

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6<sup>th</sup>. October 2010**

**Item No: 4a**

**Report of: Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Outcome and recommendations from the housing stock de-designation review**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present to City Executive board the results of this review along with recommendation for change

**Key decision** - No

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Joe McManners

**Report approved by:**

**Scrutiny Committee Chair:** Councillor Jim Campbell

**Scrutiny Panel Member:** Councillor Sinclair

**CEB is asked to consider the report attached and say if it:**

- Agrees; or
- Disagrees and why

**Recommendation:**

**These are contained within the body of the report attached at paragraphs 31 to 38**

### **Introduction and Background**

1. At the request of Councillor Turner the Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee set a Panel to consider the number and type of properties that are currently designated exclusively for the over 40s and the difficulties that this is increasingly producing in managing allocations
2. The results of this review work along with recommendation for change are attached for consideration by City Executive Board and are commended to you by the Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee
3. It is recognised that changes in this area are of concern to tenants and councilors alike and in the past proposals have either stalled or been unsatisfactory for various reasons. The review panel was mindful of this has put a lot of effort and time into looking at all aspects of the issue and in talking to councilors, tenants and officers involved in this work. The Panel is of the opinion that this time their proposals can work. This confidence comes from:
  - A very careful consideration of risk and a slow programme built around this

- A thorough yearly review involving councilors, officers and tenants that is able to look in detail at the last year and have a real effect on the coming year
  - Agreement on improved tenancy sustainment input which will allow for focused action where it needed and as quickly as it is need to bring about success
4. The Committee is very clear that if City Executive Board cannot be clear that more staffing resources will be allocated to tenancy sustainment and the terms and protocols within which they will operate then they would wish to withdraw recommendations for reconsiderations
  5. City Executive Board is asked to consider and respond to the recommendation at paragraphs 31 to 38 in the report attached

### **Comments from the Executive Director for City Regeneration**

The findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel are welcomed. This report is an excellent example of the good work that can be done when Officers, Members and tenant representatives adopt a focussed approach to resolving a challenging issue in the best interests of all of our residents. The process of de-designation that is being suggested will be taken one step at a time and, allowing for turnover in tenancies, will not be completed for a number of years. Having regard to the well being of our older residents the process will be carefully managed and will involve the development of a series of protocols for dealing with incoming tenants, older tenants who wish to move and support for those tenants that wish to remain.

The integration of the housing landlord function with the community housing function under the Council 2012 reorganisation proposals further strengthens the resources allocated to tenancy sustainment which responds positively to a concern raised by the Scrutiny Panel. Detailed operational arrangements for introducing this change will be agreed with the Lead Member in consultation with Members of the Scrutiny Panel.

### **Comments from the Board Member for Housing**

I welcome the report and all the work by officers, members and tenants. I recognise the problem and in the interests of meeting housing need we need to take action

The overall approach and the gradual programme with yearly review is good but the area of main concern is managing potentially challenging tenants.

I would like to flag up particular areas that will require focus in an implementation report as:

1. Detail about the level of tenancy support that is likely to be available
2. Protocols for the management of potential problems, especially nuisance behaviour (input will be needed from Landlord services and CANAct)
3. Detail about introductory tenancies
4. Further confirmation and legal advice about being able to direct applicants who may or may not be suitable for the de-designated units
5. Process of consultation of existing tenants in de-designated blocks
6. Protocols for existing tenants who did wish to move

Report Author

Pat Jones on behalf of the Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee

Email: [phjones@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:phjones@oxford.gov.uk)

Tele: 01865 252191

**Report of: Scrutiny Housing Stock De-designation Panel**

**To: Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: 13<sup>th</sup>. September 2010**

**Item No:**

**Title of Report : Designation of Housing stock for the over 40s**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To report the findings and conclusions of the Scrutiny Panel

**Key decision:** No

**Lead Scrutiny Member:** Councillor Murray

**Board Member:** Councillor McManners

**Scrutiny Responsibility:** Communities and Partnership

**Ward(s) affected:** All

**Report Approved by:**

Councillor Murray – Panel Lead Member

**Recommendation(s):**

**The Communities and Partnership Committee is asked to consider the findings and recommendations of the Panel and decide the recommendations it wishes to make to the City Executive Board**

**The recommendations are contained within the body of the report at paragraphs 31 to 38**

## **Introduction**

1. The Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee agreed to set a Panel to consider the number and type of properties that were currently designated exclusively for the over 40s and the difficulties that this was increasingly producing in managing allocations. The request to consider this came from Councillor Turner who was at the time the Board Member with responsibility for Housing Strategy. The view presented to the committee was as follows:

### **The Issue**

The Council has a large number of 1 bed properties which are designated for people over the age of 40. Meanwhile, the waiting list includes many single people under the age of 40,

but the properties suitable for them are not available to them. There is a mismatch between housing needs and housing provision in this area.

In addition, young, single people often have a lifestyle that is very different from that of older people. Whilst some age groups could be wary of mixing, there are others who value having neighbours who are not in the same age group.

The issue needs review in consultation with tenants to try to redress the balance

A pilot scheme to de-designate a block of flats at Rose Hill has been carried out and it was felt that it was successful.

2. The members nominated to undertake this work were Councillors Murray, Sinclair, Smith and Humberstone with Cllr. Murray nominated as the lead member. The Panel also included a tenant from the Tenant's Involvement and Monitoring Panel – Anita Fisher.

The Panel wishes to pass on its thanks to all tenants, councillors and officers who have supported this Panel and would commend their positive and open attitude.

## Methodology

3. The Panel scoped their work by setting a number of key areas they wished to see analysed and key questions to be answered. These are produced briefly below

### 1. Details of properties for consideration

#### Information

#### Source

Address

Property type

If a block the number in the block

If dispersed – amongst what other property types

Current resident mix:

- Age

View on letability:

- Number of voids in the last 5yrs?
- How difficult where they to let
- Refusal reasons

### 2. Profile of people who will benefit from de-designation

#### Information

#### Source

Those people who will benefit from de-designation i.e. the general profile of single people & couples in bands 1 – 4

What support is available to these young people (including resettlement work from frontline homeless hostels)

### **3. Current and potential management problems of mixed living**

#### **Information**

#### **Source**

What management problems exist now within the areas for consideration

How can these be quantified reasonably

What are the key risks and how can these be ranked

What can we learn from previous attempts to de-designate

How do we currently manage these issues? Do we need to do better to succeed

### **4. The positive and negative effects on the list of de-designation**

#### **Information**

#### **Source**

What would be the effect of de-designation on the waiting list (positive) i.e. how many people would it help within the target group (young people seeking housing)

Are there possibilities that we “grow” another band (negative)

### **5. What would a well managed de-designation look like and what are the practical issues with this**

**Information****Source**

Would the program or should the program cost the council

Is phasing practicable, over what period of time and how should it be determined

What would review process look like

**6. Who has an opinion****Information****Source**

What do tenants representatives think

What do councillors think

What do staff involved in allocations and tenancy management think

4. The Panel gathered and considered a significant amount of information and conducted 4 consultation and briefing exercises. The review happened over a period of almost a year with 2 lengthy breaks. The Panel are confident that they have had the opportunity to make a sound proposal.
5. The Panel would like to make it clear that when they present the views of tenants these have been gathered and discussed with the Tenants Involvement and Monitoring Panel (IMP). They are not therefore gained from broad consultation. IMP however is one of the key bodies used by the Council to engaging with its tenants. It should also be recognised that much broader consultation with tenants could arguably be considered unbalanced because the issue is as much about providing homes, within our means, for those who aspire to be our tenants as it is gaining the opinions of those who are already our tenants

**Findings****6. Background data**

To give some factual context to the review and to allow the Panel to understand and answer the questions a large amount of data was gathered and considered

**Information tables**

Appendix 1

Property demand and profile

Appendix 2	The approach of other local authorities
Appendix 3	Current housing stock profile (January 2009)
Appendix 4	Background

## Conclusions drawn from the data

### 7. Current supply of properties

20% of Council housing stock is designated in some way for over 40's (22% for all social housing in the City). For studio and one bed accommodation, 78% of Council stock is designated (66% for all social housing). The effect is that only about 15 studio/ one bed units, per year, can currently be offered to singles/couples under 40 from the General Housing Register.

8. The following table shows the Council and Housing Association stock breakdown as at 20<sup>th</sup>. November 2009.

Accommodation Type	Council units	HA units	Total
Family	5,873	1,670	7,543
Non-Designated Non-Family	421	771	1,192
Designated Elderly 1	807	46	853
Designated Elderly 2 (& 3)	423	264	687
Sheltered	341	740	1,081
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,865</b>	<b>3,491</b>	<b>11,356</b>

9. This shows that 20% of the City Council's housing stock is designated in some way for the 'elderly' (defined as over 40) while only 5% is non-designated, therefore also allowing bids from persons under 40. 30% of Housing Association stock is designated for the elderly, with 22% of the stock being non-family non-designated accommodation.
10. When you consider just studio and one bed accommodation, 78% of Council stock designated for the 'elderly', and 53% of Housing Association stock.
11. In terms of allocations, for 9/10 it was estimated that the following units (Council and RSL) would become available for the Council to offer or nominate to:



<b>Accommodation Type</b>	<b>Estimated Lets</b>
Family	354
Non-Designated Non-Family	100
Designated Elderly (1, 2 & 3)	130
Sheltered	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>634</b>

28% of expected lets are designated in some way for the 'elderly' (defined as over 40) while 15% is non-designated, therefore also allowing bids from persons under 40. The trend since this time for voids is downwards hence worsening this picture for the under 40s

## 12. Current Demand for properties.

52% of applicants waiting for one bed accommodation on the general housing list are under 40, despite these clients being dissuaded from joining the housing register. The under 40 group is also in greater housing need. 74% of applicants in Bands 1 & 2 are under 40 (comprising, in Nov 09, of 36 statutory homeless; 11 move-on applicants; and 7 others).

13. The situation with the supply of housing is at odds with the demand for accommodation from the over 40, and under 40 age group. The situation in relation to demand for accommodation, as expressed by 'live' applications on the Council's Housing Register (as at Nov 2009), is as follows.

<b>General Housing Register 'Live' Applications from Singles/ Couples</b>				
<b>Band/ Age</b>	<b>Under 40</b>	<b>40 to 60</b>	<b>Over 60</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1</b>	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	54	13	4	<b>71</b>
<b>3</b>	189	124	23	<b>336</b>
<b>4</b>	11	10	13	<b>34</b>
<b>5</b>	935	645	241	<b>1821</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1189</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>2264</b>

14. However, it should be noted that this actually understates the situation because housing staff actively discourage most people from applying to go on the list, by making sure they

are fully aware of alternative housing options; the serious shortfall of accommodation in the city; and don't have unrealistic expectations that applying for housing means that they stand a chance of getting an offer of one. The only exception to this is for accommodation for the elderly and in this case, staff actively encourages people to register because of the difficulty in filling some units.

The table above shows that 52% of applicants (waiting for one bed accommodation) on the general register are under 40, despite this client group not being encouraged to join the list.

15. This does not entirely reflect the level of need however, which is best considered by looking at the relative Bands. In Bands 1 and 2 for example which are those in exceptional and urgent need, 74% of applicants are under 40. Of those 2 Bands 67% have been accepted as statutory homeless and 20% priority “move on “ clients from front-line homeless hostels. If we move down to Band 3 we still see 56% of applicants under the age of 40.

16. Although there are 282 households over 60 waiting for accommodation, in contrast to younger clients, many are waiting for specific blocks or areas. There remains empty sheltered stock that no one will bid for and as such it remains “hard to let”

**17. Impact**

There are very limited options for single people or couples under 40 to secure social rented accommodation. Only 100 non-designated lets are expected per annum, the pressure to distribute this allocation across the various lists is severe. For 9/10 the Allocations Lettings Targets propose the following:

<b>List</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Lets</b>
Statutory Homeless	45%	45
Move-on 1 (from front-line homeless hostels)	30%	30
Move-on 2 (referrals of care leavers)	5%	5
Transfer applicants	5%	5
General Register applicants	15%	15
		100

18. The most stark indication of the limited options for under 40's is that there were 1140 applicants (singles/ couples under 40) waiting for the 15 offers expected in 9/10. The trend for voids is downwards so this becomes more acute

19. The pressure on this accommodation also limits the Council's ability to discharge its statutory homeless duty to younger single clients, and this reduces our ability to meet targets to reduce temporary accommodation.

20. In addition it also limits the Council's ability to assist with the move-on of clients through the cities homeless hostels. Although hostels are increasingly working to find alternative move-on options for clients, such as into the private rented sector, this factor does limit

the successful move-on of some clients, which reduces the through-put through hostels, making them less able to accept new clients and reduce the number of people rough sleeping.

21. The mis-match between the demand for accommodation from the under 40's, and the lack of supply is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed. As stated above, it is resulting in an increasing 'bottlenecking' of demand and increasing tensions as a result.
22. The housing situation in Oxford is well known to members, and the pressure on housing, especially for the single client group, has been detailed in many reports, including the Hidden Homeless Scrutiny Review (Report to Executive Board on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2006). The Panel concludes that rather than improve in recent years, the unequal treatment of under 40 (singles & couples) has worsened and this is to some degree because of policy changes set at limiting eligibility criteria by age.
23. If we sought to balance the housing stock to match the demand for accommodation, we would want to see less than half of studio and one bed accommodation designated for people over 40. This would require that at least **550** units be de-designated, to have approximately 950 - 1000 studio/ one bed units non-designated in the Council's housing stock, and a similar amount of 'elderly accommodation' (designated and sheltered).

#### **24. Consultation**

The Panel consulted 3 groups to both inform and support their opinions:

- Tenants through the Improvement and Monitoring panel (IMP)
- Council staff involved in the managing of properties and estates
- City Councillors

#### **25. Tenants**

The Panel wanted to give tenants the opportunity to express a view at 2 stages of their thinking:

- Before any conclusions were drawn to discuss the current situation in terms of supply and demand for properties and what their priorities would be for any scheme of de-designation.
- To present the Panel's favoured option to get their comment and issues

As stated earlier the Panel also included a member of IMP who had the opportunity to consider all the data and take part in the shaping of views and options.

26. Officers attended the IMP on the first occasion in April to outline the issue and discuss how the Panel could/should move forward in shaping their views and options. **Appendix 5** shows the key message from this first debate. As can be seen IMP accepted the issue in hand but were fearful of the effects on current tenants if allocations were not done "sensitively" and more resources were not provided for tenancy sustainment. The latter point on sustainment was of particular concern. There was by no means the view that young and old cannot live together but rather when this went wrong it blighted the lives of elderly and other residents

27. Members and officers attend IMP for the second time in July to present their favoured option. **Appendix 6** shows the key messages from this. Once again the issue of sustainment was high on their minds and they wanted very specifically to see:

- A mutual understanding of tenancy sustainment
- The detail of increased resources in this area. Where they would be, what they would do, how would they focus, what would tenants see that is different
- An undertaking that tenants in affected blocks would be told of changes in an informed and reassuring way

Within these comments tenants supported the proposals and in particular liked:

- The phased approach based on risk
- The yearly review and their opportunity to take part and influence this
- The re-designation of bungalows

## 28. Councillors

The Panel held 2 briefing sessions for councillors in July and August to allow them to see the outline of the issues and the preferred option of the Panel. About 20 councillors attend and their views can be seen in **Appendix 6**. Comments were very similar to those expressed by IMP. The additional issues were:

- The remit of the Exceptional Circumstances Panel
- Current processes and best practice in CANACT
- Absolute clarity on the protocols that will be used to sustain these tenancies and others in existence
- Some consideration of including a list of properties that have been adapted for disabled living

## 29. Officers

In coming to conclusions the Panel wanted to be clear of the views of those working directly with tenants and residents. Their input was vital in understanding how things are at the moment and the potential risks to well being involved generally and specifically in streets, blocks and areas of a process of de-designation. In particular the Panel were interested to know:

- Age and vulnerability of current tenants (age profile already shown in tables at Appendix 3)
- Prevalence of anti-social behaviour
- Location of properties and any issue that arise from this
- Existence of mixed living either in the block or the immediate area
- Proximity to other facilities
- Type and fabric of properties
- Current management issues

30. The detail of this assessment is not presented here because of the “sensitivity” of the data but was used in detail to come up with a risk rating of 1 to 5 where 1 is low risk. This data and assessment was one of the key elements used by the Panel to produce their option.

## Panel Recommendations

31. These are presented in the form of a scheme of de-designation which would run over 5 years. It includes:

- Phasing and implementation
- Details of the yearly review process
- Groupings of properties for the 5 year period
- New designation for bungalows
- Transitional arrangements
- Communication with tenants

32. The recommendations are set within 1 clear point for agreement that is sort from City Executive Board and 1 fact that sets proposals in context. If City Executive Board cannot agree at the first point then the Panel would wish to withdraw their recommendations for reconsideration

### Point for Agreement

**More investment in staffing resources is provided in tenancy sustainment to support this scheme and invest in the concept of mixed living. The Scrutiny Panel note the intention to provide for this in restructure proposals (Council 2012) but are looking for a guarantee that any new arrangements placing more staff working on tenancy sustainment give as one of their priority focuses the successful delivery of this programme. The Panel would wishes to know what will be available, within what terms and what this means on the ground. Recommendation 3 relates to this point**

### Fact

**The implementation of this scheme as proposed will be slow. Changes to current social mixes will only happen when a vacancy arises in a designated property that is due for change in that year. The void rate for the City's stock is low and diminishing so the programme may be set over 5 years but could take many more to show any real effects. Whilst this could be seen as frustrating for those in need it does mean that the management and review of change is easier and therefore the possibility of success higher**

## 33. Recommendation 1 - Proposed Scheme of De-designation

**That a scheme of de-designation is undertaken within the terms detailed below which cover**

- Phasing and Implementaion
- Yearly review criteria
- Property groupings
- A new designation for bungalows
- Transitional arrangements
- A year by year programme

### Phasing and Implementation

- a) Sheltered accommodation is not within this programme. The blocks that are “Sheltered” are listed at the end of tables at **Appendix 7** for information
- b) The programme outlined will run over 5 years with a yearly review process of action and outcome. More details are given of this review process below
- c) The properties representing the lowest risk will be de-designated first working gradually through the risk categories as informed by the programme and any review
- d) Bungalows currently within the Designated Elderly 1 and 2 categories are removed from this process and are immediately given a new and improved designation set to ensure that those in the greatest need of this type of accommodation are eligible for consideration (see bungalows below)

### **Yearly Review**

- a) It is important to outline now clearly the 5 year plan for properties considered for de-designation. It allows all to know the outline plan and use this knowledge when considering and making allocations. This plan however will be subject to a yearly review. Below is the minimum proposal for review and includes the general scope alongside some of the detail considerations that would be expected as a minimum

**General Scope** – A review of the whole scheme each year to consider if properties should be rescheduled earlier or later. In considering this to be clear that the expectation is that individual difficulties in properties should be tackled quickly and positively and not used as a lever to undermine the whole scheme.

**Issues for detail consideration (minimum requirement)** – The following information and tests will be considered and made objectively by a review:

- The current age profile of tenants within blocks
- The allocations made within the previous year. The profile of new tenants, the sustainability of these tenancies and any negative affects that can be associated directly with the allocation
- Actions taken to solve problems and the effectiveness of these
- The positive results of the scheme and any particular reasons or actions that can be associated with these that can be applied elsewhere
- The views of Tenants Representatives

### **Property Grouping within the 5 year scheme (see the table at the beginning of Appendix 4 for property category type)**

- a) All properties falling within the Elderly Designated 1 category
- b) All 1 bed risk category 1 and 2 properties in Elderly Designated 2 category
- c) Two bed properties in Elderly Designated 2 that are considered suitable because they appear in a low risk category (very few)
- d) Everything else continues with its current designation except for Bungalows (see below).

## New Designation for Bungalows

This applies to bungalows appearing in the Designated Elderly 1 and 2 categories. This change is to improve allocations and prioritise mobility issues over age. Currently most bungalows appear in Designated Elderly 1 which means they are allocated to applicants over the age of 40 regardless of mobility. In practice this change is expected to change only a few allocations with the majority still expected to go to the over 55s but it will allow younger applicants with mobility issues requiring level access to have equal priority

The allocation criteria for bungalows appearing in the Designated Elderly 1 and 2 categories will be:

- 1<sup>st</sup>. priority to any applicant requiring a level access property (mobility 1) regardless of age
- 2<sup>nd</sup>. priority to anyone over 55 years
- 3<sup>rd</sup>. priority to any applicant

The addresses on these bungalows appear in the first tables at Appendix 7

## Transitional Arrangement

- a) There is no intention to empty blocks
- b) **See the conditional note to these recommendations at paragraph 30.** More investment is provided in tenancy sustainment to support this scheme and invest in the concept of mixed living. The Scrutiny Panel note the intention to provide for this in restructure proposals (Council 2012) but are looking for a guarantee that any new arrangements placing more staff working on tenancy sustainment give as one of their priority focuses the successful delivery of this programme.
- c) The remit of the “Exceptional Circumstances Panel” is considered to ensure that it is able to adequately address any potential issues arising from this programme. In particular if the Tenancy Sustainment Officer believes that the applicant to the Panel has a valid case then the evidential requirements should be applied flexibly. **It should however be a matter of priority consideration that the offending behaviour is dealt with quickly.**

## The Year by Year Programme.

The details of this are at **Appendix 7**. This also shows at the end the overall change in designated numbers at completion of the programme

34. The Panel wishes to make 4 other recommendations set to address points specifically raised through the process
35. The Panel agrees that it is important that those affected by these changes are told in a timely and informative way allowing individuals to ask questions and receive answers to things that concern them

## **Recommendation 2**

**Changes are communicated, as a minimum as follows:**

- **A double page spread is taken in “Tenant Issues” to explain the reasons and outline of the programme**
- **A letter is sent to ward councillors and all residents in the blocks to be de-designated for the coming year inviting them to a Tenants and Residents Association meeting or if this doesn’t exist an Estate Managers Surgery. Here what the programme means for them will be explained and they can ask any questions they have**

36. It was clear to the Panel, when talking to various groups, that what was meant by “tenancy sustainment” covers a broad range. Tenants were keen to understand and agree this so that they could know what to expect not only for this programme but in other areas. The Panel would agree and thought it useful to come to some mutual understanding in particular so that they could judge if what was proposed in this field is likely to move their proposals forward successfully

## **Recommendation 3**

**That more staffing investment is made in tenancy sustainment and the actual amount and operation is clear at the point of implementation of these proposals (link to point of agreement at paragraph 32**

**When developing these protocols they have as one of their drivers a common understanding and definition of what we are trying to achieve. As a starting point the Panel offer their broad understanding**

**“The facilitation of people and groups living together as healthy communities. In particular: the “sensitive” allocation of properties, within our agreed schemes, balancing the needs of applicants and existing residents and the early and positive addressing of environmental issues and disputes that are outside of the normal ups and downs of human relationships”**

37. Councillors offered comment on the relationship between CANACT and those managing estates more generally. They were keen to understand how the relationship works, what effects Council 2012 will have on this and what represents best practice. This detailed consideration is outside of the scope of this Panel but they would agree that the outcomes from the work of these staff is important

## **Recommendation 4**

**That the Scrutiny Review of the CANACT service is built upon within the proposals for Council 2012 and the details of working in this area are made known in clear expectation and outcome terms quickly.**

38. The Panel hopes that this programme can go ahead, the case for it is overwhelming. One of the keys to success is confidence that the scheme is flexible enough to take account of changing circumstances and lessons learnt. The yearly review is at the heart of this and the Panel, or 1 of their number, would like to be involved in the first of these. This will be used as a chance to see the real effects of their proposals and take the opportunity to make any further recommendations they think necessary.



## **Recommendation 5**

**That the Panel is allowed to take part in the first yearly review of this programme should it be agreed**

**Report Author:**

**Pat Jones on behalf of the Housing Stock De-designation Panel**

**Email: [phjones@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:phjones@oxford.gov.uk)**

**Tel: 01865 252191**

## Appendix 1

### **Scrutiny Panel on De-Designation of Elderly Accommodation Report on Demand for Designated Elderly Accommodation & Profile of Housing Applicants Under 40 on The Housing Register**

This report will show the limited demand for Designated Elderly Accommodation compared applicants in Housing Need who are under 40 on the Housing Register.

Choice-Based Lettings (CBL) was introduced in January 2008. Almost 100% of the properties that have become available during the last 2 years have been allocated through this scheme (excluding some management transfers and exceptional cases).

#### **Void Designated Elderly Accommodation**

As CBL was only introduced two years ago following the introduction of the new Allocations Policy changing the way applicants housing needs were prioritised from points to bands, I have only included data below regarding voids over the last 2 years .

During the last 2 years **217** Council owned designated elderly properties (restricted to applicants aged 40 or older) have been let through CBL to applicants with a one-bedroom housing need on the Housing Register.

The table below shows the breakdown of properties to each property type.

<b>Breakdown of the Number &amp; Type of Designated Elderly Properties Let By OCC During 2008 &amp; 2009</b>	
<b>Bed Property Type</b>	<b>Number of New Lets</b>
Bedsits/Studio Flats	6
Flats	171
Bungalows	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>

#### **How Difficult Were The Properties To Let?**

Generally it is very unusual for any property to be advertised via CBL without some-one bidding for the property and being made an offer. However, exceptions to this are some low demand sheltered properties – particular studio flats on the first floor in less popular areas that are advertised unsuccessfully in consecutive bidding cycles.

The demand for specific properties or blocks can be reflected by the number of applicants on the waiting list who bid for the properties and also the priority need band of the successful applicant. Normally for the most popular properties the successful applicant will be in high housing need and be in Bands 1 or 2, and there will be a high number of bids for the property.

#### **Demand For Different Types Of Designated Elderly One –Bed Accommodation**

The demand for 1 bedroom accommodation across Oxford varies for a number of reasons including:

- The location in Oxford (relating to support, family, friends, health care, amenities and public transport)
- The type of property (flat, studio flat or bungalow)
- The floor level (ground, 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> floor)
- The facilities (such as a lift, garden, controlled communal entrance, fixed alarm service to the control centre, gas or electric, bathroom or shower & plumbing for a washing machine)
- Level of adaptations (ranging from Mobility 1 – level access accommodation to Mobility 4 fully adapted accommodation)

## **Refusal Reasons**

Most of the reasons an applicant refuses a property are based on the above.

When properties are advertised via CBL the advert describes the property and symbols are used to indicate the facilities the properties have, and if an applicant successfully bids for a property the Allocations Team contact the applicant, to discuss the suitability before making an offer of accommodation to ensure the property meets the applicant's housing needs. The table below shows the lowest number of bids received for designated elderly accommodation by property type compared to the highest number of bids. The figures shown for Bungalows don't accurately reflect the demand for most Bungalows because up until July 2009 only applicants considered to require a one-bedroom ground floor property were eligible to bid for them or applicants aged 60 years or older. However, since the introduction of the Sub-Regional CBL scheme this has changed to be consistent with our Sub-Regional partners (who generally have more Bungalows because they have more space) allowing applicants in Oxford to bid for Bungalows advertised across the Oxfordshire Sub-region.

<b>Highest Number of Bids Compared to Lowest Number of Bids By Designated Elderly Property Type</b>		
Bed Property Type	Lowest Number of Bids	Highest Number of Bids
Bedsits/Studio Flats	20	59
Flats	6	130
Bungalows	4	87

When comparing the figures on the table above it shows that it is clear that demand can vary considerably depending on the property that is advertised. For example there were only 6 bids received for one flat, however, another received 130. Clearly there are other factors that influence how many bids are made on a property such as how often an applicant bids, whether an applicant requires assistance or support in bidding and how often the applicant checks the properties that are being advertised each lettings cycle. Another factor on how popular a property is will be the queue position of the successful applicant. Where the property has been clearly advertised and is in the highest demand it would be expected that the first person to be offered the property would accept the offer. So in most, but not all cases, this would be the applicant in "queue position 1" at the end of the lettings cycle.

#### **Offers of Accommodation**

The tables below show the queue position for successful applicants bidding for Designated Studio Flats

<b>Queue Positions of The Successful Applicant For Designated Elderly Studio Flats</b>	
Queue Position	Number of Applicants
1	3
3	1
5	1
6	1

So for example of the 6 designated studio flats let over the last 2 years three of the applicants housed were in queue position 1. However, three of the applicants were not in position 1 at the end of the cycle but were still offered accommodation. The reasons for applicant not being offered accommodation can vary but the main ones are:

1. The applicant is contacted after the bidding cycle has ended, changes their mind and does not want to be offered the property or shortlists for more than one-offer and chooses to be offered another property.
2. The property is refused by the applicant after they have viewed the property.
3. Either the applicant is not considered suitable for an offer of the property or the property is not considered suitable for the applicant.

<b>Queue Position of The Successful Applicant For Designated Elderly Bungalows</b>	
Queue Position	Number of Applicants
1	26
2	7
3	3
4	2

5	2
---	---

<b>Queue Position of The Successful Applicant For Designated Elderly Flats</b>	
Queue Position	Number of Applicants
1	59
2	44
3	20
4	13
5	15
6	10
7	4
8	2
10	1
14	1
16	1
35	1

The table above shows that for one flat the property was offered to the 35<sup>th</sup> applicant on the shortlist. This is very unusual because following the introduction of CBL most applicants will only bid for a property they are interested in. However, some situations this does occur particularly if there is an on-going issues in the block or area making the property unsuitable for a number of vulnerable applicants.

### **Age of Applicants**

The tables below give an indication of the demand for different types of accommodation based on applicant's age.

<b>Breakdown of the Age Range of Successful Lets to Applicants For Bedsits</b>	
Age Range	Number of Applicants
40 to 49	3
50 to 59	2
60 to 79	1
80+	0

<b>Breakdown of the Age Range of Successful Applicants For Flats</b>	
Age Range	Number of Applicants
40 to 49	87
50 to 59	52
60 to 79	30
80+	2

<b>Breakdown of the Age Range of Successful Applicants For Bungalows</b>	
Age Range	Number of Applicants
40 to 49	1
50 to 59	8
60 to 79	27
80+	4

The table indicate that of the total number of applicants housed in designated accommodation over the last 2 years over 70% were between 40-49. In many cases only a few years older than younger applicants not eligible to bid for the properties because they are designated as elderly accommodation.

### **Non-Designated Properties**

Around 200 non-designated one-bedroom properties were let over 2008-10 and of these 11 properties (1 at Plowman Tower, 4 at Rosehill Flats despite being recently de-designated, 4 at Riverside Court , 2 at Southfield Park Flats) were let to applicants aged 40 or older with a one-bedroom need. This resulted in reducing the number of properties available to applicants aged under 40 by around 5% and also indicates that applicants aged 40 or older will be prepared to live with younger applicants.

### **Profile of the Households Who Will Benefit From De-Designation of any Current One-Bedroom Designated Elderly Properties**

Following the information provided in the last report the current breakdown of single applicants or couples under 40 with a one-bedroom housing need on the Housing Register is shown below

#### Single Applicants Under 40 On Housing Register

Single Applicants Under 40	Homeless List	Transfer List	General Register List
Band 1		2	0
Band 2	40	6	14
Band 3		2	176
Band 4		10	10
Band 5		52	1046
Total	40	72	1246

The table shows there is a high demand for one-bedroom non-designated accommodation (particularly on the General Register List).

The tables below show the breakdown of applicants in Housing Need Priority Bands 1 to 4 on the Transfer & General Register Lists showing the reason they are considered in higher housing need than the applicants in Band 5. All homeless applicants accepted as homeless are in Band 2 (there are currently 40 in temporary accommodation awaiting a permanent offer).

**Applicants with a one-bedroom housing need for non-designated accommodation on the Transfer List Showing Band Reason**

Transfer List	Band Reason	Number In Band
Band 1	Succession	2
Band 2	Under-Occupying By One Bedroom	6
Band 3	Significant Health & Disability Award	2
Band 4	Moderate Health & Disability Award	10

**Applicants with a one-bedroom housing need for non-designated accommodation on the General Register List Band Reason**

General Register List	Band Reason	Number In Band
Band 1		0
Band 2	Move On 1	13
	Move On 2	1
Band 3	Insecure Tenancy	2
	Lacking a Bedroom	63
	Move On Accommodation	72
	No Fixed Abode	30
	Non-Priority Homeless	1
	Significant Health & Disability Award	5
	Unsatisfactory Housing	3
Band 4	Moderate Health & Disability Award	10
Total		



### **Allocations to Housing Applicants via the Choice-Based Lettings Scheme**

The Housing Needs Team currently receives between 50 and 60 housing applications each week. Once a new application is received or a notification that an applicant's circumstances have changed (such as moving to a different address) their housing need is assessed based on their circumstances and they are placed in a Housing Need Priority Band ranging from Band 1 (very high housing need) down to Band 5 (low housing need). Due to acute shortage of housing in Oxford most applicants assessed as in low housing need have little chance of receiving an offer of accommodation and are encouraged to consider other housing options to help meet their housing need.

Before an applicant is included on the Housing Register their application is assessed to ensure they are eligible for housing and placed in a Housing Need priority Band (In exceptional cases applicants can be excluded from the housing register entirely for a defined period if they are found to be guilty of unacceptable behaviour such Anti-Social Behaviour or Serious Rent Arrears).

Once an applicant is included on the register they are notified of their housing need priority band and sent information about how to bid for properties they are eligible for via CBL. The priority bands defined in The Council's Allocations Policy are designed to ensure the Council fulfils the duty to give "reasonable preference" to some housing applicants over other households on the Housing List.

Following inclusion on the Housing Register applicants are eligible to bid for properties via the Choice-Based Lettings scheme, however, due the high demand in Oxford and shortage of accommodation that becomes available, most applicants are unlikely to receive an offer accommodation - especially applicants with a one-bedroom need who are under 40.

The table below shows that only 47 non-designated properties that have been let since the Sub-Regional Allocations Scheme commenced in July 2009. By de-designating some or all of the Housing stock it is clear that it would go in some way to meeting the Housing Need of applicants under 40 on the Housing Register.

Landlord	Number of Non-Designated Properties Let Since the Introduction of CBL
A2Dominion	17
Bromford	1
Catalyst	2
Jephson Housing	6
Oxford Citizens Housing Association	9
Oxford City	12
Total	47

### **Allocations checks before making an offer**

Before any offer is made to a potentially successful applicant checks are under taken to ensure that they are still eligible and suitable for an offer of the property. There may for example be a good reason not to offer an otherwise suitable property to an applicant because health advice has been received that the property is not suitable due to mobility issues or to be close to their support.

There are currently 40 applicants (under 40) to whom the Council has accepted a homeless duty to living in temporary accommodation. Before being placed in their temporary accommodation, risk assessments are completed and they are assigned a Temporary Accommodation Manager or Housing Officer to help support them. If any homeless applicants shortlist for an offer of accommodation the Allocations Team check to ensure there are no tenancy issues or other reasons that an offer might not be suitable. Where it is found the offer would not be suitable the applicant is “overlooked” and the officer will go to the next highest person on the shortlist until a suitable applicant is found.

The table profiling the housing list above shows there are 200 households on the General Housing Register List in Housing Need Priority Bands 1 to 4. Around 50% are “lacking a bedroom” or of no fixed abode (many are “sofa surfing”) and all are threatened with homelessness on a regular basis. The majority of the other 50% are living in supported “move on” projects across Oxford for applicants who would otherwise be homeless. Where an applicant living in “move on” accommodation shortlists for an offer of accommodation the Allocations Team contact their housing providers and/or support workers to discuss the applicant’s suitability for a potential offer. Where the property is not considered to be suitable for the applicant they are overlooked or where the applicant is not considered ready to move on or has any unresolved tenancy issues they will also be overlooked and another more suitable applicant offered the property.

The Allocations Team works closely with the projects and has regular meetings to review the “move on” process. The support workers at the hostels are aware that any applicants applying for housing will not be considered for offers of accommodation until the applicants is considered ready to “move on” to independent accommodation. In addition the hostel will provide support to the client in their new home to help with the transition until such time floating support can be arranged if required. Any applicant who applies for accommodation who is not felt to be ready to move on is not offered accommodation until there is satisfactory evidence they can do so.

All of the households on all three waiting lists, who are under 40 in housing need, would benefit from a partial or full de-designation of Council stock.

Tom Porter  
Allocations Manager

Jan 20

## Appendix 2

### Report on other Local Authority approaches

A comparison was made between Oxford City Council and five other local authorities who have a similar housing stock and housing issues. The enquiry was made as to whether they now have designated stock or not. If it still exists, what proportion of the stock is designated? If the stock was de-designated, how and why?

#### **Oxford City Council**

Own stock = 7668

#### **Canterbury City Council**

Own stock = 5278

Having spoken to Adrian, it was determined that Canterbury went through a de-designation programme approximately 15 years ago. The problem they had at that time was that they were finding it extremely difficult to fill vacant properties with "lifeline links". To allocate to the properties, they would prioritise to over 60's who had insufficient need for sheltered and then gradually work down the age groups until they could no longer find someone who had sufficient support need for the properties..

After a consultation period to justify the de-designation of some of its' properties, Canterbury now have approximately 450-500 of its stock as designated elderly with "lifeline links" excluding sheltered schemes and the remainder has been changed to fit general purpose housing.

The blocks that were previously designated blocks now primarily accommodate the younger generation. It has become a lot easier to fill the properties and a greater number of people are now being housed. There are the usual housing management issues, but generally, due to the tenants being of a similar age they apparently find it easier to manage.

#### **Cambridge City Council**

Own stock = 7360

Cambridge have advised that they do not have any specifically designated properties and never have, other than over 55's / Sheltered blocks.

However, where there are issues of ASB or a local lettings plan is in place, they are flexible with how they advertise their properties. With a reference from the Housing Officer they can change the criteria of the type of person that they wish to apply for the accommodation either by age or if they have a particular vulnerability or disability and would benefit an adapted property, therefore there is a much more flexible housing management process which could have the potential of continually changing, to meet the needs of the applicant and the community. With a specific advert entry, this would restrict the type of applicant bidding for the property.

They and their tenants believe this is a fairer way of allocating properties as it still gives the tenants the option of "Right to Buy" if they so wish, with a view to giving more sustained community.

Cambridge operates a Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system and has a partnership agreement with 7 other district councils under the sub regional CBL system.

### **Ipswich Borough Council**

Own stock = 8230

Ipswich has no designated 'age restricted' blocks except for its sheltered schemes, where the age is 60+. There may be very few occasions, where they allow tenants with disabilities/vulnerabilities to go into sheltered following assessment.

As part of their 'draft' older persons housing plan, they are considering the introduction of some 'age restricted blocks' that may be linked to their sheltered housing schemes under an umbrella type arrangement. This is a concept supported by their tenant representatives but would need to be assessed in terms of numbers and demands i.e. low scale in the first instance.

Ipswich operates under a regional CBL arrangement and they have very few problems in letting any voids including sheltered

### **Milton Keynes Council**

Own stock = 11590

Having spoken to the above, it has been confirmed that Milton Keynes have no and never have had properties designated to the over 40's within their stock. They do have bungalows for the over 55's and the sheltered blocks.

The younger applicants would need to prove that they have a medical need for a bungalow before they would be eligible to apply for one.

They do not have a waiting list, but they do run the banding system and advise anyone who are in bands 3 or 4 to look at the private sector.

### **Exeter City Council**

Own stock = 5063

Exeter have a small number of over 40's accommodation but they are Almshouses, other than that they have over 55's or sheltered blocks, no other over 40's accommodation is available.

They are considering de-designating the hard to let over 55's blocks due to the change in supporting people charge but no further action has taken place at this moment in time. Chris did state Exeter has been in the fortunate position to develop some new builds which existing tenants from less desirable properties have been happy to move to, therefore making the moving process easier. He believes that moving people from an over 55 block, to a new purpose built development in amongst other social housing should not pose too much of an issue in the future.

Alan Chandler  
Allocations Officer  
Jan 2010

## Appendix 3

### Report showing detailed OCC stock profile for Designated Elderly and Sheltered accommodation with the age profile of current tenants

This report gives a breakdown of all designated elderly accommodation by block, or by street (where units are more dispersed, or comprise of more than one block). For each, the breakdown of the units is given by size and by property type.

On the right hand side of each table, the age profile of current tenants is given. This data is as accurate as possible, but it does not entirely match the number of properties. This is because the age of some applicants is not known, and two ages have been included for some tenancies that are held jointly. However, it should allow for an overview of the tenants currently in this type of accommodation.

A summary of the data is given in the two tables below.

Designated Elderly Property Totals	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		
			Flat	Bungalow	Flat	Bungalow	House
Designated 1	807	46	558	170	28	5	0
Designated 2	394	17	254	91	30	1	1
Designated 3	28	0	27	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1229</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
			<b>1100</b>		<b>66</b>		

Designated Elderly Totals	Total	Tenant Age Profile*				
		Under 40	40-54	55-69	70-79	Over 80
Designated 1	818	12	240	262	180	124
Designated 2	392	3	93	146	84	66
Designated 3	29	0	4	12	6	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1239</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>197</b>

\* Age Profile totals may not equal stock totals as this can include both tenants for joint tenancies and the data is missing for some tenants

Dave Scholes  
Housing Needs Manager  
Jan 2010





(as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009)

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile*				
			Flat	Bungalow	Flat	Bungalow	Under 40	40-54	55-69	70-79	Over 80
Abingdon Road	4		4					1	2	1	
Ashmole Place	12		12				1	5	5		
Azors Court, Tree Lane	17			17				1	7	7	6
Balfour Road	12	4	5		3			4	5	2	1
Banbury Road	12	5	4		3		1	4	2	3	2
Barnet Street	2			2					1	1	
Barns Road	17	9	8					4	11	1	1
Barton Road	10		10						5	3	2
Bonar Road	19		19					10	2	4	3
Bramwell Place	6			6				1	2	2	1
Brandon Close	7			7					3	3	3
Brasenose Driftway	6			6					2	3	1
Brome Place	32		31		1			17	11	1	
Bullstake Close	22		21		1			9	8	4	2

Butterwyke Place	19		15		4			7	4	7	1
Calves Close	8			8						5	4
Claymond Road	2			2					1	1	
Cobden Court, Cobden Crescent	7		7					2	2	1	1
Colemans Hill	4		4					3			1
Corunna Crescent	2		2							1	1
Cosin Close	6			4		2			3	1	1
Cowley Road	10		10					6	2	1	1
Cranley Road	1			1						1	
Craufurd Road	3		3					1	1	1	
Cress Hill Place	5		5					1	2	1	1
Croft Close	4			3		1			1	3	2
Crowberry Road	15		15					8	4	4	1
Donnington Bridge Rd	8		8					3	2	2	1
Druce Way	3			3				1	2		
Edmund Road	10			10					5	3	3
Erica Close	16		16					7	6	2	
Faulkner Street	7		6	1				4	1		

Ferry Hinksey Road	14		14					6	2	3	2
Fettiplace Road	2		2					2			
Friars Wharf	17	7	8	2			2	3	5	4	3
Gladstone Road	4		4				1	1	2		
Goose Green Close	7		7					3	2	2	
Gordon Street	9		6	1	2			5	4		
Halliday Hill	1		1						1		
Harpsichord Place	1		1					1			
Hawksmoor Road	24	8	10		6			9	11	3	2
Heath Close	8		8					2	4	2	
Horspath Road	2		2						1	1	
Iffley Road	6		6					1	1	1	2
Jericho Street	4		4					1	2		1
Juniper Drive	4		4				1	1		1	1
Kestrel Crescent	3			3					3		
Knights Road	11		7	3	1			3	6	1	1
Ladenham Road	4			4						1	3

Lake Street	25		19	1	5			8	9	4	5
Lambourn Road	4		4					1	2	1	
Laurel Farm Close	3			2		1				2	1
Leiden Road	6			6					1	3	2
Littlehay Court, Oxford Road	8		8					3	2	3	1
Malford Road	2			2					1	1	
Mattock Close	8		8						4	1	3
Nelson Street	4		4					2		1	1
Newport Close	3			3				1			2
Normandy Crescent	6		6					3		1	2
Northfield Road	15		15					2	6	4	2
Nye Bevan Close	3			3					1		1
Paget Road	2		2						1		1
Paradise Square	7	3	4					5	1	1	1
Peat Moors	6	2	4					3	2	1	
Pegasus Road	7			7					3	2	2
Pennywell Drive	13		13					4	3	2	4
Peregrine Road	3			3					2	1	

Pickett Avenue	1			1						1	
Princes Street	4		4					2	2		
Richardson Court, Bath Street	10		7	2		1		4	5	1	
Salter Close	22		21		1			7	11	8	5
Scott Close	12			12				1	2	2	
Skelton Court, Jeune Street	5		5					3	2	1	
Slaymaker Close	7	2	4		1			2	4	1	
South Bridge Row, St Aldates	23		23					9	7	6	2
Stephen Road	4		4					2	1	2	
St Nicholas Road	16		16					2	6	6	2
Stubbs Avenue	18			18			1	1	3	2	10
Sturges Close	6			6			1	2	2	1	1
The Grates	22		18	4				5	3	6	9
The Slade	25	5	20					12	7	5	2
Three Fields Road	11			11					5	4	3
Warburg Crescent	12		12				1	5	4	1	1
Warren Crescent	4		4						1	3	

Wellington Street	7	1	6					1	2	3	1	
Whitehouse Road	20		20				1	6	7	4	1	
William Kimber Crescent	6			6					1	2	2	
Williamson Way	8		8					2	2	3	1	
Wood Farm Road	10		10					5	1	3	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>124</b>	
			<b>728</b>			<b>33</b>						

Designated Elderly Two Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed			Tenant Age Profile*				
			Flat	Bungalow	Flat	Bungalow	House	Under 40	40-54	55-69	70-79	Over 80
Spindleberry Close & Knights Rd, BBL	16			15		1				4	6	6
Birchfield Close Blackbird Leys	4		4						2	2		
Pegasus Road Blackbird Leys	34		34						11	14	6	2
Moorbank & Blackbird Leys Rd	7			7						2	1	3
Boundary Brook Rd Donnington	12		12						5	6	1	1
George Moore Cl Donnington	21		19		1		1		7	10	3	2
Donnington Lodge	8		7		1				3	5	1	1



Wolvercote												
Kendall Cres & David Walter Close, Templar Rd Estate	35	9	8	12	6				6	11	7	10
Templar Rd, Pennywell Drive & Bourne Close	42	3	6	30	3				3	17	15	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>66</b>
			<b>345</b>		<b>32</b>							

Designated Elderly Three Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile*				
			Flat	Bungalow	Flat	Bungalow	Under 40	40-54	55-69	70-79	Over 80
North Place Bury Knowle	28	0	27		1			4	12	6	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	
			<b>27</b>		<b>1</b>						

Designated Elderly Totals	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed			Tenant Age Profile*				
			Flat	Bungalow	Flat	Bungalow	House	Under 40	40-54	55-69	70-79	Over 80
<b>Designated 1</b>	807	46	558	170	28	5	0	12	240	262	180	124
<b>Designated 2</b>	394	17	254	91	30	1	1	3	93	146	84	66



<b>Designated 3</b>	28	0	27	0	1	0	0	0	4	12	6	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1229</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>197</b>
			<b>1100</b>				<b>66</b>	<b>1239</b>				

\* Age Profile totals may not equal stock totals as this can include both tenants for joint tenancies and the data is missing for some tenants

<b>Sheltered Scheme</b>	<b>Addresses</b>	<b>Total Units</b>	<b>Studio</b>	<b>One Bed Flat</b>	<b>Two Bed Flat</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Atkyns Court	Atkyns Road Wood Farm	24		22	2	
Birch Court	Coleman's Hill Headington Quarry	21	1	18	2	
George Moore	George Moore Close, Donnington	20	5	15		
Headley House	Headley Way Headington	15		13	2	
Northbrook House	Knights Road Blackbird Leys	25	4	20	1	
Windale House	Field Avenue Blackbird Leys	27	6	20	1	
Singletree	Rose Hill Rose Hill	31		20	11	Excludes the 3 bed warden flat
Knights House	Harold White Close Risinghurst	26	4	22		
Eastern House	Eastern Avenue Littlemore	15	9	5	1	Proposal to add another 6 units
Bradlands	Mill Lane Old Marston	30	8	22		Not being let to – proposal to decant residents
Cardinal House	Cardinal Close	32		32		Currently empty and being refurbished

	Littlemore					
Alice Smith House	Alice Smith Sq Littlemore	20	11	8	1	Considered for disposal (after Cardinal refurb)
Cumberlege House	Cumberlege Close Old Marston	15	8	6	1	Not being let – being considered for disposal
<b>Total</b>		<b>301</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>22</b>	



## Appendix 4

### Background and Context

In the mid-1980's a large number of Council properties were designated as 'elderly accommodation' to only be let to single applicants and couples that were aged over 55 years of age. This was partly introduced for housing management reasons, but it was also thought to exempt these properties from the 'Right to Buy' legislation. Following legal challenge however, this was not upheld, and only sheltered schemes were considered exempt.

In the mid-1990's a decision was taken to lower the age at which applicants became eligible for elderly designated properties from 55 to 40 years old. This was partly in response to a District Auditor recommendation to reduce the number of properties that were designated for use by the elderly in the City, which reflected the mis-match between the supply and demand of one bed accommodation, with insufficient property being made available to younger applicants.

Council stock is categorised in a number of ways, but the key classifications in relation to allocations are as follows:

<b>Accommodation Type</b>	<b>Property &amp; Allocation Criteria</b>
Family	These comprise of two bed properties or larger that are suitable for families. It includes most accommodation larger than a one bed, although some two bed flats & bungalows are excluded.
Non-Designated Non-Family	These comprise of studio flats and one bed properties (mostly flats) that are allocated to anyone 18 or over.
Designated Elderly 1	General needs properties, designated, for allocation purposes only, to single applicants and couples, over the age of 40, with no dependent children. There is no support provided, but as with any property, a community alarm could be provided, where required. Mostly studio and one bed flats, but also two bed flats & bungalows.

<p>Designated Elderly 2 (&amp; 3)</p>	<p>These are also allocated to single applicants and couples, with no dependent children. The properties have traditionally included a 'hard wired' alarm system however, although these systems are becoming increasingly obsolete, as community alarms are used more. The level of support is determined through a support needs assessment. They can also be known as 'Category 1' schemes (usually by RSLs), or as 'independent sheltered' (with respect to the one Council Designated 3 scheme). They are usually allocated to persons over 55 years of age, but this is reduced to 40 years on some schemes. As with Designated Elderly 1, the properties are mostly studio and one bed flats, but also include some two bed flats &amp; bungalows.</p>
<p>Sheltered</p>	<p>These properties are also known as 'Category 2' Sheltered. They comprise of blocks of self contained flats, with common facilities, emergency alarms and a visiting warden. They are only allocated to persons with an assessed support need showing that they require this accommodation, usually over 60, but this is reduced to 55 years old on some schemes (or less in exceptional circumstances). Most are one beds, but the stock includes some two beds.</p>

In the mid-2000's, there were further reviews of accommodation provision for the elderly, this included the Review of Older Peoples Housing (see Housing Scrutiny 25<sup>th</sup> January 2006, & Executive Board 20<sup>th</sup> February 2006). Whilst this mainly dealt with the rationalisation of sheltered accommodation, it also touched on the issue of elderly designated stock, and made recommendations to:

1. Undertake a pilot de-designation
2. Conduct a rolling programme of appraisals and de-designations once the pilot had been evaluated

3. Allocate an extra budget to the under-occupation scheme (*REMs*) to facilitate the transfer of residents wishing to move
4. Increase the age limit for designated elderly housing not part of the de-designation programme to 55 or over.

In 2007, a pilot de-designation scheme was developed for Rose Hill flats (see Housing Scrutiny of 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2007, and Executive Board of 14<sup>th</sup> May 2007). This de-designated 32 flats and offered the 14 tenants aged over 55 years a move. Of these, 6 tenants requested to move and were prioritised for such. A local lettings plan (LLP) was developed for future allocations to the scheme for a limited period of time. A report went to City Executive Board on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2008 confirming the success of the pilot and recommending the continued de-designation of the scheme.

In October 2009, the Communities and Partnership Scrutiny Committee agreed to set up a Scrutiny Panel to consider this issue in depth. This panel is comprised of non-Executive Board members, and a tenant representative, working on a cross party basis with officers. The panel has met three times to date and has received reports on a range of issues, including the position in other local authorities, the demand for accommodation, information about the stock that is designated, and issues concerning any de-designations that may take place. The panel wants to consult tenants about the options and proposals currently under review by the Panel at this early stage in the process.

## Appendix 5

### Tenants Panel Consultation – Stock de-designation

#### Key messages

- Fearful that applicants with mental health and other challenges are likely first takers after de-designation and this will not be handled well causing problems for all. Want this risk recognised up front and either new or diverted investment in tenancy sustainment officers to minimise this risk
- Anti-social behaviour is the biggest issue and this needs to be recognised and the risks managed well
- Want to see the programme considered looking at issues block by block and within this the views of resident tenants sort and considered
- The potential to destabilise areas that are currently stable has to be recognised up front and considered as a real risk. Efforts should be made through allocations to minimise this risk
- When considering phasing want to see the current age range of tenants considered
- Whatever the scheme would want to see consideration of “appropriate people in appropriate places”
- Proposal that we consider phasing on the age range of applicants and gradually reducing the age of applicants considered for vacancies
- Proposal to set a mini plan block by block or area by area where we would set some sustainability measures up front and allocate accordingly. Then testing and reviewing this as we went along with residents
- General comment that mixed living can and does work if handled well by all
- General comment that the “40 age band” made not sense at all and we were right to look at this.

## Appendix 6

### 1. Tenants Involvement and Monitoring Panel

Officers and members took the details of the Panel's preferred option to the Tenants Panel on 21<sup>st</sup>. July. The details of the option were sent well in advance of the meeting so tenants had a good length of time to digest the details.

The Panel had been re-elected since the first consultation round and so a number of tenants were unfamiliar with the issues. To support understanding the papers given to the Tenants Panel included the slides presented at the first consultation round. These slides showed clearly the issue for debate and the key messages received from tenants

#### Views

The views of tenants remained largely unchanged from the first consultation round. They:

- Understood the problem
- Where pleased that bungalows were to be re-designated
- Supported the phased approach on a risk basis but there were still significant concerns about the current difficulties at Salter Close and the surrounding area and how proposals here might just make these issues worse
- Wanted absolute certainty that tenancy sustainment resources would be increased and these would be focused to deliver this scheme and address already difficult issues
- Wanted to see details of these tenancy sustainment increased resources
- Wanted a mutual understanding of what tenancy sustainment meant and therefore what its aims were
- Wanted sensitivity in allocations
- Wanted to see details of how tenants in effected blocks would be informed of these changes

### 2. Councillor Briefings

Officers invited all councillors to attend 1 of 2 briefings (29<sup>th</sup>. July and 16<sup>th</sup>. August) to hear and understand the issue and consider the Review Panel's detailed proposals. Address details were not sent to councillors before hand so those attending were asked to send any additional comments they wanted to make to officers.

#### Views

- Broadly happy with the approach taken by the Panel and generally supportive of the phased approach



- Significant concern at both meetings about differences in lifestyles and the escalation of this into anti-social behaviour
- A desire for CANACT to comment on the risk factor 5 blocks and a desire to see CANACT and other resources going into these areas now
- To include a review of best practice in ASB (this is outside of the brief and was partially considered by the ASB scrutiny review of 2008/09)
- Want to be more explicit on the Exceptional Circumstances Panel recommendation and drop some of the evidential requirements of ASB when an elderly person in a de-designated block is asking to move
- Emphasised the importance of informing the residents of blocks that are to be de-designated and what they can expect and where they can go to with issues
- Increased tenancy sustainment is crucial and like tenants they want to know exactly what will be available and how it will be deployed before they agree to change (where are the boundaries between estate management/tenancy sustainment/CANACT. How will it all actually work for the better)
- Can we include a list of properties that have been adapted for disabilities of various origins and consider the process for letting these(I think mostly out of our remit)



## Appendix 7

### Designated Elderly – Detailed OCC Stock Profile with De-Designation phasing proposals over a 5 year period

#### Change of designation for Bungalows

All 267 Bungalows (formerly Designated Elderly One and Two) are allocated on the basis of first preference to anyone requiring a level access property (mobility 1), regardless of age. If there is no-one suitable, in any band, then the allocation preference will be to anyone over 55 years of age. If the property cannot be let, then it will be re-advertised without any eligibility restriction on mobility needs or age.

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Azors Court, Tree Lane	17			17			13	1	Lower demand
Barnet Street	2			2			1	5	
Bramwell Place	6			6			3	4	
Brandon Close	7			7			6	3	
Brasenose Driftway	6			6			4	3	
Calves Close	8			8			9	3	
Claymond Road	2			2			1	1	Lower demand
Cosin Close	6			4		2	2	4	Lower demand
Cranley Road	1			1			1	1	

Croft Close	4			3		1	<b>5</b>	2	
Druce Way	3			3				1	
Edmund Road	10			10			<b>6</b>	1	Lower demand
Faulkner Street	1			1				5	Also 6 flats (listed below)

Friars Wharf	2			2			-	1	Also 15 flats (listed above)
Gordon Street	1			1				2	Also 8 flats (listed below)
Kestrel Crescent	3			3				1	
Knights Road	3			3			2	2	Also 8 flats (listed below) Lower demand
Ladenham Road	4			4			<b>4</b>	1	
Lake Street	1			1			-	1	Also 24 flats (listed above)
Laurel Farm Close	3			2		1	<b>3</b>	3	
Leiden Road	6			6			<b>5</b>	2	
Malford Road	2			2			1	1	Lower demand
Newport Close	3			3			<b>2</b>	1	
Nye Bevan Close	3			3			1	1	
Pegasus Road	7			7			<b>4</b>	4	
Peregrine Road	3			3			1	1	Lower demand

Pickett Avenue	1			1			1	1	
Richardson Court, Bath St	3			2		1	1	4	Also 7 flats (listed below)
Scott Close	12			12			2	5	Lower demand
Stubbs Avenue	18			18			12	5	
Sturges Close	6			6			2	5	Lower demand
The Grates	4			4			15	1	Also 18 flats (listed below)

Three Fields Road	11			11			7	2	Lower demand
William Kimber Crescent	6			6			4	4	
<b>Total</b>	<b>175</b>			<b>170</b>		<b>5</b>			

Designated Elderly Two Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Spindleberry Close & Knights Rd, BBL	16			15		1	12	5	
Moorbank & Blackbird Leys Rd	7			7			4	2/1	Lower demand
Donnington Bridge Rd, Donnington	4			4			-	3-5	Also 15 flats (listed below)
Mallinson Court	4			4			5	5	Also 7 flats (listed below)

Osney									
School Ct & Gt Clarendon, Jericho	5			5			5	3	Lower demand Also 11 flats (listed below)
Gurl Close Barton	6			6			5	5	Lower demand
Plough Close Wolvercote	8			8			6	3	
Kendall Cres & David Walter Cl	12			12			17	1	Lower demand Also 23 flats (listed below)
Templar Rd, Pennywell Drive & Bourne Close	30			30				3	Lower demand Also 12 flats (listed below)
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>			<b>91</b>			<b>1</b>		

## Year 1

The following 219 flats are de-designated. These are Designated Elderly One flats, with a considered low risk of issues resulting from de-designation, and excluding any schemes that currently have more than half of the tenants over 70 years of age, or where any management issues have been noted:

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Abingdon Road	4		4				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Ashmole Place	12		12					1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Barton Road	10		10				5	1	
Colemans Hill	4		4				1	1	Dispersed property/ Mixed small blocks
Cress Hill Place	5		5				2	1	
Donnington Bridge Rd	8		8				3	1	
Friars Wharf	15	7	8				-	1	Also 2 bungalows (listed below)
Goose Green Close	7		7				2	1	
Halliday Hill	1		1					1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Harpsichord Place	1		1					1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Hawksmoor Road	24	8	10		6		5	1	
Iffley Road	6		6				3	1	

Jericho Street	4		4				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Juniper Drive	4		4				2	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Lake Street	24		19		5		9	1	Also 1 bungalow (listed below)
Lambourn Road	4		4				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Littlehay Court, Oxford Road	8		8				4	1	
Mattock Close	8		8				4	1	
Northfield Road	15		15				6	1	
Paradise Square	7	3	4				2	1	
Pennywell Drive	13		13				6	1	
Princes Street	4		4					1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Slaymaker Close	7	2	4		1		1	1	Lower demand
Warburg Crescent	12		12				2	1	Lower demand
Warren Crescent	4		4				3	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Williamson Way	8		8				4	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>187</b>		<b>12</b>				



## Year 2

The following 203 properties are de-designated. These are any remaining Designated Elderly One or Two properties, with the lowest risk (risk 1) of issues resulting from de-designation:

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Banbury Road	12	5	4		3		5	1	
Corunna Crescent	2		2				2	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Craufurd Road	3		3				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Crowberry Road	15		15				5	1	
Fettiplace Road	2		2					1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Horspath Road	2		2				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Paget Road	2		2				1	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
The Grates	18		18				15	1	Also 4 bungalows listed above
Wellington Street	7	1	6				4	1	
Wood Farm Road	10		10				4	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>64</b>		<b>3</b>				

Designated Elderly Two Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung/Hse*		Risk Factor	
George Moore Close, Donnington	15		14			1	-	1	14 X 1 bed flats & 1 house. Also 6 flats listed below
Donnington Bridge Rd, Donnington	12		12				-	1	Also 4 bungalows listed above, and 3 flats listed below
Whitworth Place Jericho	19	1	12		6		5	1	
Venables Close Jericho	7		3		4		3	1	
Jericho Street Jericho	8	2	4		2		3	1	
Gt Clarendon, Jericho	8		8				-	1	Lower demand. Also 5 bungalows listed above & 3 at School Ct below
Hart St & Cardigan St, Jericho	6	2			4		3	1	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Henry Taunt Close Barton	32		32				8	1	
Kendall Cres & David Walter Close	23	9	8		6		17	1	Lower demand Also 12 bungalows listed above
<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>93</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>			

### Year 3

The following 138 properties are de-designated. These are any Designated Elderly 1 or 2 properties, with a low risk (risk 2) of issues resulting from de-designation, & any Designated Elderly Two 2 beds that are suitable for de-designation & not part of another scheme:

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Barns Road	17	9	8				2	2	Dispersed property/ small blocks/ Mixed blocks
Bonar Road	19		19				7	2	
Erica Close	16		16				2	2	
Gordon Street	8		6		2			2	Also 1 bungalow listed above
Heath Close	8		8				2	2	
Knights Road	8		7		1		2	2	Also 3 bungalows listed above. Lower demand
Peat Moors	6	2	4				1	2	Lower demand
St Nicholas Road	16		16				8	2	
The Slade	25	5	20				7	2	
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>3</b>				

Designated Elderly Two Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung/Hse*		Risk Factor	
Boundary Brook Rd, Donnington	12		12				2	2	
School Court, Jericho	3				3		-	3	Lower demand. Also 5 bungalows & 8 flats (Gt Clarendon St) listed above
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>12</b>		<b>3</b>				

#### Year 4

The following 117 properties are de-designated. These are any Designated Elderly One properties, with a risk assessment of 3 or 4, relating to any potential issues resulting from de-designation:

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Balfour Road	12	4	5		3		3	3	
Butterwyke Place	19		15		4		8	3	
Gladstone Road	4		4					3	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Nelson Street	4		4				2	3	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Normandy Crescent	6		6				3	3	

Richardson Court, Bath St	7		7				1	4	Also 3 bungalows listed above
Salter Close	22		21		1		<b>13</b>	4	
South Bridge Row, St Aldates	23		23				8	4	
Whitehouse Road	20		20				5	4	
<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>105</b>		<b>8</b>				

## Year 5

The following 100 properties are de-designated. These are any Designated Elderly One properties, with a risk assessment of 5, relating to any potential issues resulting from de-designation:

Designated Elderly One Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung		Risk Factor	
Brome Place	32		31		1		1	5	
Bullstake Close	22		21		1		6	5	
Cobden Court, Cobden Crescent	7		7				2	5	
Cowley Road	10		10				2	5	
Faulkner Street	6		6					5	Also 1 bungalow listed above
Ferry Hinksey Road	14		14				5	5	
Skelton Court, Jeune Street	5		5				1	5	
Stephen Road	4		4				2	5	Dispersed property/ small blocks
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>98</b>		<b>2</b>				

## Remaining Designated Elderly Accommodation

The following 185 properties (formerly Designated Elderly Two or Three properties) are not proposed for de-designation. These will be let to persons aged over 55 years of age.

Designated Elderly Two Addresses	Total Units	Studio	One Bed		Two Bed		Tenant Age Profile 70+	Additional Comments	
			Flat	Bung	Flat	Bung/Hse*		Risk Factor	
Birchfield Close Blackbird Leys	4		4					3	Dispersed property/ small blocks
Pegasus Road Blackbird Leys	34		34				8	4 or 2/3 with a LLP 3	
George Moore Close, Donnington	6		5		1		-	5	Also 14 flats & 1 house listed above
Donnington Lodge Donnington	8		7		1		2	4	
Donnington Bridge Rd, Donnington	3		3				-	2/3	Also 4 bungalows & 12 flats listed above
Mallinson Court Osney	7		7				5	5	Also 4 bungalows listed above
Lydia Close Barton	24		24				4	4	
The Oval Rose Hill	15		15				5	5 or 2/3 with a LLP	
Lambourne Rd	8		8				3	3	





		(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)	project
Elderly 1	632	219	73	123	117	100	0
Elderly 2	302	0	130	15	0	0	157
Elderly 3	28	0	0	0	0	0	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>185</b>

**For Information Only:**

<b>Sheltered Scheme</b>	<b>Addresses</b>	<b>Total Units</b>	<b>Studio</b>	<b>One Bed Flat</b>	<b>Two Bed Flat</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Atkyns Court	Atkyns Road Wood Farm	24		22	2	
Birch Court	Coleman's Hill Headington Quarry	21	1	18	2	
George Moore	George Moore Close, Donnington	20	5	15		
Headley House	Headley Way Headington	15		13	2	
Northbrook House	Knights Road Blackbird Leys	25	4	20	1	
Windale House	Field Avenue Blackbird Leys	27	6	20	1	
Singletree	Rose Hill Rose Hill	31		20	11	Excludes 3 bed warden's flat
Knights House	Harold White Close Risinghurst	26	4	22		
Eastern House	Eastern Avenue Littlemore	15	9	5	1	
Bradlands	Mill Lane Old Marston	30	8	22		
Cardinal House	Cardinal Close Littlemore	32		32		Block currently empty and being refurbished
Alice Smith House	Alice Smith Sq Littlemore	20	11	8	1	
Cumberlege House	Cumberlege Close Old Marston	15	8	6	1	Disposal being considered (tbc)

<b>Total</b>		<b>301</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>22</b>	
--------------	--	------------	-----------	------------	-----------	--