

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Responses Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy

1. Introduction

This report summarises the feedback received for the consultation carried out on the proposed Estate Renewal, Rehousing and Payments Policy. The formal consultation period started on 17th November 2015 and ended on 14th February 2016.

Feedback was received in a number of ways:

- Questionnaires completed by hand or on line
- Written submissions by e-mail
- Views expressed orally by attendees of consultation events (some of whom subsequently used the questionnaire)

2. Questionnaire Results

Response Rate

There were 12 online responses, and 41 paper returns, a total of 53 completed questionnaires.

Other feedback

Staff attended 7 meetings, and received comments from tenants, leaseholders at those meetings, as well as responses from the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisors. A further 43 text responses were received by email. 22 of these were identical, suggesting a coordinated campaign.

Demographic data

Tenure: Of the respondents, 36% were tenants, 32% tenants, and 30% owner occupiers. 2% did not provide tenure information.

Age: 2% were between 16 and 24; 14% were between 25 and 44; 32% were aged between 45 – 64 and 32% were over 65. The remainder preferred not to say what their age was.

Physical or Mental health condition lasting more than 12 months: 24% of respondents indicated that someone in their household had a physical or mental illness lasting more than 12 months.

Ethnicity: 31% of respondents were White British; 8% were White Irish and 6% were White (Other). 10% were Asian, 14% were Black and 12% were mixed race. The remainder preferred not to say what their ethnicity was.

Gender: 39% of respondents were male, and 54% were female. The remainder preferred not to say what their gender was.

Sexuality: 58% of respondents indicated that they were heterosexual. The remainder preferred not to say what their sexuality was.

Responses to the questionnaire

Questions	% of respondents who Agreed	% of respondents who disagreed	% of respondents who had no opinion
Do you agree with the proposals generally set out?	47%	47%	6%
Do you agree that the current Allocations Policy should apply to all tenants who are under occupying inc Estate renewal tenants?	55%	28%	17%
Approach to paying Home Loss and disturbance payments. Tenants can opt to be paid through submitting itemised receipts or can choose to receive a lump sum. Do you agree with this approach?	83%	2%	15%
Right to return. The Council will aim to offer tenants a right to return but this may not always be possible so will be assessed on a scheme by scheme basis. Do you agree with this approach?	62%	25%	13%

Tenants with adult children Which Option do you prefer?	Option 1 Tenants with adult children being moved as a result of estate renewal should be treated in the same way as other similar households on the housing register	Option 2 Tenants who are having to move as a result of estate renewal should be awarded additional priority (such as re-housing adult children separately)	No opinion
% of respondents	52%	41%	6%

Homeless and disturbance payments Which Option do you prefer?	Option 1 Tenants affected by Estate Regeneration should be paid the set amount in line with the requirements of legislation	Option 2 Tenants affected by Estate Regeneration should be paid additional discretionary sums	No opinion
% of respondents	35%	63%	2%

3. Other comments from organisations and individuals

Topic	Issue raised	Council response
Choice based lettings	Views were also expressed about the Choice Based Lettings scheme, and whether they could have a direct offer, rather than being obliged to bid for properties. This was particularly true for elderly or more vulnerable residents who found the system quite difficult to use.	The Council recognises that some applicants do find bidding online difficult. However, Choice Based Lettings is a very popular scheme as it does give additional choice to applicants to decide for themselves what they would like to bid for. It is proposed that applicants who find Choice Based Lettings more difficult will have additional support from officers working both in the Lettings Section and on the re-housing programme. It is not proposed to change this part of the policy as this would reduce choice for those who prefer to use it; direct offers will be made to all households who have not bid in the period up to 12 months before the demolition date.
Amount of time tenants will be given to bid for a property	Some residents were concerned that they would not be given enough time to bid for a property before they would allocated a property that met their needs by the Council	The Council agrees that this is a potential problem, in that people may bid differently, depending upon how long they think that they have, before they are required to make a forced move. The policy has therefore been amended to set a minimum required free bidding window of 6 months, before the period when a direct offer may be made. This is set out in paragraph 7.24.
Distress caused by estate renewal process	A number of respondents stated that in general the proposed policy did not sufficiently acknowledge the major disruption that estate renewal brought, and the distress it caused.	The Council agrees that there is insufficient recognition within the policy of the disruptive nature of estate renewal. This has been reflected better in the new draft of the policy, specifically in paragraph 1.2 and 5.1.
Future rent levels	Many respondents expressed concern about the level of rent and service charges that they would be obliged to pay in their new homes.	The Council recognises that the costs of a new home are a major concern of residents. Whilst it is not possible to give a guarantee on rent levels, as these are governed to a large extent by Central Government policy, it is possible to express a commitment to keeping rents affordable and this has been done in the new draft policy, paragraph 7.30.
Future Service Charges	Many respondents expressed concern about the level of service charges that they would be obliged to pay in their new homes.	The Council recognises that there are concerns about the level of service charges that residents may have to pay in their new homes. This is not entirely within the Council's control, however. It is proposed in the final policy that there is a commitment made to minimising service charges through design; and also to consulting on any new services that are introduced, for which a charge will be made. This is set out in the new draft policy, paragraph 7.31.
Compensation	The majority of respondents felt that they	Although the Council acknowledges that there was a majority in favour of paying

Topic	Issue raised	Council response
issues	should be paid higher levels of compensation over and above the minimum legal obligation.	more than the legal minimum compensation it is not proposed to change this policy. Home loss and compensation payments have a financial impact on all tenants, as they are paid from the Housing Revenue Account, and therefore reduce the resources available to improve the homes of tenants who do not benefit from estate renewal.
Nature of future tenancy	Many respondents were concerned about the type of tenancy that they will be offered, when they are obliged to move.	The Council recognises that the type of tenancy is a difficult issue, which has been made more complicated by recent changes in legislation. Generally, tenants who move to another Council tenancy, either voluntarily or through a direct offer will retain the same security of tenure. However, if a resident chooses to move to a Housing Association tenancy, or returns to a tenancy held by the developer of the site (which may be the Haringey Development Vehicle, this is simply not possible in law. The key is to ensure that tenants are fully informed of their options, and the consequences. This has been made explicit in the new draft policy in paragraphs 7.30.
Right to return	Respondents were concerned on behalf of both tenants and leaseholders about the breakup of communities, and many expressed the view that they should have been able to return to the same area, or same estate when regeneration had taken place in order to maintain community links. If they could not remain on the same estate, some expressed the wish to remain in the same area.	The Council is committed to enabling communities who wish to do so, to remain together. The Council will endeavour to ensure tenants have the right to return but this may not always be possible and so this is a matter that will be discussed with affected tenants and residents as part of the communications plan on a scheme by scheme basis.
Leaseholder issues	There were many respondents who expressed concern at the way in which the valuation will be carried out, and whether it would be independent, and fair. One Association asked whether it would be possible to offer temporary accommodation for leaseholders, if there were a gap between sale, and purchase of a new	The Council acknowledges that the valuation of their home will be an important issue for leaseholders. Valuations are carried out by independent valuers, and households can appeal to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal if they dispute the offer made. This has been well covered in the new policy, and no change to the policy is required in this area.

Topic	Issue raised	Council response
	property	
Private tenants	Some individuals expressed concern about what would happen to private tenants, if they were displaced by estate regeneration. The current policy states that they will receive advice and assistance.	The Council has sympathy for tenants whose private tenancies have come to an end. However, the Council does not have the resources to re-house all those displaced. The Council has a duty to provide advice and assistance, and the policy makes it clear that this will be provided.
General Comments	Several respondents, particularly those who wrote in, felt that the package of measures overall, was not as generous as that given to the tenants at High Road West, and felt that the package given to tenants there should be extended to tenants and leaseholders everywhere.	<p>The Council agrees that the package of measures offered to tenants and leaseholders in the estate renewal scheme at High Road West is relatively generous. This is a small scheme affecting around 200 tenants. However, forthcoming schemes are likely to be much larger, and it would be difficult to provide such a package of measures again as it would be likely to make estate renewal schemes less viable financially. It is not proposed to offer exactly the same package in all future estate renewal schemes. There are key elements of the proposed arrangements which will be a matter of a decision on a scheme by scheme basis; these issues will themselves be subject to consultation on a scheme by scheme basis, when the design and costs of the individual scheme are known.</p> <p>The differences between the proposed policy and the High Road West package are set out below.*</p>
The consultation process	One Association wanted more time, to respond to the consultation process, and one Association felt that the questions were too general	The Council does not agree that there was insufficient time for consultation. The consultation period was 12 weeks, and responses were received from all over the Borough. 12 weeks is in line with Government practice. In addition, 8 meetings were held in all parts of the Borough. The consultation was extensive and it would not be fair to those people who responded to prolong consultation and delay consideration of the results and adoption of the final policy. There were both general and specific questions. Many of the questions were agreed by Cabinet when the authorised the policy to go out to consultation.

* This table sets out the differences between the Residents Charter for High Road West and the proposed final policy:

High Road West	Estate Renewal, Rehousing and Payments Policy
-----------------------	--

High Road West	Estate Renewal, Rehousing and Payments Policy
Tenants	
<u>Guarantee</u> of return to the area; “choice of home” – The Residents Charter states “you will be offered a secure home in the High Road West Area”	<i>No guarantee of the right to return but there is a commitment to do so where possible.</i>
<u>Size</u> – a home that meets your needs; The Residents Charter states that if you are overcrowded, you will get the right size home in accordance with Allocations Policy. If you are under occupying now, then you will be allowed to keep a spare bedroom (although the Charter does mention that the rehousing officer will discuss with the tenant whether they can afford it (e.g. impact of bedroom tax)	<i>The proposed policy is line with the current Allocations Policy and says that the tenant can keep an extra spare bedroom if they are giving up a 4 bedroom home or a 3 bedroom adapted home.</i>
<u>Rent guarantee</u> – The Charter says “you will continue to pay a social rent”	<i>The proposed policy does not offer a rent guarantee, but says that the Council is committed to keeping rents affordable</i>
<u>Adult Children:</u> The issue of adult children and whether they will be rehoused separately is not mentioned in the High Road West guide	<i>Our proposed policy says that adult children are housed with the family, and can register on the Housing Register for a home of their own but get no special priority; treated in line with Allocations Policy</i>
Leaseholders	
<u>Choice:</u> The Leaseholder Guide offers leaseholders displaced a range of choices, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase a property in the regeneration area • Purchasing LCHO built by the Council • Leaseholder swap • Option to purchase elsewhere 	<i>The proposed policy states that options for leaseholders will be developed on a scheme by scheme basis</i>
Non resident leaseholders to receive 7.5% “home loss” compensation.	<i>The proposed policy states that options for leaseholders will be developed on a scheme by scheme basis. However, this is not a statutory obligation.</i>
If Decent Homes work was carried out, leaseholder to get the money they paid for this back, if it is not reflected in the value of their home	<i>The proposed policy states that options for leaseholders will be developed on a scheme by scheme basis.</i>
Commitment to an Independent Tenants and Leaseholder Adviser.	<i>The proposed policy says that an ITLA will normally be provided.</i>