

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

	<b><u>Consultation comments</u></b>	<b><u>Response / Action</u></b>
1.	<p>Just been reading through picked out the paragraph below, has this always been the case or is this different from your previous policy? Also I cannot see any mention of 16/17 yr olds over 27 weeks pregnant or with a child. I might have missed this</p> <p>Applications will not normally be accepted from persons who are aged under 18. However, the following may be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The applicant is in the care of the Council, or is a care leaver</li> <li>b) The applicant has been defined as a child in need as a result of a S17 Children Act 1989 statutory assessment</li> <li>c) The applicant is owed a full statutory homeless duty following a S20 Children Act 1989 statutory assessment</li> <li>d) The applicant has an adult or adults who will act as a trustee(s) and hold a legal tenancy until the legal incapacity to hold a tenancy ends, and the Council accepts the adult as a suitable trustee</li> </ul>	<p>The criteria is similar to the old policy.</p> <p>Applications from 16/17 year olds who are pregnant would only be accepted if they meet one or more of the listed criteria</p> <p>No changes to policy</p>
2.	<p>Suggestion on the development of the Quarry that we may want to link in with Rutland around nominations to affordable housing, we need to include some working in the allocations policy.</p>	<p>Nominations that have different or additional criteria to the allocations policy would be subject to S106 agreements</p> <p>No changes required</p>
3.	<p>Income cap can we limit – be specific – affordability assessment – stronger wording</p>	<p>Need to add in financial means criteria. Also detail the affordability assessment, referring to partner debt advisors as required</p> <p>Change to draft policy</p>

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

4.	Consider banding criteria for homeless at home	<p>This will be in line with the duties owed under the homeless legislation and the relevant band that then applies</p> <p>No change required</p>
5.	Adult social care e.g. moving in with Mum	<p>This is not a standalone need - we would need to assess if there is a medical need, overcrowding, welfare need etc.</p> <p>No change required</p>
6.	Legally separated	<p>This is not considered a housing need, unless the person is unsafe for any reason. It is expected that if a couple separates, they try to meet their own housing needs where possible.</p> <p>No change required</p>
7.	Traveller community	<p>No additional preference needs to be given. In terms of local connection, it could fall under the 'no LC anywhere' criteria</p> <p>No change required</p>
8.	College relocation to SKDC	<p>This is not considered a housing need. It is expected that students sort their own accommodation. Social housing is not used for this purpose.</p> <p>No change required</p>
9.	<p>4.6.7 look at the wording:</p> <p>Please note that passport benefits and non-contributory disability benefits are not included for the purposes of income in this definition. Any lump sum</p>	<p>The section starts by talking about homeowners, then briefly mentions income</p>

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

	received by a member of the Armed Forces as a compensation for an injury or disability sustained on active service will be disregarded as savings	– income needs to be separated out- as per the change above  Change to draft policy
<b>10.</b>	online review and ability:  5.10.1 Annually, all applicants are required to complete an online review. The review is to ensure: a) The number of applicants on the South Kesteven housing register reflects the immediate needs for social housing b) Applicants still want to stay on the South Kesteven housing register and c) Applicants’ details are accurate and up to date.	Application process is primarily online. Elsewhere in the policy it states the following:  <i>Should applicants require assistance in completing the form or require the form to be made available in other formats this can be requested by telephone or by prior arrangement from the Council offices.</i>  No change required
<b>11.</b>	Wording around employment:  7.10.2 The Council may also use a local lettings policy to support people who contribute to their communities such as people in employment, to encourage working people to move to particular areas, or to encourage people who contribute to their local community through volunteering.	Remains for future development opportunities.  No change required
<b>12.</b>	7.9.1 direct offer	No comment made -unsure of the query  No change required
<b>13.</b>	Check delegations on the policy – senior housing officers	This is in order  No change required
<b>14</b>	Caravan and accommodation	No comment made -unsure of the query  No change required
<b>15.</b>	Private landlord – HMOs – relationship	No comment made -unsure of the query

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

		No change required
16.	No mention of emergency banding	There is no emergency band – just band 1 to 4  No change required
17.	Graduates who lived in SK before going to University who wish to move back into SK following graduation but whose parents moved out of SK whilst they were at University	Would have to be assessed on own merit – very specific circumstances, cannot have a separate section just for this scenario.  No change required
18.	Applicants who have no internet access	As stated:  <i>Should applicants require assistance in completing the form or require the form to be made available in other formats this can be requested by telephone or by prior arrangement from the Council offices.</i>  No change required
19.	People who are in receipt of Adult Social Care (who wish either to move to more suitable accommodation alone or to move in with younger relatives)	Would have to be assessed on own merit – very specific circumstances, cannot have a separate section just for this scenario.  No change required
20.	I think the policy could be clearer about SKDC's relationship with private landlords in the whole process.	Policy is to complement the homeless duty. Negotiations with private landlords in relation to the prevention of homeless would be done as part of the homelessness investigations.  No change required

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

21.	In terms of the issue of connection with the area, is there a way to take account of people who are geographically close to SK but live across the border - for example someone born in Stamford who moved a few years years ago to Casterton or Tinwell but whose children have always attended schools in Stamford.	Would have to be assessed on own merit – very specific circumstances, cannot have a separate section just for this scenario.  No change required
22.	4.6.2 "a static caravan situated on a site open all year round or a boat which has a mooring" are only homes if used as such. Should it not read "a static caravan situated on a site open all year round or a boat which has a residential mooring which are used as a main residence"?	As this would suggest if they are choosing not to use this property as a main residence then we would disregard this. When in fact it would be expected that they could utilise this as a residence rather than seek social housing.  No change required
23.	4.6.7 "Any lump sum received by a member of the Armed Forces as a compensation for an injury or disability sustained on active service will be disregarded as savings" - I really don't like this. As drafted, a member of the Armed Forces compensated for injuries sustained during training, or because of a terrorist incident at their barracks whilst not on active service would be excluded from this - as would a civilian victim of a terrorist incident. I think it should be widened to cover all tax-free lump sums awarded as compensation for any damage to any applicant's health or wellbeing.	Agreed, the wording is very specific. We will re word to – certain compensation payments may be disregarded as savings when assessing an applicant's financial resources.  Change to draft policy
24.	4.7.1 How do you define a " <b>permanent</b> member of a household"	Anyone who normally resides within the household and the accommodation is their only or main residence.  No change required
25.	4.8.1 should "applicant's household" be "applicant's current household"?	This suggests this is subject to change. By default we are referring to their current situation at all times.

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

		No change required
26.	5.10.1 Fails to address the needs of those with no online access	As stated: <i>Should applicants require assistance in completing the form or require the form to be made available in other formats this can be requested by telephone or by prior arrangement from the Council offices.</i>  No change required
27.	5.11.1 b) It appears that two different points are included on the same line here.	Agreed – b) needs to be split  Change to draft policy
28.	5.11.1 c) Why " <b>South Kesteven</b> private landlord"? Why not just "private landlord"	Agreed  Change to draft policy
29.	5.11.1 f) Should "Provides false or misleading information" be "Deliberately provides false or misleading information"?	Agreed  Change to draft policy
30.	5.12.1 " Applicants and household members can only be on one South Kesteven housing application" - Isn't this overly restrictive? Let's say I'm 19 & my brother's 20 and we live at home with our parents who are splitting up. We would both like to stay with the same one parent - but equally would be happy sharing a flat just the two of us. Why couldn't we apply for both?	We cannot consider more than 1 allocation of social housing for each applicant. They would have to make the choice – either their parents are eligible for 2 bedrooms or they're not. We need to make best use of housing stock.  No change required
31.	7.9.1 i) Should such a serious decision not be signed off by the portfolio holder if not the Cabinet?	Officers have the delegated authority to make these decisions.  No change required

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

32.	7.10.2 What is intended here? It smacks of social engineering and appears discriminatory against those who are not economically active.	Agreed – This will be removed  Change to draft policy
33.	8.4.1 24 hours seems very restrictive.	We need to minimise void times. Applicants will be advised of this time scale when they place the bid so will be prepared for the deadline.  No change required
34.	I would just like to give my views on the housing allocation procedure. My parents have been on the housing register for around 9 years now as they require a bungalow due to my mum being disabled. They are in rented accommodation and the landlord will not let them adapt the property to help her needs. The end of last year my dad had a heart attack and this year suffered from a stroke which has left him now disabled also. Their landlord will still not let them adapt the property. My parents require a bungalow urgently as my dad struggles with the stairs now as does my mum. We have updated the housing register with medical information for both my parents but still feel like the council are not bothered which infuriates us as a family.	This is not a comment on this new policy, rather a comment on an existing housing register application.  No change required
35.	Check the banding of existing tenant who are in properties in disrepair. Higher banding should not be awarded – the expectation is that the issues are fixed, even if a decant is required.	Major Repairs The applicant is a tenant of a social or affordable rented property living in South Kesteven who needs to move because their accommodation needs major renovation or extensive repairs. <i>This only applies when all decant options have been exhausted and it is deemed that a permanent move is the most cost effective and practical option.</i>  Change to draft policy

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

36.	Banding for homeless cases – should not differentiate between suspected priority need or not – goes against homeless legislation. Band 2 – relief. Band 3 prevention	Adjust to accepted relief cases: Band 2 Accepted preventions cases: Band 3  Change to draft policy
37.	Banding criteria is too descriptive – add in headings and suggestions underneath	Adjust the layout of the banding criteria and shorten descriptions. Use ‘examples include’ phrase to allow for some flexibility when applying banding.  Change to draft policy
38.	Bedroom table – should say couple without children	Change wording  Change to draft policy
39.	Employees and people related to SKDC employees– approval of any allocation needs to be done by head of service	Add this detail in  Change to draft policy
40.	Remove and reference to ‘priority banding’ causes confusion between priority need and priority bands – different things.	Adjust and remove the word  Change to draft policy
41.	Delete the following – this is not for an allocations policy to determine, rather something that is assessed under homelessness  4.6.1 All applicants must declare whether they own a home or have a legal interest in any land or property in the UK or abroad.	Remove  Change to draft policy
42.	4.6.3 Homeowners will be exempt from the scheme unless they have an urgent housing need to move (Bands 1 and 2) and have insufficient equity, capital or assets to resolve their housing difficulties  What is classed as sufficient?	Sufficient means that debt organisations will undertake a robust financial assessment. An Occupational Therapists report will also be required to establish their needs.  Change to draft policy



Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

<p><b>43.</b></p>	<p>4.6.6 Homeowners who sell or transfer their property in the UK or abroad within the last 5 years and have received or would have received equity of £16,000 or above will be excluded for 5years from the date of sale unless eligible for sheltered housing.</p> <p>Why 5 years? If someone applied as a homeowner, they would be refused. If they had equity of over £16k, they would be refused. So if they sell and use that money to privately rent and then approach when the money has gone, we are then refusing them again? Doesn't make sense.</p>	<p>This needs re wording/re looking at as it appears we are penalising people twice over.</p> <p>The income level and savings are benchmarked against best practice.</p> <p>No change required</p>
<p><b>44.</b></p>	<p>4.7.1 Local connection table:</p> <p>Current tenant of a landlord resident in South Kesteven whose application is supported by the landlord</p> <p>Why is this in the policy? It opens it up too much</p>	<p>Remove</p> <p>Change to draft policy</p>
<p><b>45.</b></p>	<p>4.11.1 Households owed a homeless duty will fail to qualify after refusing one offer of suitable accommodation.</p> <p>What if they are in prevention – the homeless duty doesn't get discharged so why should they not be allowed another offer?</p>	<p>We need to look at all parts of the policy again in relation to homeless applications as some parts are not clear or go against the homeless legislation</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Change to draft policy</p>
<p><b>46.</b></p>	<p>5.5.2 Verification includes checks on an applicant's full circumstances including their eligibility, qualifying criteria, housing need, property eligibility and community contribution</p> <p>Why do we need to look at community contribution? Surely social housing is needs based.</p>	<p>Remove</p> <p>Change to draft policy</p>
<p><b>47.</b></p>	<p>5.7.1 is 10 days a realistic timescale? There is already a backlog of applications.</p>	<p>Review of timescales undertaken.</p> <p>No change required</p>

Housing Allocations Consultation Table – Version 1

48.	There are too many different categories under Band 1. Do they all fall under an urgent need?	Re look at banding definitions again  Change to draft policy
49.	7.2.5 Why will we allow applicants to bid for properties that are larger than what they need? i.e., a couple can go for 1 or 2 bed properties. Why?	Due to stock profile we aim to enable greater choice  No change required
50.	7.3.1 Pregnancy recognised from 27 weeks – this doesn't compliment the homeless legislation. A pregnant woman is classed as a priority need under the legislation yet it wont be recognised on the register until third trimester	Re look at, reflecting homeless legislation alongside decision  Change to draft policy
51.	9.2 Any applicants who believe they meet an alternative band must initially submit a banding enquiry in writing explaining the reasons they believe they meet an alternative band.....If an applicant remains unsatisfied, they will have a right to review.  Why are we giving applicants two chances to have their banding re looked at? It should just go straight to a review otherwise you will need a senior officer to look at the first 'appeal' and then a manager to look at the actual review. Time consuming, unnecessary and a waste of resource	Agree  Change to draft policy