

Meeting: Integrated Housing Board

Date: 23 March 2009

Report Title: Registered Providers Partnership

Report of: Strategic and Community Housing

## 1.Purpose

1.1 To recommend to the IHB that the current partnering arrangements are altered to encompass all Registered Providers (RPs) working within Haringey under a new partnership agreement/protocol.

## 2.Summary

- 2.1 This report reviews Haringey's Preferred Partnering arrangements and requests that proposals for the alteration of the current partnering arrangement are considered and approved.
- 2.2 Considering the current economic downturn and the associated pressures on the housing market this report recommends a more holistic approach to preferred partnering to encompass all RPs working within the borough that the Council and the RPs will be better able to cope and continue to provide quality services and deliver new homes if the group of strategic partners is widened.

## 3.Legal/Financial Implications

3.1 None identified

#### 4.Recommendations

- 4.2 That the RP partnership is expanded to include all RPs working within Haringey willing to sign up to a new partnership agreement.
- 4.3 That subject to agreement of point 4.2, the partnership agreement/protocol and associated service level agreements covering standards of management, development, maintenance, joint working and nominations and lettings appended to this report is circulated to relevant staff, Members and stock holding RPs for consultation (attached draft for consultation).

#### For more information contact:

Name: Paul Dowling

Title: RSL Development Officer

Tel: 020 8489 4301

Email address: <a href="mailto:paul.dowling@haringey.gov.uk">paul.dowling@haringey.gov.uk</a>

# 5. Background

5.1 The proposal to pursue a system of Registered Social Landlord (RSL) preferred partnering was initially ratified by the Executive of 21<sup>st</sup> March 2006. Following a detailed selection process the Council adopted 6 preferred partners (subject to annual review):

Circle Anglia
Family Mosaic
L&Q
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Presentation
Servite Houses

- 5.2 The initial ideology behind this approach was:
  - a) That a preferred partnering approach would improve our collective capacity to meet the various targets that the government has set for us, to maximise inward investment in our borough and to raise housing management standards and benefits to tenants across all the sectors.
  - b) That it would enable a more co-ordinated approach to the delivery of affordable housing and to the standard of housing management in new stock.
  - c) That it would help ensure longer-term commitment to the Council and the

wider communities particularly the tenants of the respective RSLs.

- d) That it is easier to have a closer and more productive relationship with a smaller, more manageable group of RSLs for officers, Members and residents, and that the Council would be able to undertake better monitoring of their performance from scheme development through to site management of completed projects.
- e) That Partners would be more likely to develop closer links with the community and its representatives.
- 5.3 The intention was for the selected partners to work closely with the Council on initiatives such as common housing management standards, public realm management; and research and strategy formulation. Quid pro quo the Council intended that the preferred partners would receive the bulk of National Affordable Housing Funding and that the borough could insist on its choice of partner for schemes where Haringey was the landowner.

#### 6. The current situation

- 6.1 Recent assessments by the Housing Corporation have identified areas of concern in two of Haringey's existing partners. Both Servite Houses and Presentation have lost development partner status with Servite Houses receiving an 'Amber' status for both viability and Governance (May 08) and Presentation receiving an 'Amber' status for viability and 'Red' for Governance. The assessments leave both associations unable to bid for funding from the Homes and Communities Agency and under the terms of the existing partnership protocol the partnership status of both should be rescinded. This would leave four preferred partners in the current system which is viewed as officers as unviable.
- 6.2 Many of the larger RPs (not limited to preferred partners) work effectively with the Council on a strategic and operational level. 13 RPs are currently signed up to the Council's nomination agreement (notably however Presentation refused to sign the agreement).
- 6.3 The 2006-8 bid round was very successful for Haringey with a take-up of over £87m although the two top performers were non-preferred partners Newlon Housing Trust and Paddington Churches HA (Genesis Housing Group). Table 8.1 shows the take-up broken down by RP; overall the preferred partners took up £31,655,709 compared with an 'other RP' figure of £56,064,095.
- 6.4 Last financial year Haringey's affordable housing figure submitted to CLG was 315 (Table 8.2). The other RPs delivered 179 of these units compared with 136 from the preferred partners. The RP (Paddington Churches HA) that brought forward the highest proportion of these units (96 units in 4 schemes) is not a preferred partner. Forecast completions for the next four years currently show the preferred and other RPs on an even keel at 720 and 727 forecast completions respectively.
- 6.5 Whilst the data in tables 8.1 and 8.2 reflect poorly on the preferred partners compared to other developing RPs it must be recognised that due to the development pipeline timescales the performance mainly relates to the period prior to the appointment of partners in 2007. However the allocations to date for the 2008-11 programme do not reflect an improvement with no allocations going to preferred partners (table 8.3).
- 6.6 Over the life of the preferred partnering arrangement there has been no significant difference in terms of development between the preferred and the other RPs. It cannot be demonstrated that the existing preferred partners have exceeded other RPs in terms of performance and in several cases they have been outperformed by non-preferred RPs.
- 6.7 The intentions set out in the original report to the Executive, that being improving targets, raising management standards and ensuring that Preferred Partners received the bulk of affordable housing grant have

either not been realised or performance has not differed greatly from the other RPs.

### 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 It is clear, especially in the current economic climate that Haringey cannot simply focus on a small group of RPs to deliver affordable housing in the Borough; by expanding the partnership it is hoped that Haringey will be better able to meet affordable housing targets over the next few years.
- 7.2 The premise for the recommendation to change the existing partnership arrangement is that Haringey will benefit from working proactively with all RPs willing to commit to the agreement. As a result it is also expected that a greater number of RP will sign up to the Council's nominations agreement which is currently undersubscribed.

# 8. Appendices

8.1 2008 National Affordable Housing Programme grant take up by RP

RP	Total	
	£28,302,000	
Newlon Housing Trust	.00	
Paddington Churches Housing	£12,371,566	
Association Ltd	.00	
	£10,499,782	
Circle Anglia Limited*	.00	
	£9,178,139.	
Community Housing Association Ltd	00	
B ( // LI · A · // L//#	£5,896,000.	
Presentation Housing Association Ltd*	00	
Landa O O advad Haraia Tarak	£5,795,683.	
London & Quadrant Housing Trust*	00	
Motropoliton Housing Trust Ltd*	£5,603,179.	
Metropolitan Housing Trust Ltd*	00	
Notwork Housing Croup	£4,531,625.	
Network Housing Group	£3,861,065.	
Family Mosaic Housing*	£3,861,065.	
Sanctuary Housing Association	£875,370.00	
Octavia Housing and Care	£700,000.00	
Islington and Shoreditch Housing	27 00,000.00	
Association Ltd	£101,130.00	
Habinteg Housing Association Ltd	£4,265.00	
	£87,719,804	
	.00	

<sup>\*</sup>Preferred Partners

8.2 2007-2008 Affordable housing completions

			Unit
RP	Scheme Name	Tenure	S
		MFREN	
Genesis	143 Broad Lane	T	6
Genesis	143 Broad Lane	HBYNB	48
		MFREN	
Genesis	Middx Uni	T	27
		MFREN	
Genesis	P&R	T	15
		MFREN	
Family Mosaic*	Academia Way	T	26
		HBYNB	
Family Mosaic*	Academia Way	KW	29
		MFREN	
Network	Elizabeth Clyde Close	Т	5
Network	Portland Place	SPH	48
	Windsor Parade, 583 - 554		
Network	High Rd	TSH	14
		MFREN	
L&Q*	Middx Uni	Т	58
Presentation*	691 - 693 High Road	HBYNB	23
		MFREN	
Newlon	Street Properties	Т	2
	London SQ Bounds Green		
Origin	N11	HBYNB	14
			315

<sup>\*</sup>Preferred Partners

# 8.3 National Affordable Housing Programme 2008/11 initial allocation

RP Name	Projects allocated to	Total units	Total allocati on
			£1,752,1
Newlon HT	1	31	36
Paddington Churches			£1,748,0
HA Ltd	2	21	00
			£1,462,4
Sanctuary HA	1	16	04
			£517,00
Network HG	2	8	0

8.4 Draft partnership agreement/protocol (attached separately)

**END**