

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

1. Introduction

- 1.1. In March 2020, Cabinet agreed to consult on two draft housing policies, the High Road West Local Lettings Policy and Love Lane Leaseholder Offer, which form the basis of the proposed offer to residents living in the High Road West masterplan area. Cabinet also noted the intention to engage non-secure tenants living in temporary accommodation in the masterplan area on other potential elements of an offer to them.
- 1.2. These consultation and engagement activities took place over a six-week period between 5 February and 19 March 2021. This report sets out the feedback received in these consultation and engagement exercises.

2. Consultation and engagement approach

- 2.1. During the consultation and engagement period the council used a range of methods to maximise participation. This was deemed to be particularly important in light of ongoing social distancing restrictions due to Covid-19, and in response to recent phone surveys with Love Lane Estate residents that indicated that many residents experience barriers to digital participation.
- 2.2. Love Lane Estate residents, and households on the wider housing register who were invited to respond to the Local Lettings Policy consultation, were all informed of the consultation and engagement relevant to them. Bespoke letters were posted and dedicated online Q&A events took place for each group.

Tenure group	Consultation and engagement activities
Secure tenants on Love Lane Estate (LLE)	Local Lettings Policy consultation
Non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation on LLE	Local Lettings Policy consultation and engagement on other potential elements of a proposed offer
Resident leaseholders on LLE	Leaseholder Offer consultation
Non-resident leaseholders on LLE	Leaseholder Offer consultation
Households on housing register and not living on LLE	Local Lettings Policy consultation

- 2.3. The consultation and engagement methods used are summarised in the following table, with details on these helped ensure equal access across demographics and tenures to overcome issues of digital exclusion.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Method	Description	Ensuring equal access to consultation and engagement
<p>Letters and hard copies of consultation and engagement materials sent out</p>	<p><u>Love Lane residents</u></p> <p>A consultation pack, with a foreword from the Leader of the Council, was sent to all 44 Love Lane secure tenants, 197 non-secure tenants and 48 leaseholders at the start of the consultation period.</p> <p>This included information on upcoming consultation and engagement activities, with the relevant policy and questionnaire booklet included, as well as a free postage return envelope. It also stated the closing date for the consultation and details of how to respond.</p> <p>A reminder postcard was also sent to Love Lane residents two weeks before consultation close.</p> <p><u>Households on the housing register</u></p> <p>An email or letter was sent to all households on the housing register (not living on Love Lane) in advance of the consultation start for the Local Lettings Policy. A total of 9,972 emails were sent inviting the recipient to take part in an online survey and 1,511 letters sent to those without a known email address, alerting them to the consultation and providing a link to a webpage with information on the consultation and an online consultation questionnaire.</p> <p>A dedicated email address and phone number were provided to allow consultees to ask questions, and to allow those without access to the internet to request that a paper consultation form and stamped address return envelope be sent to them. A total of 53 paper forms and envelopes were sent on request.</p>	<p>Translated copies were also sent on request, with versions produced in six different languages.</p> <p>Residents had the option of submitting their response online or providing verbal feedback over the phone if they were not able to return by post.</p>
<p>Phone calls to all Love Lane residents</p>	<p>The council's HRW Engagement & Rehousing team attempted to call all residents on the estate for whom contact details were available.</p> <p>In total, officers spoke to 172 Love Lane residents during the consultation period at least once, 65% of the total number of</p>	<p>Following initial contact by the HRW team, residents were able to choose a time for a phone call which was suitable for them, whether this was day or evening.</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

	<p>tenants and resident leaseholders on the estate. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 secure tenants (out of 44, 70%) • 124 non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation (out of 197, 63%) • 17 resident leaseholders (out of 25, 68%) <p>The purpose of these calls was to check they had received the materials, answer any initial questions to inform their response to the consultation, and direct them to upcoming online events. Officers also spoke to residents around the Masterplan and New Homes engagement material, which is summarised in Appendix 2.</p> <p>Residents were offered a detailed follow-up call with a member of the HRW team to talk through the policy, and 5 residents took this up option.</p> <p>Residents had the option to call or email the HRW Engagement Officer at any time during the consultation via contact details included in their letter.</p>	<p>The team were also able to arrange for a translator to support the phone conversation. Two residents took up this option.</p> <p>Residents had the option of a regular phone call or video call depending on their preference.</p> <p>This approach was designed to replace the option of attending a drop-in session or the HRW team undertaking a door-knocking exercise to speak to residents which would be normal practice prior to the Covid-19 restrictions.</p>
<p>Dedicated Local Lettings Policy mailbox and phone line for households on wider housing register</p>	<p>A dedicated mailbox (LLP@haringey.gov.uk) and phoneline was in place for households on the wider housing register (non-Love Lane) to contact regarding the consultation.</p> <p>There were a total of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 89 emails received and • 103 phone calls with residents. <p>All residents who attempted to call and left a message were subsequently called back and spoken to.</p>	<p>The dedicated mailbox and phone line was in place to ensure that all residents could speak to an officer regarding the consultation and request hard copies or translated materials if they wished to.</p>
<p>Website, online events and social media</p>	<p>A dedicated consultation webpage was in place (www.tottenham.london/HRWconsultation) with links to online versions of the consultation materials and online polls. This website was referenced in correspondence with residents.</p> <p>Due to coronavirus and the ongoing restrictions in place, the Council was unable to hold information sessions in person for consultees. Instead, the Council held</p>	<p>Online events were available to watch back online after the event at a convenient time for the resident, with the option to provide feedback after the broadcast.</p> <p>The HRW team worked with residents who required extra help to access digital content, including on using the online event software (Microsoft</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

	<p>dedicated online Q&A events for each tenure group on Love Lane and the wider housing register. These events were available as recorded sessions on the website for those who were unable to attend the live event.</p> <p>The dates for the events were as follows and are available to be watched back at the following links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tuesday 16 February 2021, 1pm – Love Lane secure tenants (link) - Tuesday 16 February 2021, 6pm – Love Lane non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation (link) - Tuesday 23 February 2021, 1pm – Love Lane leaseholders (link) - Tuesday 23 February 2021, 5.30pm – Households on the housing register not living on Love Lane (link) <p>There was a total of 19 live attendees across the four sessions. Due to the limitations of the technology, it is not possible to confirm the number of residents who watched the event back following the live broadcast. Officers received requests for the links to the broadcast from several residents.</p> <p>The Haringey Twitter account also publicised the consultations. (one example can be seen at this link)</p> <p>Residents who expressed an interest in attending the session were also texted a link to the event in the hours prior, via the GOV.UK Notify service.</p>	<p>Teams). As part of the investment in socio-economic outcomes in HRW, the intelligence gathered from residents on who had digital barriers was used to target laptop provision, working with the Haringey Adult Learning Service (HALS).</p> <p>As outlined above, phone calls with the HRW team were available for residents to talk to the proposals and answer questions as an alternative for those that did not have digital access.</p>
<p>Local Lettings Policy infographic video</p>	<p>A seven-minute infographic video (link) was produced to explain the draft Local Lettings Policy for both Love Lane tenants and those on the wider housing register.</p> <p>This was hosted on YouTube and linked to on the consultation webpage. The HRW team also sent the link to residents who had expressed an interest via text.</p>	<p>The video was available to watch on both laptop and smartphone. The short length was an option for those who did not have time to watch the full online events.</p> <p>Translated copies of the script were also available on request, although no residents requested these.</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

3. Consultation on the Draft Local Lettings Policy

Overview and consultation response

- 3.1. Consultation on the Local Lettings Policy sought the views of:
- Secure, assured and non-secure tenants living on the Love Lane Estate or elsewhere in the masterplan area
 - Households on the housing register
- 3.2. A total of 164 responses were received, which is broken down across groups in the table below. In total 61 residents living in the masterplan area responded to the consultation (around 25% of those eligible to respond) and 103 households on the wider housing register (around 1% of this group).

Consultee group	No. of post responses	No. of online responses	Total	Total eligible to respond	% response rate
Non-secure tenants in the masterplan area	50	3	53	197	27%
Secure tenants in the masterplan area	6	2	8	44	18%
Households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area	17	86	103	11,483	1%
Total	73	91	164		

- 3.3. The draft High Road West Local Lettings Policy Consultation Questions booklet summarised and asked questions around the two key proposals which form part of the draft policy. These relate to the eligibility criteria for new council homes in High Road West, and the order of prioritisation for new home lets. There was also an opportunity to provide general feedback around the draft policy. The feedback to these proposals is summarised below.

Proposal: Eligibility for new Council homes in High Road West

- 3.4. The booklet sets out the council's proposed eligibility criteria for the new council homes in High Road West alongside two alternative options, with the rationale described for why this option is preferred over the alternatives. The preferred option includes eligibility for most residents in the masterplan area, including non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation. The two alternative options place limitations on the eligibility criteria for residents in the masterplan area to varying degrees.

A summary of the three options consulted on is set out below:

Option	Residents eligible for a new council home in High Road West
Option 1 (The Council's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure and assured tenants in the masterplan area • Non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation who:

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

preferred option)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have been accepted as homeless by the Council at least 12 months prior to the publication of the Landlord Offer AND ○ Have lived within the masterplan area for at least 12 months prior to the publication of the Landlord Offer.
Option 2 (Alternative option)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure and assured tenants in the masterplan area • Non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have been accepted as homeless by the Council pursuant to an application made BEFORE 9 November 2012 AND ○ Have lived within the masterplan area for at least 12 months prior to the publication of the Council's Landlord Offer
Option 3 (Alternative option)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure and assured tenants in the masterplan area

All applicants under the Local Lettings Policy would need to meet the eligibility and qualification criteria under the Council's Housing Allocations Policy 2015 (as updated from time to time) up until the point they are rehoused.

Any homes not allocated to residents within the masterplan area would be made available to the wider housing register.

- 3.5. 141 respondents answered questions on this proposal. Of these, 90% were in favour of Option 1, with 5% each in favour of Option 2 and Option 3. This preference for Option 1 was reflected across all three consultee groups. A breakdown is presented in the table below.

Option	<i>Non-secure tenants in the masterplan area</i>		<i>Secure tenants in the masterplan area</i>		<i>Households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area</i>		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	29	94	8	100	90	88	127	90
2	1	3	0	0	6	6	7	5
3	1	3	0	0	6	6	7	5
Total	31	100	8	100	102	100	141	100

23 respondents did not answer the questions on this proposal, including 22 non-secure tenants in the masterplan area, and 1 household on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area. See paragraph 3.11 for commentary on the former.

- 3.6. Commentary on the responses from each consultee group are provided in the table below.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Group	Commentary
<p>Non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation within the masterplan area</p>	<p>Of non-secure tenants who answered questions on this proposal, 94% were in favour of Option 1.</p> <p>The responses from this group indicate that this option was preferred as it offered the opportunity of a secure tenancy council home to many of these residents, with associated benefits for affordability and security, and protected the stability of the existing community. Example responses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like a secure tenancy so that in the future I will have the right to buy • It allows many residents to remain in their existing communities • Option 1 seems to be the only option that allows non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation and have lived on Love Lane Estate after 2012 to be given an opportunity to be rehoused in the new homes. Therefore, as I fall into this category of residents I think this is the best option for me and others like myself • It gives assurances to people living on the estate it caters for the majority of people • I welcome the opportunity for me and my children to have a place to call home • For 10 years in temporary accommodation not better for me still stress in temporary accommodation • It is fair that everyone on the estate receive a council property <p>One resident in this group was in favour of Option 2, and one resident in favour of Option 3. Both noted that this was more suitable for their personal circumstances. The respondent in favour of Option 3 noted that this was due to them not having lived on the estate for 12 months, and therefore not meeting the eligibility criteria under Option 1.</p>
<p>Secure tenants within the masterplan area (Love Lane Estate)</p>	<p>All secure tenants in the masterplan area were in favour of Option 1. Responses indicated that this was preferred for the security it provided of remaining in the existing area in a council property, in line with the existing commitments of the Secure Tenant Guide, agreed by Cabinet in 2014. Example responses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have lived in the area all of my life and have family and friends who live close by • I want to stay in the community I've always been in • Fair for everyone concerned • Almost all tenants will be rehoused under this option
<p>Households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area</p>	<p>88% of households on the housing register and not living on the masterplan area were in favour of Option 1.</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

	<p>Responses indicated that this option was generally preferred as it represented the fairest option and protected the existing community in the area whose homes are due to be demolished. There was also recognition that there would still be opportunities for households on the wider housing register to access a new council home in the High Road West development. Example responses are provided below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seems like a fair option for all. It takes into consideration the community rather than breaking it up.• It is the fairest and least disruptive option in order to preserve the existing community. Better prioritisation and makes sense.• I choose council's preferred option because it gives priority to even temporarily accommodation family's.• People who are on the housing register are able to bid for the new built for property too.• The council have a better ideal on how to manage individuals home issue• It does sound the fairest option. My concern, as a local on the housing register, that I won't get a look in at these new homes due to priority• Option 1 seems to be the most thought out proposal in regards transparency, fairness to existing tenants in the masterplan area and equality to those on the housing register (at least 250 homes to be made available) <p>Six residents in this group were in favour of Option 2, and six residents in favour of Option 3. These respondents noted that these options were fairer or had a lesser impact on other households on the council's housing register.</p> <p>It should be noted that six residents who responded in favour of Option 1 indicated in their response that they believed they were currently living in the High Road West masterplan area, which influenced their response. Many respondents also put forward details of their specific housing situation to be considered.</p>
--	--

Proposal: Order of prioritisation for new home lets

- 3.7. The consultation booklet describes the proposed priority order for new home. In general, this prioritises residents in the masterplan area for rehousing by phase, in the order in which their homes are required for demolition. Once all residents in the masterplan area have been rehoused, then the new homes would be made available to households on the housing register. It also proposes that eligible secure and assured tenants are given priority over non-secure tenants in the rehousing process for each block. Consultees were asked whether they agreed with the proposal.
- 3.8. 142 respondents answered questions on this proposal. 88% of these respondents were in favour of the council's proposed priority order, with 12% not in favour. This

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

response in favour of the proposal was reflected across the three consultee groups. A breakdown is provided in the following table.

Response (Do you agree with this priority order?)	<i>Non-secure tenants in the masterplan area</i>		<i>Secure tenants in the masterplan area</i>		<i>Households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area</i>		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	28	90	8	100	89	86	125	88
No	3	10	0	0	14	14	17	12
Total	31	100	8	100	103	100	142	100

22 respondents did not answer the questions on this proposal, all of whom were non-secure tenants in the masterplan area. See paragraph 3.11 for commentary on this.

3.9. Commentary on the responses from each consultee group are provided in the table below.

Group	Commentary
Non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation within the masterplan area	<p>Of non-secure tenants who answered questions on this proposal, 90% were in favour of the council's proposed priority order.</p> <p>Respondents were generally in favour of the proposals as the priority order would bring less disruption by way of the phasing approach, and by prioritising residents whose homes are due to be demolished first.</p> <p>Many respondents used this question to reiterate their preference for the council's proposed eligibility criteria, including the offer of a secure home to eligible non-secure tenants, relevant to the previous proposal. Example responses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will help those in need first • This priority order seems to bring the least amount of disruption • The priority order is fair because the people that have been living in these properties more then me but there is also people with medical needs like myself • Because the council will help residents get a new home faster and support principle of maintaining the continuity of the existing community living in each block <p>Three respondents were not in favour of the council's proposed priority order. In their answer to the question, two respondents stated that the approach was unfair, and that all residents should have an opportunity to move to the new homes at the same time. The other respondent referred to their individual housing circumstances and requested that they were prioritised on this basis.</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

<p>Secure tenants within the masterplan area (Love Lane Estate)</p>	<p>All secure tenants in the masterplan area were in favour of the proposed priority order. Respondents generally agreed that secure tenants, who have generally lived on the estate for a longer period of time, should be prioritised. Example responses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal offers the least amount of disruption to residents. A transition which results in the fewest moves (i.e. rehousing) is ideal • Priority to rehouse long term tenants is very sensible • Because it is fair
<p>Households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area</p>	<p>86% of households on the housing register and not living in the masterplan area were in favour of the proposed priority order.</p> <p>Respondents generally agreed that priority for the new homes should be given to residents in the masterplan area whose homes are proposed to be demolished. As with the previous proposal, there was recognition that there would still be opportunities for households on the wider housing register to access a new council home in the High Road West development.</p> <p>Some residents also noted that once eligible Love Lane residents had been rehoused, then households on the housing register with the most urgent housing need should be prioritised for the remaining homes. The policy would achieve this by letting the remainder of the homes in line with the council's Housing Allocations Policy. Example responses are provided below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority being given to Love Lane residents is the main concern as they are highly affected • I completely agree with the priority order as I understand that those whom have had their houses demolished are more in need of permanent housing. • I agree with the priority because other people apart from Love Lane tenants will be given the other opportunity as well • I feel people the people who homes are having homes demolished should be house 1st then longest bidders <p>14 respondents, 14% of this group were not in favour of the proposed priority order. The respondents generally stated that priority should be given to households who had been on the housing register the longest, regardless of their location, or should be given to those with specific housing needs, including residents with disabilities, single parents, and those with young children.</p> <p>An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been produced to assess the impact of the proposal on groups with protected characteristics, see Appendix 6 of the May 2021 Cabinet report.</p>

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Other comments

- 3.10. The final question in the consultation booklet sought to capture any other comments around the draft policy which were not captured by the previous questions or related to the two proposals put forward.
- 3.11. 41% of non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation in the masterplan area did not respond to questions on the two proposals. In responding to the final question, all these respondents wrote variations of a message requesting that non-secure tenants in the masterplan area be offered “secure tenancies prior to the ballot”. This refers to the resident ballot scheduled to take place on the Love Lane Estate in summer 2021, in line with the Mayor of London’s Estate Regeneration Resident Ballot requirement. Some respondents also noted that they would like the offer of a new council home to be extended to elsewhere in the borough, beyond only the High Road West scheme, and that additional guarantees be made regarding this offer beyond the Local Lettings Policy.
- 3.12. The offer of a secure tenancy to non-secure tenants in the scheme is only deemed to be possible by delivering High Road West and the 500 new council homes. The 500 council homes will be sufficient to rehouse not only all secure and non-secure tenants on Love Lane, but also 250 households with the highest priority on the wider housing register which is seen to be a fair balance of protecting the stability of the existing community while also providing a substantial number of new council homes for the households with the most pressing housing need in the borough.
- 3.13. Across all three consultee groups there were questions around the time it would take to build the new council homes and when eligible residents would be able to move in. Several respondents living in the masterplan area noted their specific requirements, such as need for a ground floor property, and asked that these be considered in the lettings process.
- 3.14. Many respondents who were households on the housing register who were not living in the masterplan area provided information on their individual circumstances and asked questions around the likelihood of them being able to move to one of the new council homes at High Road West. It is not possible to comment on individual circumstances through this consultation. In addition, as the new homes will take several years to build, it is not possible to give details on the implications for individual households living outside the masterplan area at this stage.

Proposed change – amending the proposed eligibility criteria for non-secure tenants in the masterplan area

- 3.15. As noted in the table in paragraph 3.6, one consultation response was received from a non-secure tenant in the masterplan area, who stated that they would not be eligible for a new council home in High Road West under the current criteria, due to having lived on the estate less than 12 months prior to the proposed date of publication of the Landlord Offer. As set out in paragraph 5.5, engagement officers also spoke to four non-secure tenants by phone, who also expressed their disappointment that they were not eligible under the current criteria.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

- 3.16. In response to this, it has been decided in the final Local Lettings Policy to reduce the duration of time that non-secure tenants are required to have lived in the masterplan area from at least 12 months prior to the publication of the Landlord Offer, **to at least 6 months**. This responds to this feedback received across consultation and engagement and means that the very small number of tenants currently living in the masterplan area who were not eligible under the criteria in the draft policy, which is less than 10 residents, would be made eligible for a new Council home in High Road West.
- 3.17. This supports the principle of maintaining a strong and sustainable community in the masterplan area, which was favoured by most respondents. It also recognises that by the time these tenants are required to relocate as a result of the regeneration, they will have lived on the estate for a much longer duration and are likely to have settled within their community.

Demographics of respondents

Age range	No.	%
Under 20	0	0
21-24	2	1
25-29	12	7
30-44	49	30
45-59	67	41
60-64	7	4
65-74	8	5
75-84	1	1
85-89	0	0
90 and over	0	0
(blank)	18	11
Total	164	100

Disability	No.	%
Have a mental or physical health condition	45	27
Do not have a mental or physical health condition	100	61
(blank)	19	12
Total	164	100

Ethnicity	No.	%
Asian	12	7
Black	77	47

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Mixed	15	9
White	13	8
Other	26	16
(blank)	21	13
Total	164	100

Sex	No.	%
Female	108	66
Male	38	23
Prefer not to say / (blank)	18	11
Total	164	100

Gender	No.	%
Same as birth sex	136	83
Prefer not to say	6	4
Differs from sex	1	1
(blank)	21	12
Total	164	100

Sexuality	No.	%
Bisexual	1	1
Gay man	0	0
Heterosexual	116	71
Lesbian woman	2	1
Prefer not to say	20	12
(blank)	25	15
Total	164	100

Refugee or Asylum Seeker	No.	%
A refugee	15	9
An asylum seeker	5	3
(blank)	144	88
Total	164	100

Religion	No.	%
Christian	79	48
Muslim	36	22

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Other	6	4
No religion	13	8
(blank)	30	18
Total	164	100

Language	No.	%
Albanian	2	1
Arabic	3	2
English	74	45
French	5	3
Mandarin	2	1
Polish	5	3
Portuguese	7	4
Somali	8	5
Spanish	4	3
Turkish	12	7
Other	10	6
(blank)	32	20
Total	164	100

4. Consultation on the Draft Leaseholder Offer

- 4.1. Consultation on the Local Lettings Policy sought the views of resident and non-resident leaseholders on the Love Lane Estate. The draft Love Lane Leaseholder Offer Consultation Questions booklet considered the sections of the draft policy in turn, with specific questions around the proposed changes and enhancements to the council's Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy 2017 (ERRPP).
- 4.2. 6 legitimate responses were received, 5 responses by post and 1 completed online. All responses were from resident leaseholders, representing 24% of those currently living on Love Lane Estate (25 resident leaseholders total). In conversations between engagement officers and resident leaseholders who did not provide a response, several noted that they had provided feedback to the Council on the draft offer in previous rounds of consultation, which has informed the draft policy. Further information on previous consultation with leaseholders can be found in paragraphs 6.15 and 6.16 of the Cabinet report.
- 4.3. No responses were received from the 23 non-resident leaseholders who own properties on the Love Lane Estate at the time of consultation. It should be noted that, apart from a more restrictive definition of resident leaseholder, the draft Leaseholder Offer includes only one change from the baseline offer in the ERRPP for non-resident leaseholders. This relates to the payment of compensation for 'Decent Homes' works,

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

which was not covered within the ERRPP but is an existing commitment of the 2014 Leaseholder Guide, and therefore is not a new proposal.

- 4.4. A further 9 responses were received which were all completed online. These respondents either did not provide their address or provided an address outside of the Love Lane Estate. All of these responses were in favour of the proposals, and did not provide any further written feedback beyond stating 'yes' 'no' or 'unsure' to the questions. In phone calls with leaseholders, no residents spoken to stated that they had submitted an online form. Based on this, it is deemed highly unlikely that these responses came from leaseholders on Love Lane Estate, and it is inferred that these may have originated from respondents completing the incorrect form for the Local Lettings Policy consultation. These responses have been discounted and have not been considered as part of the consultation analysis.

Proposal: Definition of a resident leaseholder

- 4.5. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the proposed definition of a resident leaseholder. The Leaseholder Offer has a different definition of resident leaseholder to the ERRPP for the purposes of eligibility for rehousing options. The definition within the Leaseholder Offer reflects the Leaseholder Guide definition.
- 4.6. Three respondents (50%) were in favour of the proposed definition of a resident leaseholder. No further comments were provided by these leaseholders.
- 4.7. Three of the respondents were not in favour of the definition. The reasons provided are summarised as follows:
- Preference that the definition of resident leaseholder should include historic residency, as a leaseholder may have interrupted recent occupancy for personal reasons, and then return within the proposed timeframe. The current definition would exclude such a leaseholder.
 - The current definition would penalise anyone who legitimately moved in as a resident leaseholder since December 2014, which is particularly unfair due to the long timescales for the regeneration scheme and is designed to save the council money. It is also unlikely that landlords would move back for an additional 5% value in compensation, which would be cancelled out by the costs of removing tenants and moving back into the property.
- 4.8. The option of using the ERRPP definition of a resident leaseholder for the purposes of the rehousing options was considered by officers. However, it was considered that this would go beyond the Council's aim of ensuring the existing community can be kept together. Under the ERRPP definition, there is a risk that buy-to-let landlords could move into a Love Lane property in response to the publication of the masterplan, to secure the rehousing offer at the expense of public funds for Council housing. Furthermore, by increasing the number of people considered as a resident leaseholder, the cost to the Council would be significantly greater, particularly because of the enhanced terms being offered for Love Lane residents. In the Council's view, this additional cost would not be a reasonable use of public housing funds.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

Proposal: Enhanced equity loan terms – Minimum contribution

- 4.9. Respondents were asked whether they agreed to the enhanced equity loan terms for resident leaseholders to buy a new home within the High Road West area. This includes a reduction to 25% minimum contribution to buy a new home, with the council offering an equity loan to cover the outstanding balance.
- 4.10. Four respondents (67%) were generally in favour with the proposed minimum contribution of 25%. These respondents noted that:
- I will be offered the equity loan and that gives me a lot of chance to buy a property.
 - The 25% minimum contribution for the enhanced equity offer strikes the right balance for us.
 - As an offer to allow a resident leaseholder access to remain mortgage free the offer provides a workable solution.

These respondents did however put forward some concerns and comments alongside this, summarised as follows:

- The Home Loss payment should be separate and not required as part of the contribution.
 - If a resident leaseholder has an existing mortgage or second charge, then they may not be able to use the total funds given for their existing property, without acquiring additional funds to repay their debt. This could present issues if a leaseholder cannot re-mortgage for example.
 - If the new homes are expensive, then the 25% contribution may be too high.
- 4.11. Two respondents (33%) were not in favour of this proposal, with one respondent providing the reasons for this, summarised as follows:
- The need for an equity loan shows that the homes are unaffordable and too expensive to buy outright from the compensation package. Resident leaseholders who have paid off their mortgage will now have additional debt to the council. The leaseholder would retain 100% of the responsibilities for repair and service charge obligation.
- 4.12. Officers considered the option of the Council making up the difference in value between existing and new homes for resident leaseholders, and for the Home Loss payment to be excluded from any requirement to invest equity into a new home. However, these proposals were not supported as these would result in a significant amount of funds being required from the HRA, and would reduce the amount available for the Council to fund repairs and maintenance of Council stock and for acquiring new Council owned homes for the most vulnerable residents in the borough.
- 4.13. In regard to a situation in which a resident cannot afford 25% of the new property, the Leaseholder Offer sets out that their individual circumstances would be considered in the light of an independent financial assessment, to find the most appropriate way of enabling them to stay in the area without adversely affecting their financial situation.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

- 4.14. In regard to service charges, in the new development, officers will be working closely with leaseholders to understand the type and level of services that they want and need and to ensure that these are affordable.

Proposal: Enhanced equity loan terms – Passing on the equity loan

- 4.15. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the 12-month grace period for family members / beneficiaries in the event of the death of the leaseholder, to decide whether to sell the property and use the proceeds to find alternative accommodation or to pay off the equity loan and retain the leasehold property. There was one positive response to this proposal, two mixed, and three negative.
- 4.16. The positive or mixed responses generally indicated that they were in favour of the opportunity for the adult child to be the owner of the property. All three respondents expressed some concerns around a situation arising where the adult child was not able to repay the equity loan, and one suggested that the grace period should be extended, particularly due to the need to pay for funeral funds.
- 4.17. Of the three negative responses, two provided additional comments. Both stated that the 12-month grace period is too short, with one noting that leaseholders should have the ability to leave the property to another beneficiary.
- 4.18. Officers considered enabling the equity loan arrangement to be transferred to children or another beneficiary under the leaseholder's will. However, this option was considered to not be a prudent use of HRA funds, as this would tie up a substantial amount of public housing funds for many years, which otherwise could be used for funding other Council housing. The 12-month grace period was considered a reasonable period of time for family members to consider their options properly and to investigate obtaining a mortgage.

Other comments on the equity loan offer

- 4.19. Respondents were also asked if they had any other comments around the equity loan offer. Two responses were received to this question, with one resident noting that an option to use the equity loan areas in other parts of England would be an attractive offer. The other respondent stated that they were not in favour of the equity loan offer and expressed concerns about the affordability of the new homes.
- 4.20. In response to the feedback received, clarification has been added that the Discretion Panel will be able to consider offering equity loans for properties outside of Haringey based on individual circumstances. This is particularly relevant given the location of the Love Lane Estate in the north-east of the borough, near the borough boundary with Enfield. This does not apply to the enhanced equity loan terms which are available for new properties in High Road West only.

Proposal: The option to complete a leasehold swap

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

- 4.21. Respondents were asked whether they agree with the proposal to provide the option of leasehold swap option for resident leaseholders. This is the option to swap their property for an existing council property elsewhere in the borough, subject to limited availability. This option was previously made to Love Lane resident leaseholders in the Leaseholder Guide but does not appear in the ERRPP.
- 4.22. Four respondents (67%) were generally in favour with the proposal to offer of a leasehold swap. Three of these did not provide any further comments. One respondent noted that they would like to see additional details provided such as a list of available properties, timescales of availability and information on the lengths of leases provided (i.e. would these be extended beyond the length of their existing lease on the Love Lane Estate). A question was also raised on whether the value of the property could be increased in combination with an equity loan option.
- 4.23. Two respondents (33%) were not in favour of this proposal. One respondent provided additional comments, stating that the leasehold swap was the 'least bad option on offer' but noting that this was subject to availability and that they would still not like to relocate / prefer to stay in their current location. This respondent suggested that offering a secure tenancy to resident leaseholders would be a better option.
- 4.24. The final policy includes clarification that to access the leasehold swap option, leaseholders are required to submit a leasehold swap needs assessment form to the Discretion Panel. This has been added to clarify the process for accessing this rehousing option, recognising that leasehold swaps will be subject to very limited availability and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 4.25. The council's rehousing team will be engaging resident leaseholders on the detailed leasehold swap process in the coming months, including working with leaseholders to complete a needs assessment form if this is a preferred option.

Other comments on the rehousing options for resident leaseholders

- 4.26. Respondents were also asked whether they have any other comments regarding the proposed re-housing options for resident leaseholders. Two responses were received to this question, with one respondent noting their preference to stay in the area in a new home in High Road West, with the other stating that they would prefer not to move from their existing property.

Proposal: Option to appoint an independent single joint expert if an agreement cannot be reached on the valuation

- 4.27. Respondents were asked whether they agree with the proposal to appoint an independent single joint expert if an agreement cannot be reached on the valuation. The single joint expert (a third valuer) would help them reach an agreement, and reasonable costs will be covered by the council.
- 4.28. Three respondents were in favour of the proposal as the expert is jointly agreed by both sides, representing a fairer process. One reiterated that the expert should be independent and not a council employee.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

4.29. Three respondents were not in favour of the proposal. The reasons provided are summarised as follows:

- The opinion from a single joint expert seems restrictive and possibly not unbiased – if three were used then a more balanced decision could be made.
- The council is not allowing you to choose your own surveyor.
- I do not believe that the “joint expert” would be sufficiently neutral as a local authority has more power and influence over members of the surveying profession than does an individual profession.

4.30. These responses suggest that there were misconceptions amongst respondents around the valuation process and the role of the single joint expert, indicating this could have been communicated clearer in the consultation material. All leaseholders can appoint a qualified valuer to act on their behalf, with reasonable costs reimbursed by the Council. If an agreement cannot be reached between the Council’s valuer and the leaseholder’s valuer, then the parties can appoint a single joint expert (a third valuer). Both parties would need to agree the choice of the expert, who would be jointly appointed, and would be a RICS qualified valuer. Officers will engage leaseholders to ensure they are familiar of the valuation process and their ability to appoint an independent valuer/surveyor.

Other comments on the valuation process

4.31. Respondents were asked whether they had any other comments regarding the proposed valuation process. Two responses were received to this question, with one leaseholder noting that the valuation should be fair and receive market value, and the other stating that they did not want to move out of their existing home into the new properties. In regard to the first point, leaseholders are entitled to receive the full market value for their property.

Proposal: Decent Homes reimbursements

4.32. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the proposal that all Love Lane leaseholders will be able to claim for compensation for Decent Homes works carried out before the council’s Cabinet agreed the High Road West masterplan in December 2014.

4.33. Three respondents were in favour of this proposal and did not provide any further comments. One respondent did not respond to this question. Two respondents were not in favour of the proposal, with one noting that some residents had not benefited from the Decent Homes work improvements and that these should be carried out on existing properties, with these residents also not benefiting from additional compensation.

Other comments on the payments for resident and non-resident leaseholders

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

- 4.34. Respondents were asked whether they had any other comments on the payments for resident and non-resident leaseholders. Three responses were received to this question, summarised as follows:
- All payments should be separate and not contribute towards purchasing a new home.
 - Properties may be sold for less than their estimated value. For example, my property is a two bedroom and the price given for my property is less compared to other two bedrooms around the council.
 - I do not want to move and am not interested in shared equity or shared ownership as these represent a poor financial deal and a real decline in my tenure status. I wish to remain in my current home with 100% equity. Leasehold new build properties do not fill me with confidence. I am not interested in expensive new facilities and services which will inflate the service charges, and fear inflated ground rents in place of the council pepper-corn style ground rent.
- 4.35. As noted, leaseholders are entitled to full market value of their property, and a dispute resolution process (through the single joint expert approach) is put forward in the Leaseholder Offer in cases where an agreement on the valuation of the existing property cannot be reached. Officers will also be working closely with leaseholders to understand the type and level of services that they want and need and to ensure that these are affordable.
- 4.36. The Leaseholder Offer put forward by the council needs to be generous but also fair, in striking a balance in both providing support to existing leaseholders and funding other housing within the borough, including for the borough's most vulnerable residents.

Other comments on the Love Lane Leaseholder Offer

- 4.37. Respondents were asked whether they had any other comments on the draft Love Lane Leaseholder Offer. One response was received to this question, which raised concerns around the size of the reply envelope included with the consultation booklet and its suitability given the size of the document to be returned. This feedback will be responded to in future consultation and engagement exercises.

5. Engagement with non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation

- 5.1. The Council also engaged non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation on other proposed commitments as part of an offer to these residents. The list of proposed commitments was sent to all non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation on the estate. The commitments include the promise of a new council home in High Road West for eligible residents which meets their rehousing need, as well as support from the council through the rehousing and regeneration process, and contribution to their moving costs.

Appendix 1: High Road West - Consultation & Engagement Report for Draft Resident Offers

- 5.2. A feedback form was included in the consultation and engagement pack sent to non-secure tenants. 27 responses were received in total, all by post. Of these, 13 provided written comments, and 14 of these were blank. Of those who wrote comments, the following points were raised:
- 7 respondents were positive around the commitments and the new home offer
 - 5 respondents provided details of their specific housing need to be considered in the lettings process, included concerns about their current overcrowding situation
 - 2 respondents stated that they would like non-secure tenants to be offered a secure tenancy now or prior to the ballot taking place (see 3.11 for further commentary on this)
 - 2 respondents stated that the existing homes on the Love Lane Estate are of a poor quality
 - 1 respondent stated that they would not be eligible for the new council home under the current criteria
- 5.3. As noted in paragraph 2.3, engagement officers spoke to 124 non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation (63% of those living on the estate) across the consultation and engagement period. In conversations with residents, the majority were found to be broadly positive about the commitments. The overwhelming focus of these discussions was on the offer of a new Council home for eligible non-secure tenants, and of the specific rehousing need and preferences of these residents. There was also a focus on the phasing and timescales of the scheme.
- 5.4. Several residents raised questions around the level of compensation that will be offered to non-secure tenants to cover the costs of moving to the new property. expressed a clear desire to see these costs, such as removal vans and expenses for fittings and disconnections, covered by the Council. In response to this, it is proposed in the Landlord Offer that the Council will offer the same package of disturbance payments to non-secure tenants in line with that offered to secure tenants and resident leaseholders. The Council will however not be liable to pay a Home Loss payment to non-secure tenants.
- 5.5. Engagement officers also spoke to four non-secure tenants over the phone who stated that they would not be eligible for a new council home in High Road West under the current criteria and expressed their disappointment that the offer was not extended to all non-secure tenants currently living on the Love Lane Estate. In response to this, a change to the eligibility criteria in the final Local Lettings Policy has been made, see paragraphs 3.15 to 3.17.