



# **Tees Valley Sub Regional Choice Based Lettings**

## **Common Allocation Policy Review 2010**

### **Consultation Report September 2010**

**Formal Consultation Period  
1<sup>st</sup> July 2010 – 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010**

## 1. Introduction

The report highlights the consultation on key policy amendment suggestions which took place across the Tees Valley sub region and with customers and stakeholders.

The feedback from the consultation was analysed by the partnership and incorporated into the new policy where appropriate.

## 2. What we did

Formal consultation on the review of the Tees Valley common allocation policy began on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010 and ended on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010.

A consultation plan was developed identifying key stakeholders, including staff, elected members and board members, tenants, applicants, statutory & voluntary organisations, Registered Social Landlords and the wider community.

An Equalities Needs Impact Assessment screening identified the specialist groups that needed to be considered during the consultation period. These groups included:

- disability groups, including physical and mental disability
- older peoples groups, including particularly vulnerable / housebound
- younger persons groups
- BME groups, particularly A8 Nationals and Asian females
- gay/bisexual/lesbian/transgender groups

## 3. Who we consulted with

### Summary of consultation plan

Consultation Group	Variety of Methods used:
Elected Members and Board Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ e-mail</li><li>▪ briefings</li><li>▪ drop-in sessions</li><li>▪ presentations</li><li>▪ questionnaire</li></ul>
Members of Parliament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ e mail</li><li>▪ letter / copy policy</li></ul>
Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ e-mail</li><li>▪ briefings</li><li>▪ team meetings</li><li>▪ presentations</li><li>▪ quiz and questions</li><li>▪ questionnaire</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ website</li> <li>▪ staff newsletter</li> </ul>
Applicants and Tenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ letter / questionnaire</li> <li>▪ newsletters</li> <li>▪ housing forums</li> <li>▪ tenants panels</li> <li>▪ specialist groups</li> <li>▪ website</li> <li>▪ public notice – various media</li> <li>▪ road shows</li> <li>▪ coffee mornings</li> <li>▪ telephone surveys</li> </ul>
Sub Regional RSLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ e mail</li> <li>▪ newsletter</li> <li>▪ half day seminar</li> </ul>
Statutory and voluntary organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ stakeholder events</li> <li>▪ presentations</li> <li>▪ e mail</li> <li>▪ questionnaire</li> </ul>
Wider communities including MESMAC and DAD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ email</li> <li>▪ focus group meetings</li> </ul>

We consulted with 8428 people throughout the Tees Valley Sub Region, of which 1121 (13.3%) responded. Consultation methods included telephone surveys, postal questionnaires, focus group meetings and stakeholder events.

#### 4. Policy Review consultation results

**Q1. Local Lettings** - Do you agree with the suggestion to include within the policy that local lettings policies will be used to achieve a wide variety of policy objectives, including dealing with concentrations of deprivation or creating mixed communities by setting aside a proportion of vacancies for applicants who are in employment, or to enable existing tenants to take up an offer of employment? – 86.17% agreed with this suggestion.

	Sub Regional response
<b>Agree</b>	<b>86.17%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>6.44%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>6.88%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

**Q2. Cumulative Needs** - Do you agree with the suggestion to remove Cumulative Need from the assessment of applicant's housing needs? – 81.31% agreed with the suggestion to remove Cumulative Need. However, there was a distinct difference of opinion in Middlesbrough; with the majority disagreeing with this suggestion.

	<b>Sub Regional response</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>81.31%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>15.54%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>2.62%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.53%</b>

**Q3. Band 1+** - Do you agree with the suggestion to clarify that the priority band, Band 1+ should only apply to the main householder(s) rather than the household? – 72.13% Agreed with this suggestion.

	<b>Sub Regional response</b>
<b>Agreed</b>	<b>72.13%</b>
<b>Disagreed</b>	<b>25.45%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>2.17%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.25%</b>

**Q4. Priority Band 1 – HM Forces** - Do you agree with the suggestion to clarify awarding priority Band 1 to people at the point of leaving HM armed forces rather than leaving HM armed forces? - 87.15% agreed with this suggestion.

The majority of those that responded also felt that a priority, within Band 1, should be included for those that require suitably adapted properties because of a serious injury, medical condition or disability sustained as a result of service in the Armed Forces.

Respondents also felt quite strongly about the terminology used in the present Priority Band 1 for those leaving Armed Forces should not be referred to as priority for being 'institutionalised'.

	<b>Sub Regional response</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>87.15%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>9.42%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>2.68%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.75%</b>

**Q5. Property of the week** - Do you agree with the suggestion to remove Property of the week due to the limitations of the IT system? 88.16% agreed with this suggestion.

	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>88.16%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>8.37%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>2.97%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

**Q6. Local Connection** - Do you agree with the suggestion to remove the local connection question relating to applicants who have previously lived in the area for 5 years or more? – 82.75% agreed with this proposal.

	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>82.75%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>11.59%</b>
<b>No Resp.</b>	<b>4.88%</b>
<b>Neither agreed or disagreed</b>	<b>0.78%</b>

## **5. Policy Review Summary**

The response to policy review has been well received with the total percentage of respondents to the policy review suggested amendments as follows:

<b>Policy Review suggested amendment</b>	<b>% of Respondents in agreement with suggestions</b>
Local Lettings amendment	<b>86.17%</b>
Removing Cumulative need	<b>81.31%</b>
Band 1 + Main householder amendment	<b>72.13%</b>
Band 1+ HM Forces amendment	<b>87.15%</b>
Removing Property of the week	<b>88.16%</b>
Local Connection amendment	<b>82.75%</b>