taken place with the members of the Herts and Essex Housing Options Consortium on possible ways to enhance the current HomeOption choice based letting scheme. This had resulted in the report before members which set out options on cross boundary allocations and possible enhancements to the current scheme. The six authorities were now seeking the views of their members and would report back to the consortium. Any changes to the current scheme would only go ahead if there was consensus from all of the partners.

It was noted that there was an expectation of the Communities and Local Government that should be greater access and choice to housing, and cross boundary bidding and one point of access was seen as an opportunity to provide people with real choice.

If cross border working was to be introduced the allocations policy would be centred around four possible models.

- Model 1 Retention of own allocation scheme

There would be no cross boundary working but customers would be able to view available properties across all areas via the free sheet of the website. Housing applicants had the opportunity to join any housing register, so as long

as they were on the register for an authority in the consortium they could express an interest. The applicants would only have priority in terms of local connection with their own area.

- Model 2 - Retention of own allocation scheme with an over arching sub-regional policy

Each authority would retain its own allocations scheme locally. Prior to any expressions of interest around 5-10% of vacant properties, selected randomly would be for cross boundary bidding.

- Voluntary sub-regional policy for difficult to let policies

The members would pool all difficult to let properties and advertise them as being available to all applicants across the partner authorities.

- Common assessment policy

All members would allocate accommodation across all areas under one allocation scheme. Each authority would have to operate either a banding or a point a based system. Local connection could be given greater priority within the band.

Members questioned the likely take up from residents outside of Uttlesford. This was hard to quantify, there were a number of people from outside the district on the list, but it was also the case that people tended to have a connection to an area and most people were seeking properties in their local area. In any event a safeguard could be built in to a scheme to ensure priority for local residents.

Councillor Chamberlain proposed that the council continue with model 1. He said that there were issues within the council that might be affected by a cross border scheme. For example, it could make it easier for SA to recruit workers which was against council policy to oppose the further expansion at the airport. Also with the LDF, the council was making a case to the Government that the district did not require additional housing. He said that addressing housing need should be a bottom up approach and the authority's priority should be to help local people. He said that there was already a sufficient number of Uttlesford residents on the housing list and these should be dealt with under this council's own allocation scheme

In answer to a question, officers said that, as with the allocation policy, any cross border working should be looked at with the tenants in mind, and the scheme would give them greater opportunity to move. Some members pointed to the advantages of option 4 in terms of cost savings. It was felt that as the council would still be in control of its own scheme and could build in necessary safeguards, it was worth pursuing this option, particularly as it was considered to be the way forward by the Audit Commission and the Government.

On being put to the vote the proposal for option 1 was lost. A further proposal was then tabled to recommend option 4 and this was carried

RECOMMENDED to the Community and Housing Committee that the working groups preferred option is option 4.

The report also set out other potential enhancements to the scheme. These included a common application form and on line registration, inclusion of private and shared ownership accommodation, inclusion of a consultation model and looking for a more consistent approach to the rules for local connection. It was agreed that officers discuss these issues further with the Consortium and report back to the working group.

### HWG35 **HARD TO LET BUNGALOWS**

The working group was advised that there were a few elderly persons bungalows in the district in isolated locations that had proved very difficult to let to people over 60 and as such remained empty for long periods. It was therefore suggested that the 'elderly' designation on certain bungalows be changed to allow general needs applicants to express an interest in them. The first preference would still be to allocate to an elderly person if they came forward.

Members welcome this idea in principle, as a way of addressing void time, but were concerned to give a blanket discretion to officers without knowledge of the type and number of properties involved. It was also confirmed that the properties could be subject to right to buy. The working group agreed to this request with the proviso that the decision was made in consultation with chairman of Community and Housing Committee and there was a progress report back to the working group in due course.

RECOMMENDED that following consultation with the Chairman of the Community and Housing Committee, discretion is given to the Head of Division for Housing to change the designation of elderly on some hard to let bungalows to allow them to be advertised as also available to general fund applicants, up to a maximum of five units.

### HWG36 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting would be held on 10 May 2010 at 2.00pm when the draft allocation policy would be discussed.

### HWG28 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The chairman suggested various issues for the future work programme of the committee as follows

- Allocations policy
- Housing Strategy -action plan review

- Anti social behaviour –current policies, issues and how these can be addressed.

Councillor Menell suggested that, as council properties often had very large gardens, it might be possible to let part of this land for allotment use. It was agreed that officers would obtain a legal opinion and report back to the next meeting

The meeting ended at 3.40pm