

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION**  
**1st November, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Mallinder (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Birch, B. Cutts, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Jones, Khan, McNeely, Reeder, Sansome, Sheppard, Vjestica, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson, Julie Turner and Whysall.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-  
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

**24. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

There were no members of the public or press present at the meeting.

**25. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) The Chair reported that there would be a visit to the proposed Rother Valley caravan park at 11.00 a.m. on 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2018. Please contact Christine Bradley if interested in attending.

(2) Councillor Sheppard reported that a number of information hoardings had now been erected in the vicinity of the former Magistrates Court building giving details of the proposed Forge Island development.

(3) Councillor Vjestica reported himself and Councillors Reeder and Sheppard had met with Polly Hamilton and Elenore Fisher to further discuss/provide input/share views on the development of the Cultural Strategy. A further meeting was to be held which would be reported to the Select Commission in due course.

**26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20TH SEPTEMBER, 2018**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2018.

Arising from Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods), it was noted that there was a clerical correction which should read " ..... prominent in the south there were very few in north" not south as stated.

## **IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18**

Arising from Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods), it was noted that there was a clerical correction which should read "... reasons for the money not being spent in Wards could" and not should.

Arising from Minute No. 17 (visit to the Crematorium) Councillor Atkin reported that he had attended the visit and seen the changes that had been made to improve the facilities. Another visit was planned for 19<sup>th</sup> November at 5.30 p.m. and would urge any Members who had been unable to attend.

Arising from Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods – training on the Strategy), it was reported that training had been provided to Members in relation to the Neighbourhood Working Strategy. The first meeting had taken place between the Member Development Panel and Members of the Neighbourhood Working Group to identify the training needs as the initiative moved forward.

Councillor Jones expressed concern with regard to the training that had taken place. It has been titled "understanding your community" whereas the event itself had focussed on the Equalities Act which, whilst important, had not coincided with his understanding of what it was supposed to be.

Councillor Jones' comments would be fed back to the respective officer(s).

Arising from Minute No. 20 (Thriving Neighbourhoods recommendation (3), an update was requested as to whether the required training had been arranged.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 20<sup>th</sup> July, September, subject to the above clerical corrections, be approved as a correct record.

(2) That the required training for Members and officers in relation to the working of Thriving Neighbourhoods be convened as a matter of urgency together with an invitation to the Police to attend.

(3) That a written answer be provided to Mrs. Birch, Co-opted Member, with regard to the disused land and the land ownership map.

### **27. HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE**

Tom Smith, Assistant Director, Community Safety and Street Scene, presented an update on the implementation of the new Home to School Transport Policy together with Martin Raper, Head of Service, Street Scene, and Fiona Featherstone, 14-19 SEN Adviser.

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18

The revised Home to School Transport Policy was approved by the Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> April 2018 (Minute No. 134 refers). The changes included:

- Publication of the Home to School Transport Policy 2018-19;
- Introduction of the Home to School Transport Assessment Matrix;
- The introduction of a formal annual review of transport provision which included engagement with families;
- That an assessment of existing Service users be conducted to review their circumstances to enable participation on a voluntary basis ahead of the introduction of the formal annual review;
- The introduction of a personal travel budget scheme to provide transport support to families of children with special educational needs and disabilities;
- That post-16 transport travel arrangements be revised to replace direct transport as a first option with personal travel budgets for those students with special educational needs and disabilities;
- The consideration of alternative methods of support for particular groups or individuals such as walking bus, cycle or moped schemes when appropriate;
- The introduction of independent travel training as a central resource in Rotherham to support arrangements currently delivered by Special Schools for children from the age of 14+ to enable independence. That travel training be commenced from June 2018 for appropriate young people;
- The personal travel budgets for all students making new applications for post-16 travel be instigated from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2018, and existing users of the post-16 service permitted to apply on a voluntary basis from 1<sup>st</sup> May;
- That a transition period to validate the Transport Assessment Matrix would begin from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018, with the full implementation of the Policy for all new applicants with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2018;
- That children and young people in need of home to school transport, and including transport operators, be engaged as part of the transition and implementation process;
- Any decisions to amend the Transport Assessment Matrix, resulting from the transition period, to be delegated to the Assistant Director, Community Safety and Street Scene.

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

Following approval of the new Home to School Transport policy, the Transport Team had commenced completing the transport matrix for each new transport applicant. This had been further developed following work with Children and Young Peoples Service's (CYPS) Education Health Care Team. Following approval of an Education Health Care Plan (EHCP) the Team would provide a completed Matrix to support the initial transport request. Further work was programmed with special schools to enable completion in the future for those who were already being provided with transport.

The annual transport review process was to be undertaken at the same time as EHCP reviews and would assess the suitability of existing transport, and the ability to partake in Independent Travel Training. It was not normal practice for a CYPS or Transport Service representative to attend the reviews, as they were undertaken at schools and, therefore, required the support of individual schools with engagement having commenced. This was ongoing, with attendance at the Special Schools Heads meeting 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018.

Representatives of the Transport Team would attend to discuss the annual review process. The Service aimed to have a robust process for reviews in place in early 2019.

All transport applications were now being assessed in line with the Matrix with families being made aware of the options for transport including Personal Travel Budgets. Following the provision of a brochure in September 2018, detailing the choices for families, a number of families had expressed an interest in alternative transport options. The Personal Travel Budget was now a key part of options for families particularly for post-16 young people where it formed part of the initial application discussion.

To date the Service had received 30 expressions of interest with the following outcomes:

Of the 17 who already had existing transport:

- 2 had signed up to personal travel budgets
- 15 were currently under review

Of the 13 new post-16 starters:

- 8 had signed up to personal travel budgets
- 3 were currently under review
- 2 were not suitable

The Service had plans in place to discuss alternative methods of support for particular groups/individuals such as walking, bus, cycle, with the Parents' Forum and Special School as the Policy was implemented further and would consider opportunities as they arose in particular circumstances.

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18

The Service had considered a number of approaches with regard to travel training and had adopted a collaborative approach with Special Schools where the Council would deliver training for trainers, and training for young people would then be delivered through school staff.

Delivery of the initial 'train the trainer' training would be with the support of Leeds City Council's Independent Travel Training Team providing refresher training. The initial training was programmed for November and December 2018.

Further work was required to engage with transport operators outside of the Council and would take place over the coming months ahead particularly when a young person made the transition into public transport.

Authority for any amendments to the Transport Assessment Matrix had been delegated to the Assistant Director. Review by colleagues in Transport and CYPS and had identified some clarifications in terms of the interpretation of the document and minor reference changes to descriptions. The Matrix had accordingly been approved by the Assistant Director and circulated to CYPS colleagues to provide the basis of the assessment following confirmation of an EHCP.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- New applications were assessed against the matrix for post-16 transport
- Information from those that worked with children and young people was fed into the matrix process that allowed officers to make an objective assessment. It would always be tempered by those that worked with the young people concerned. Work was taking place with the schools so that they would complete a degree of the assessment themselves.
- There was an appeals process
- The independent travel training had not commenced as yet. Work was taking place with schools to look at the training levels required for staff to support the initiative. A survey had been conducted, in collaboration with Children's Services, across all the schools that children with special educational needs attended to ascertain the level of need and what position they were in to be able to deliver the training
- Leeds City Council could deliver train the trainer training across the 6 special schools initially this month. This would then enable Rotherham to deliver training to its young people. There was currently no provision within the Council to provide the training

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

- The ethos of travel training was to support young people to live independently ultimately and equipping the young person for adulthood so they could travel without someone always having to take them
- The special schools were really keen to travel train their own staff to deliver travel training as they could see the benefit to their young people
- Once a decision was made on an application it was discussed with the family. There was now more choice in the Policy such as personal travel budgets. An annual review would take place where there would be further discussion about travel and consider the appropriateness for independent travel training, timing of how that might occur and how travel might look for the individual through their school life. The Service very much wanted to move away from one service fitted all
- Had contactless travel cards been discussed with SYPTTE/bus companies?
- The Policy(ies) was available on the Council's website as well as the schools having an awareness of what services were offered. For those who did not have access to a computer, a paper application form would be sent out to the home address
- The definition of home to school transport was home to school. Many of the transports offered were via a mini bus. The way the Service was structured it was unable to offer tailored transport due to the number of children involved in the process
- Had SYPTTE recently changed their criteria for disabled persons' travel passes?
- Changes in the Policy would reduce the costs related to the current cohort of young people, estimated to be approximately £162,000 per annum. However, that was in the context of increasing demand nationally in terms of this type of service. It was known that the number of children with SEND was rising nationally which exerted more pressures on the Service. There was a close working relationship with Children's Services
- Disability Living Allowance or PIP could not be taken into consideration at the present time when assessing applications for transport assistance as they were payment for wider family support and not home to school assistance
- Concern regarding the appeal process and the lack of ability for an officer to allow a renewal of a home to school transport bus pass when the circumstances of that family had not changed from the previous year

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That an update be submitted to the Select Commission in 6 months.

(3) That the possibility of contactless cards be discussed with SYPTTE/bus companies.

(4) That the appeals process for the renewal of a home to school free bus pass be reconsidered in those cases where a family's circumstances had not changed from the previous year.

## **28. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY 2019-2022**

Sandra Tolley (Head of Housing Options), Jill Jones (Homelessness Manager) and Sandra Wardle (Housing Advice and Assessment Manager) gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

The Homelessness Reduction Act

Moves local authority approach to homelessness from less crisis intervention to more prevention ensuring more people were entitled to help.

Background

- Housing Act 1996 Part 7 remains the primary legislation
- Prior to April 2018 the principal duty was to secure accommodation for applicants who were eligible, homeless or threatened with homelessness within 28 days and who had a 'priority need' for housing and were homeless unintentionally
- Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 amended the 1996 Act, introducing new statutory duties to act to prevent and relieve homelessness for all eligible applicants who were homeless or threatened with homelessness within 56 days

Before 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2018

- Single people with no clear priority need were entitled to 'advice and assistance' but their needs were often not assessed
- Prevention activity was 'good practice' but not compulsory – crisis response at the point of homelessness was commonplace
- The process involved an application, officers undertaking inquiries, assessing an applicant against the statutory tests and making a decision without needing to involve the applicant in finding possible solutions

Now

- All eligible applicants have a full assessment of their housing and support needs
- Local connection, intentionality and priority need were not a barrier to accessing support
- Applicants and authorities work together to prevent or relieve

homelessness

The Homelessness Reduction Act

The Act placed a number of new duties on local housing authorities

- Expanded advice and information duty – available to all residents regardless of eligibility. Advice must be designed to meet the needs of particular groups; care leavers, former members of the armed forces, people leaving custody, victims of domestic abuse, people leaving hospital and people with mental health issues
- Prevention duty – owed to all eligible applicants threatened with homelessness in the next 56 days irrespective of 'local connection', 'priority need' or 'intentional homelessness'. Includes tenants served with a valid Section 21 notice (no fault eviction) which expired within 56 days
- Relief duty – owed to people who were actually homeless and lasted for 56 days irrespective of 'priority need' or 'intentional homelessness'. The local authority may refer to another authority if the applicant had no local connection to their authority

Duty to Refer (from October, 2018)

This duty applied to:

- Prisons and youth offender institutions
- Secure training centres and secure colleges
- Youth offending teams
- Probation Services (including community rehabilitation companies)
- Jobcentre Plus
- Social Service authorities
- Emergency departments and urgent treatment centres
- Hospitals in their function of providing inpatient care
- Secretary of State for defence in relation to members of the armed forces

Preparation for the Act

- Structure changes
- Allocation Policy Review
- Personal Housing Plans developed
- Upgraded ICT Systems
- New Homelessness Contact Card
- Extensive training
- Implemented the Homelessness Code of Guidance

The Impact

- Same picture nationally
- Temporary accommodation target 32-39 currently plus hotels
- As of 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018 case load increased from 132 in April 2018 to 354 cases  
54 in intervention stage



149 prevention stage

143 (households) relief stage

8 Main Duty stage

#### Rough Sleeping

- Official numbers were low (November, 2017 = 2)
- The Count (30<sup>th</sup> October, 2018)
- Reporting a rough sleeper
- Framework 0800 0665358

#### The New Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeper Strategy

- Homelessness Act 2002 (2003-2008)
- Five yearly since
- Currently reviewing 2014-2018
- New Strategy 2019-2023
- Review annually

#### Achievements

- 7 priorities – all actions met
- 16/17 year old protocol implemented

Sub-Regional Funding attained for Rough Sleepers

Restructure of Housing Options Service including Resettlement Officers and Tenancy Support Officers

Reviewed provision of temporary accommodation (to be increased)

#### Consultation

- Improving Places Select Commission
- Side by Side Homelessness Forum
- Rotherham Show
- Staff

#### The New Strategy

##### Proposed 7 key priorities

- Supporting people with complex needs
- Rapid housing – getting everyone housed quicker
- Preventing and supporting young people from becoming homeless
- Ending rough sleeping
- Preventing homelessness to reduce the impact on health/mental health
- Reduce the time spent in temporary accommodation
- Sustaining tenancies

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

### Timetable

- July 2018-October 2018 – consultation period
- November 2018 – first draft
- January 2019 – final draft
- February 2019 – Cabinet for approval
- March 2019 – publish new Strategy

### Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The Code of Guidance now included in the priority group those that were terminally ill receiving palliative care
- £37,500 per annum Government funding was received for rough sleepers, the same as Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield. It paid for the outreach service and for a support worker who helped identify those as sleeping rough in whatever way they needed
- £200,000 funding had been received for domestic abuse which had been used to set up 2 properties for those that could not access the refuge e.g. had an animal, older children or had complex needs (alcohol/drug issues). A further funding bid had been submitted. The other part of the funding had been used for support that Rotherham Rise (specialist domestic abuse provider) had provided
- 354 referred to the number of households and could be single people, couples or families. In Homelessness terms it was “households” units
- Within Rotherham there were Mental Health Services at Swallownest Court and the Hospital. Within the Council, the Service worked very closely with the Vulnerable Person’s Team which had 3 Mental Health Social Workers. Joint visits were carried out whenever required
- The new Strategy was to be submitted to the Select Commission in December, 2018
- The Service received a daily report of those that had been identified as sleeping rough. If allowed, their names would be taken and assistance provided
- The Rough Sleeper Team was out in the town centre 2/3 times a week. Outreach work was carried out at Shiloh, Carnson House, the Probation Service and in prisons. If it was known that someone was out on the street a homeless assessment was carried out, Framework went out 2/3 times a week and the Tenancy Support Team would follow that up

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18

- Local businesses were one of the main reporters of those who may be rough sleeping or begging. Officers would go out with the Police, PCSO and/or the Police's Vulnerable Person's Team and would also visit someone across the border
- Within the Allocations Policy there was a rule that if someone had been evicted they were not eligible to join the Housing Register for 5 years. However, individual circumstances would be considered and quite a detailed assessment undertaken to ascertain if they were intentionally homeless
- Framework, who were commissioned to carry out Rotherham's outreach work, also carried out work in Sheffield. Their contract would expire in January, 2019
- Shiloh was one of the organisations the Service worked very closely with. Tenancy Support staff carried out outreach work with them twice a week and helped in whatever way they could
- The outcomes of the assessments/personalised plans were monitored electronically and reported to Government. It was quite new so there was no data as yet but it would collate a lot of detailed information. A number of the questions asked were quite daunting for the people the Service was working with but it was important to give them the right support
- The length of time someone would be supported varied: the aim was to prevent them from becoming homeless again
- No waiting list at the moment
- The Team not only supported those that were homeless but also provided support in cases where there were issues with a tenancy that may result in the tenant becoming homeless
- There had been a sharp increase in cases since the implementation of the Act. The most common reason why people accessed the Service was when they lost their assured shorthold tenancy which could be for various reasons e.g. the property being sold, tenant behaviour issues, rent arrears, relationship breakdown both violent and non-violent.
- The Service worked with Refuge and the Independent Domestic Violence Advocates as well as other partners
- The outcome of the consultation would be included in the report to be submitted in December

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

- A tender exercise was underway for 6 short lease modular buildings
- An ex-officer of the Armed Forces who was homeless would be considered under the Homeless Legislation and their particular circumstances taken into account. If there were any other issues that needed to be taken into account the Allocation Policy would come into play. At present if someone had been a member of the armed forces for the last 5 years they would get a high band on the Allocation Policy but if less than 5 years their medical needs would be taken into consideration
- There were 20 bed spaces available for those with complex needs through Housing First. There was currently a waiting list of 10 people
- Framework had been working with the Council since 24<sup>th</sup> September. Since then 15 rough sleepers had been found 6 of which had already been accommodated, one already had accommodation, 2 had returned to prison and the others had lost contact
- The Housing Income Team had had additional resources, due to the roll out of Universal Credit, and visited the DWP to assist people submitting applications for Universal Credit. A Universal Credit meeting had been established and met with the DWP on a monthly basis. Those customers who found it difficult to make an application were linked with a support worker.
- Before someone was released from prison, the Homeless Team would carry out an assessment. There was also a team within the prison to assist someone prior to their release
- People who attended Shiloh were not all homeless. Shiloh aimed to help people become more independent
- Data was submitted to Central Government. The Ministry of Housing provided support and information
- Tenancy Support Officer would support anyone in accessing a doctor or dentist

Sandra, Jill and Sandra were thanked for their informative presentation.

Resolved:- That the presentation be noted.

## 29. **AMENDMENTS TO THE HOUSING ALLOCATION POLICY - JANUARY 2019**

Sandra Tolley (Head of Housing Options), Jill Jones (Homelessness Manager) and Sandra Wardle (Housing Advice and Assessment Manager) gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18**

Overview of the Housing Register

- Band 1	246
- Band 2	1,668
- Band 3	1,783
- Band 4	1,755
- Transfers	1,336
- Total	6,788

Overview of the Housing Register

Band 2 Reason	Number of applications
Statutory Homeless (pre April Legislation)	19
Medical priority (reviewed 980)	1,280
Statutory overcrowded	19
Not ready for independent living held in suspension	147
Leaning supported housing ready to live independently	67
Requiring extra care housing	5
Offender not a high risk to the community	4
Applicants living in private rented who cannot afford the rent but are employed	24
Victim of domestic violence	96
Looked after child ready to live independently	7
Total	1,668

**Recommendation 1**

The current banding related to homelessness households be enhanced to award a higher banding following a full homeless assessment

Rationale

- Legislative changes which aim to prevent homelessness earlier
- The Allocation Policy must adhere to a legal framework outlined in Part VI and Part VII of the 1996 Housing Act
- Meeting demand

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

### The Demand

Homelessness Category	Total number of applications in each Band	Number of homelessness applications	% of homelessness applications as a % of the total in that Band
Band 1 Homeless households who are both homeless and also have a medical need	246	61	24.80%
Band 2 Unintentionally homeless households who are in priority need	1,688	19	1.14%
Band 3 Unintentionally homeless but not in priority need	1,783	280	15.70%
Band 4 Threatened with homelessness awaiting assessment	1,755	217	12.36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,452</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>10.58%</b>

### Proposed Policy

- Applicants in priority need who actually become homeless and a relief duty is owed or when a full housing duty is owed are placed into Band 1
- Applicants in priority need who are faced with homelessness and a prevention duty is owed are placed into Band 2
- Non-priority homeless applicants, who are owed a prevention or relief duty, be placed into Band 3
- Applicants awaiting a homelessness assessment are placed into Band 3

### **Recommendation 2**

Review the downsizing policy to award Band 2 status to Council or Housing Association tenants who are under occupying their home to move to a property with at least 1 less bedroom, a flat or a bungalow (a medical assessment will be required for bungalows)

Rationale

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18

- Current Policy confusing
- Impacts on waiting time for applicants who have been assessed for a bungalow

### Current Policy

- Tenants under occupying a 4 bedroom house can move to a 2 bedroom house
- Tenants who are affected by the Bedroom Tax can move to any type of property with 1 less bedroom
- Tenants who are not affected financially can only move to a flat or a bungalow

### New Proposed Policy

Review the downsizing policy to award Band 2 status to Council or Housing Association tenants who are under occupying their home to move to a property with at least one less bedroom, a flat or a bungalow (a medical assessment will be required for bungalows)

### Recommendation 3

Increase the quota of advertised properties in Band 2 from 50% to 60%, reduce the quota of advertised properties in Band 3 from 40% to 30% and retain the 10% quota for Transfers.

#### Rationale

- Reduce waiting time for applicants in urgent housing need

### New Proposed Policy

	Old Quota	Proposed New Quota
Band 2	50%	60%
Band 3	40%	30%
Transfer	10%	10%

### Recommendation 4

Single people who are Council or Housing Association tenants living in a flat who are expecting their first child to be eligible for family accommodation on the production of the MATB1 form

#### Rationale

- To ensure that there is equality and fairness

### Current Policy

- Council or Housing Association single tenants living in a flat who are expecting their first child
- Living with parents or in private rented accommodation

## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18

### New Proposed Policy

Single people who are Council or Housing Association tenants living in a flat who are expecting their first child to be eligible for family accommodation on the production of the MATB1 form

### Recommendation 5

A person has local connection if their grandparents live in Rotherham and have done so for the last 3 years. There will be a validation process asking the applicant to provide proof of the grandparent's address and confirmation that they are in contact with them

### Rationale

- To ensure that there is equality and fairness

### Current Policy

- Lived for the last 3 years in Rotherham through their own choice
- Currently employed in Rotherham and have been for the last 3 years
- Have direct family who live in Rotherham and they have done so for the last 3 years. Direct family members include spouses, civil partners, parents, sons, daughters, brother and sisters

### Proposed New Policy

- Add grandparents as direct family members. There would be a validation process asking the applicant to provide proof of the grandparents' address and confirmation that they were in contact with them

### Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- In the case of a person who was in employment but could not afford the rent, options would be considered to enable them to stay in the property e.g. could they share with someone or offer to move them to something cheaper. It was also possible for a Discretionary Housing Payment to pay the rent for a certain period. If someone was really trying to keep their tenancy it would be considered a priority to retain them in the property
- An affordability assessment was undertaken before receiving a tenancy (since April 2018) so it was known what could and could not be afforded before the tenancy commenced
- If someone was accessing private rented property, an affordability assessment would be carried out. A tenant would receive a Housing Allowance as per the Housing Benefit Regulations for that particular size of property. If a person presented themselves through the Homelessness route they would not be signposted to accommodation they could not afford



## IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION- 01/11/18

- OAP Bungalows used to be exempt from Right to Buy if a warden lived on site. However, as the Warden Service no longer existed, they were now eligible
- The inclusion of more homeless people in Band 1 had been in line with the Housing Reduction Act. The Authority had been advised to review its Allocation Policy to ensure homeless households were given the highest priority
- The inclusion of grandparent(s) as regard to the local connection would be checked to ascertain that there was regular contact
- Existing applicants would retain their banding date and remain in Band 1 but new applications would have the new Policy implementation date applied
- The majority of those that occupied a bungalow had had a medical assessment and was over the age of 50 and had a medical need. The 1,650 applicants did not necessarily all require a bungalow but had had medical assessments and deemed to need a ground floor property
- Previously the Allocation Policy had an eligibility age of 60 years but it had been found that they could not be let so the age had been lowered to 50. The shortlist was weighted for those that been assessed and over the age of 50 and then those that were over 50 and not medically assessed but wanted a bungalow. Bungalows were allocated on a need basis but were also kept open to ensure properties could be let and not incur lost rent
- Whilst there was no mention of carers who wanted to move to be nearer to someone they cared for, the medical assessment process did support those in Band 2 if they needed to move
- Consideration could be given to also including a family member who had been the primary carer in childhood with regard to the local connection if the Commission so wished
- Suggestion that existing applicants retain their banding date and remain in Band 1 unless they had a change in circumstances and if so moved to Band 2
- Concern with regard to the length of time some applicants with a medical reason were waiting for a property. Should there be a bidding criteria that stated a person should make a certain number of serious bids for properties in a year or face removal from the waiting list?
- An Equalities Impact Assessment would be completed

## **IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - 01/11/18**

- Those wishing to downsize would now be considered in Band 2 rather than Band 1. The properties were awarded to Band 1 applicants in the first instance
- There was a need to look across at possible Policy conflict across the wider Council particularly Adult Social Care

Resolved:- (1) That the current banding related to homelessness households be enhanced to award a higher band following a full homelessness assessment as detailed in section 3.2.6 of the report be supported.

(2) That the review of the Downsizing Policy to award Band 2 status to Council or Housing Association tenants who were under occupying their home to move to a property with at least one less bedroom, a flat or a bungalow (a medical assessment would be required for bungalows) be supported.

(3) That the increase in the quota of advertised properties in Band 2 from 50% to 60%, reduction in the quota of advertised properties in Band 3 from 40% to 30% and retention of the 10% quota for transfers be supported.

(4) That single people who were Council or Housing Association tenants living in a flat who were expecting their first child to be eligible for family accommodation on the production of the MATB1 form be supported.

(5) That a person who has local connection if their grandparents lived in Rotherham and had done so for the last 3 years, subject to a validation process requesting the applicant to provide proof of the grandparent's address and confirmation that they were in contact with the applicant, be supported.

(6) That consideration be given to extending No. 5 above to include extended family members providing there were close links with family members.

### **30. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2018, commencing at 1.30 p.m.