



ARCH Tenants' Group Meeting & AGM

Monday 18 June 2018

National Council for Voluntary Organisations

Society Building, 8 All Saints Street, London N1 9RL 11.00 am – 3.00pm

Refreshments and arrivals from 10.15am

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

AGENDA

1. Welcome and apologies
2. Minutes of AGM 19 June 2017
3. Matters arising
4. Chairman's report – Jenny Hill verbal update
5. Reflection on 2017/18 from ARCH Executive – John Bibby verbal update
6. ARCH Tenant Group Expenditure 2017/18
7. AOB – to be notified to Julie Morton by 12 noon on Thursday 14 June

TENANTS' GROUP MEETING

AGENDA

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of last meeting 14 May 2018
3. Matters arising
4. Feedback from ARCH Executive meeting 21 May – verbal report - John Bibby
5. Update Government policy/legislation - John Bibby
6. Conference planning – Tina Reid & Mani Hundal
7. Fire safety
8. AOB - to be notified to Julie Morton by 12 noon on Thursday 14 June

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

9. Tenants' Group Work Plan 2018
10. Next meeting – 3 September 2018

COMPANY NO. 7970258

Association or Retained Council Housing Ltd

Minutes of the ARCH Tenants' Group Meeting

**Held on Monday 14 May 2018 at the National Council for Voluntary Organisations
Society Building, 8 All Saints Street, London N1 9RL**

PRESENT:

Tenant Group members:

David Bown (South Derbyshire)
Yaw Boateng (Croydon)
John Ranshaw (Lincoln)
John Bradshaw (Woking)
Chris Gould (Norwich)
Jenny Hill (Runnymede) – Chair
Marlene Price (Wandsworth) – Vice Chair
Gary Jones (Brighton & Hove)
John Kite (Sheffield)
Les Issacs (Stevenage)
Martyn Lund (Kettering)
Stella Parkin (Rotherham)
Eric Shipton (Birmingham)
Dennis Smith (Tendring)
Brian Tulley (Crawley)
Mavis Vines (East Riding of Yorkshire)

In attendance:

John Bibby (ARCH)
Gez Kinsella (HouseMark)

1, WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND APOLOGIES

Apologies received from:

Wyn Marshall (Epping Forest)
Brian Rhodes (Welwyn Hatfield)

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (26 March 2018)

Agreed as a true record

3. MATTERS ARISING

3. Stevenage Scrutiny Presentation. John Spoke to Martin Guest, Stevenage are currently reviewing all tenant participation functions.

4. Feedback from Arch Executive on Key Issues. The Green Paper. Yaw commented that Aloka Sharma, said council seeking funding should “come and have a discussion”. John clarified that this was in reference to essential fire safety work. To date only two landlords have been asked to provide further evidence. Government support so far only extends to a consideration of raising the debt cap or agreeing to a transfer from the General Fund to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

6. Consultation. The comment in the last minutes that “Council aren’t impartial” is an acknowledgement that complaints are resolved through in-house processes, before external *independent* challenge.

4. FEEDBACK FROM ARCH EXECUTIVE ON KEY ISSUES

The last Executive meeting was 9 April. Key issues discussed were:

- Membership renewals have been sent
- Update on TG activity and conference
- Encouraging nominations for Community Champions Award
- Consultation on key issues – the Board will decide on whether to issue an ARCH discussion paper in advance of the Green Paper being published
- MP for Warwick has launched a cross- party campaign to promote social housing. John is meeting with him in early June

5. UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT POLICY /LEGISLATION

The issues discussed were:

A new Secretary of State has been appointed. James Brokenshire replaces Savid Javid, who has been appointed Home Secretary.

Housing White Paper/Housing & Planning Act 2016

RTB funding. Nothing new on RTB funding – the high value levy is still on the statute books. A pilot testing this will take place in Birmingham in summer.

RTB. Minister announced a review of RTB discount by Councils, so Councils can keep 100% of receipts. This is good news and a reflection of the work ARCH have done raising this issue.

Fixed term tenancies. The Bill has now gone through the Report Stage. Minister for Housing and Homelessness, Heather Wheeler MP has stated that the Government will bring forward guidance on regulation of Fixed term Tenancies. So still very much on the Government’s agenda.

John is speaking to the Ministry encouraging them to speak to Councils that have already introduced fixed term tenancies in order to learn lessons as many landlords are at the point of tenancy review. John has asked ARCH members to contact him if they use fixed term tenancies.

Additional resources. This includes the Affordable Homes Programme from Homes England and additional borrowing headroom via HRA. A prospectus setting out the detail for both programmes will come out simultaneously.

Welfare reform. 18-21 are now able to claim housing costs under Universal Credit.

Green Paper. The Board will discuss their response at next meeting. The recently published Labour Party Review of the Green Paper will also be discussed by Board.

Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety. The publishing of this report is imminent and is expected on Thursday 17 May. John is having a phone call with the Ministry in advance of the publication, so they can flag up the key issues.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As previously stated the Government have announced a major overhaul of the NPPF, including reforms to the way developers contribute to affordable housing.

6. TENANT CONFERENCE UPDATE

6.1 Venue

This will take place at Kettering Conference Centre on Tuesday 18 September. A proposal will go to the next Board meeting requesting assistance with the costs.

ACTION: HouseMark Events team - sponsorship opportunities will be explored, as well as identifying suitable hotels. Stands will be offered to local authorities at discount rates, targeting local authorities in the area.

ACTION: John to contact John Conway to see if the Kettering Mayor can attend.

6.2 Speakers

The TG agreed to have a plenary session, followed or preceding two workshops.

ACTION: John write to the Ministry to ask Minister to attend, failing that a high ranking official to attend and talk about Green Paper. It was suggested that Brian Riley (Brixton and Wandsworth) respond to this, followed by a question and answer discussion.

The Group discussed ideas for the workshops. It was agreed that Workshop one should focus on how we develop more affordable housing, including social housing.

ACTION: John to contact Herriot Watt University and the Joseph Roundtree Foundation (JRF) following recent research in to this area.

Workshop two – focus on resident involvement, with details to be worked up by the ‘task and Finish’ Group.

ACTION: Liaising with HouseMark's events team, a 'task and finish' group, consisting of Jenny Hill, Marlene Price, Martyn Lund and David Bown will identify speakers, topic areas and other arrangements of the day.

The ARCH Executive will be asked to fund the event. HouseMark estimated costs are £3435.00 + VAT

Martyn Lund also pointed out that if only two workshops are being held, do we need to cancel one of the rooms and will the rooms be big enough.

ACTION: To be addressed by the 'Task and Finish' Group with HouseMark.
What role for AVFT?

6.3 Community Champions Award Nominations

An appeal for nominations was made to all TG members. It was also agreed to issue Certificate of Recognition to nominated person. To avoid conflict of interest, it was agreed that TG members can't nominate tenants from own organisations.

7. A VOICE FOR TENANTS STEERING GROUP

There was a joint meeting of all parties on 18 April and this was attended by Marlene and John. The AV4T Steering Group were approached by the National Housing Federation (NHF) to encourage all housing associations to support tenant engagement. This included producing a joint statement recommitting the sector to tenant involvement and set up a cross tenure panel of 2,000 tenants across the country to act as an electronic sounding board.

ARCH will be making the point that any joint statement from AV4T should be based on the existing Tenant Involvement and Engagement Standard – the set of principles that all housing organisations should sign up to.

Any initiative to establish a panel should be owned by the AV4T, rather than any single organisations and that it should also be genuinely cross sector.

ARCH await progress from the NHF on the next steps.

8. PRESENTATION – PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE

Following the 'using your data' presentation, it was suggested that members' tenant annual reports and where in the public domain, performance reports could be shared and posted on the ARCH website.

ACTION: John to raise this at the next Board meeting.

9. UPDATING TENANT GROUP PROFILES

ACTION: All TG members were asked to add/update their profiles. Gez will send out what is currently on the website

10. FUTURE SPEAKERS - SUGGESTIONS

Suggestions included; Jo Linney to come back with a further update on welfare reform, ARCH member feedback on their councils' experience of the roll out of Universal Credit (such as Rotherham's experience), feedback on the ARCH/National Federation of ALMOS' survey evaluating the impact of Universal Credit on rent arrears that reports in September.

ACTION: As part of the work of the 'Task and Finish' Group any additional speakers identified, but not able to be included in the Tenant Conference agenda, should be considered by TG as potential speakers for further meetings.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

12. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting and the date of the TG AGM is 18 June.

The new meeting venue was endorsed by the TG, albeit that it was a more expensive option compared to previous venues. It was agreed to continue to use the venue for the rest of this year and explore a discount for block booking.

Association or Retained Council Housing Ltd

Minutes of the ARCH Tenants' Group Annual General Meeting

Held on Monday 19 June 2017 at CIH Offices 236 Grays Inn Road London

PRESENT:

Tenant Group members:

Yaw Boateng (Croydon)
David Brown (South Derbyshire)
John Bradshaw (Woking)
Mick Daniels (Sheffield)
Chris Gould (Norwich)
Jenny Hill (Runnymede) – Chair
Les Issacs (Stevenage) - Observer
Gary Jones (Brighton & Hove)
Ted (William) Jones (Stevenage)
Martyn Lund (Kettering)
Wyn Marshall (Epping Forest)
Stella Parkin (Rotherham)
Marlene Price (Wandsworth) - Vice Chair
John Ranshaw (Lincoln)
Eric Shipton (Birmingham)
Dennis Smith (Tendring)
Mavis Vines (East Riding)
Cindy Watts (Exeter)

In attendance:

John Bibby (ARCH)
Carole Halfacre (HouseMark)

1, INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the AGM. Before the introductions the Chair asked everyone to take a minute to remember fellow tenants who died, or suffered as a result of the dreadful fire at Grenfell Towers. After the minute silence Jenny the Chair stressed that it was not worth speculating on the whys and wherefores until the investigations report was published. David Bown suggested that all Members of the Group should strive back in their own districts to help ensure that this does not happen again.

The topic of fire safety will be included on the agenda for future meetings.

After the minutes silence the Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting particularly the new members. Everyone introduced themselves around the table

Apologies were received from Brian Tulley (Crawley). New member Joy Chance from Welwyn & Hatfield did not attend but no apologies received. Carole to ask Julie to make contact.

ACTION

Carole Halfacre add Fire safety as a standing agenda item

Julie Morton to contact Welwyn

2. MINUTES OF 13 JUNE 2016 AGM

The minutes were agreed as a true record

3. CHAIRMANS REPORT

Jenny delivered the following report to the meeting:

Since the last AGM we have continued to look at the new legislation and John has been keeping us up to date on the Housing and Planning Act and in particular Part 4. As you know Pay to Stay went and I think that ARCH may have had some influence with this. Fixed Term Tenancies which we are all interested in has yet to be finalised and in view of the recent election I do not think, although John will correct me if I am wrong, that the finer details of this will not be published soon.

The implications of the High Value Stock and the levy has been deferred until 2018 at the earliest.

I think we are to be consulted on the future rent policy once the four year period of rent reduction ends.

However, as with all the above we now have a new Housing Minister and who knows what will happen.

We had a very good presentation from Kettering in how they involve their tenants in scrutiny. This was a good example of how tenants and councils can work together with their tenants.

I know from our conferences and our meetings here that not all of us have the same relationship but now more than ever since the dreadful fire we need to push for more involvement and get our voices heard.

We are also involved along with other housing providers in Smashing Silly Stereotypes (Now called Benefit to Society) and Carol will be speaking about this later in the meeting.

Our conference in Leamington Spa was I think one of the best and I just hope we have just as a successful conference in Birmingham.

On a sad note we lost one of our long standing member Michael Hewlett and Rachel who used to be on the TG and Brian Tully (not here today) attended his funeral.

We also send our thoughts and best wishes to another long standing member Jim Nichol who wife died only last week and those of you who remember Jim and would like to sign the card which Marlene has kindly brought it.

Finally, I would like to thank Carol for her continued support and John for all his help in explaining the legislation.

Finally and my no means least I would like to thank you all for your support.

4. REFLECTION ON 2016-17 FROM ARCH EXECUTIVE

John Bibby CEO of ARCH summarised the key policy areas and legislation that have been looked at by ARCH and the Tenants Group over the year. Members of the ARCH Executive had meet with Gavin Barwell, the then Housing Minister, last year and ARCH put proposals forward which were reflected in the Housing white paper.

ARCH have put a series of proposals forward with many Council's and 1 ALMO. On the 30 June ARCH Executive officers have a meeting planned to discuss further with officials.

The recent manifesto pledges include mention that housing could play a role in providing housing.

Now we have a new Housing Minister ARCH will continue to lobby the Department of Work & Pensions (DWP) and plan another survey with the National Federation of ALMOs (NFALMOS) on the impact of the welfare changes. ARCH have had a number of meetings with Lord Freud. He is no longer in post so the work will continue with further discussions with DWP officials.

ARCH have improved communications with ARCH members with the fortnightly e bulletin. John added that any tenant from an ARCH members Council can access this by signing up online to receive.

In the last month weeks there have been dramatic events in the Country with the election, terrorist attacks and the fire at Grenfell tower which has horrified everyone. With regard to the fire John advised that there was clearly a role for the ARCH Tenants Group to look at details once more information is available from inquiry and technical reports.

There are a number of questions to be asked about fire risk assessments and whether they were undertaken and reviewed annually or after refurbishment work; evacuation procedures and the stay put policy; why the compartmentation in the building didn't prevent the spread of the fire so quickly, as the fire should have been contained within an individual flat for up to one hour; the cladding used – the type and how fixed in place. Everyone agreed that Councils will need to be provide lots of reassurance to tenants.

With regard to sprinklers there is no regulatory requirement to have these retrofit in older buildings at the moment.

John advised that the Government have promised the interim findings to be published quickly. He has written to the DCLG to offer to decimate information to Councils which has quickly been acknowledged.

It is understood that the DCLG have contacted all councils asking for details about their tower blocks.

Each Councils housing stock will vary. Some members of the ARCH Tenants Group have many tower blocks and are concerned about their safety. A member of the Group asked if there was a federation of tower blocks or similar but this had not been heard of.

All agreed that there were lots of scenarios surrounding the fire but until the fire report is published it won't be clear about future action. Once the official fire report is received ARCH will share information with members via the e-bulletin

John explained that ARCH is meeting with the NFALMOS soon to discuss how best to serve tenants and members. This is a 'wakeup call' for councils. They should have emergency plans in place with contingency plans for such emergency eventuality.

The Tenants Group discussed the importance of a sterile block policy –i.e. not having combustible objects in corridors. John asked if any ARCH members have examples of best practice in this and other fire safety arrangements to let him know so he can share with other ARCH members.

Some members of the Group are concerned that recommendations made may not be implemented although it is believed that the tragedy was on such an immense scale with loss of life that action will result.

A role for the ARCH Tenants Group will be to look at the changes that come about and remind councils and tenants to take fire safety seriously. The regulations are a minimum requirement and tenants could ask for more than the minimum

ACTION:

Carole: Put fire safety put on meeting agendas as a standing item. ARCH will play a role in keeping pressure on the Government.

ALL: any examples of fire safety best practice to be emailed or sent to John Bibby

5. ARCH TENANT GROUP EXPENDITURE

Members of the Tenants Group noted the report and asked that next time the items for marketing and postage /stationery are not included in the report if there is no spending on these areas

ACTION: Carole

6. TENANT GROUP MEMBERSHIP RATIFICATION

The 19 nominees were ratified as members of the ARCH Tenants Group for two years until June 2019

7. AMENDMENT TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

After discussion the changes to the criteria for eligibility to be chair or Vice Chair as discussed and agreed at the 8 May meeting was agreed as attendance at four meetings in the year rather than six.

ACTION:

Carole: ask ARCH Executive to approve at their next meeting and make the amendments

Julie: to update members pack and circulate to the Group

8. ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE CHAIR

Two candidates stood for the position of Chair, Jenny Hill and Marlene Price. A secret ballot took place. 17 votes were cast. 12 votes for Jenny. Jenny was elected as chair. Marlene was proposed to stand as Vice Chair which was proposed by Gary Jones and 2nd by John Ranshaw

9. AOB

There was no other business so the meeting was closed

| |
|---|
| ASSOCIATION OF RETAINED COUNCIL HOUSING LTD ARCH TENANT GROUP MEETING 18 JUNE 2018 |
|---|

ITEM 5: LEGISLATIVE/HOUSING POLICY UPDATE

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To provide an update and overview of the government's housing policy & legislative programme as it affects the management of council housing.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The ARCH Tenant Group is asked to note this report

3. Housing White Paper/Housing & Planning Act 2016

- 3.1 At previous meetings the Tenant Group has received updates on the Government's proposals set out in the Housing White Paper together with an update on matters outstanding in regard to Regulations and Guidance under Part 4 of the Housing & Planning Act in regard to the proposed Higher Value Asset (HVA) Levy and introduction of fixed term tenancies.

- 3.2 There has been no further announcements on the Government's plans for the introduction of the High Value Asset Levy and Fixed Term Tenancies. Both require debate and approval of the necessary Regulations by both houses of Parliament under the "Affirmative Resolution" process and there still remains a doubt as to whether the necessary Parliamentary time can be found and/or whether a minority Conservative Government would command the necessary majority to get the Regulations approved but there is no indication that the Government intend to back away from these policies and withdraw these proposals.

Extension of RTB to Housing Associations and the HVA Levy

- 3.3 The Chancellor in the Autumn Budget announced that a £200million "extended regional pilot" of the RTB for housing association tenants would be introduced in the West Midlands area. This pilot is to be fully funded by Treasury and in a Written Statement to Parliament on 29 March the Housing Minister Dominic Raab confirmed the intention to proceed with introduction of the extended regional pilot in the West Midlands later this year but he gave no indication that the Government intend to abandon the idea of a HVA Levy to fund a full roll-out of the policy. It is understood the extended regional pilot in the West Midlands will commence in August this year but at this stage it is not clear which housing associations will take part.

Introduction of fixed term tenancies

- 3.4 There have been no further announcements on the proposals for introduction of mandatory fixed term tenancies under Part 4 of the Housing & Planning Act and discussions with civil servants suggest that this is currently "with Ministers" awaiting a decision but there is nothing to suggest that there is any intention to abandon this policy.

- 3.5 The passing of the **Secure Tenancies (victims of domestic abuse) Act 2018** amends changes to the law on secure tenancies for social housing tenants introduced under Part 4 of the Housing & Planning Act 2016 (but not

implemented as yet) suggests that the Government have not backed away from the idea of scrapping “old style secure tenancies” and introducing mandatory fixed term tenancies for council tenants.

- 3.6 The Act received Royal Assent on 10 May 2018 and contains measures to ensure that lifetime tenants of social homes who are victims of domestic abuse are granted a further lifetime tenancy where:
- They either need to leave or have left their home to escape domestic abuse and are being re-housed by a local authority.
 - They are a joint tenant and wish to remain a tenant of their social home after the perpetrator has left or been removed and the local authority decides to grant them a further sole tenancy in their current home.
- 3.7 The Act will ensure that when provisions in Schedule 7 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 are brought into force to abolish “old style secure tenancies” and requiring local authorities in England to offer only fixed-term tenancies.
- 3.8 In responding to the debate the Minister for Housing & Homelessness, Heather Wheeler MP, did not address the question of when the Government intend to bring forward regulations to implement the provisions of Schedule 7 of the Housing & Planning Act to introduce mandatory fixed term tenancies. However during the subsequent debate at Third Reading in the House of Commons the Minister Heather Wheeler said: “We will be issuing guidance to assist local authorities to implement the fixed term tenancy provisions in the Housing & Planning Act 2016” (Hansard column 578).
- Backing council’s to build & RTB receipts flexibilities**
- 3.9 Latest RTB statistics released on the morning of 29 March 2018 show that the Government is failing in its pledge to ensure that additional homes sold under the Reinvigorated RTB introduced in 2012 are replaced on a one for one basis.
- 3.10 Under the Government’s one for one commitment made under the Reinvigorated RTB local authorities have 3 years from the date of the sale of each additional home to provide a replacement home but can only use RTB receipts to a maximum of 30% of the cost of providing a replacement.
- 3.11 The latest figures show that the Government is currently falling short of its commitment to replace dwellings sold under the Reinvigorated RTB by over 1,000 dwellings: There were 17,072 additional RTB sales between Quarter 1 2012/13 and Quarter 3 2014/15 but only 15,981 additional affordable housing units were started or acquired by local authorities, Homes England and the Greater London Authority between Quarter 1 2012/13 and Quarter 3 2017/18.
- 3.12 Following publication of the RTB figures, Housing Minister, Dominic Raab issued a **Written Ministerial Statement (HCWS 614)** to Parliament on the afternoon of 29 March 2018 under the heading “Social Housing Update”. In the Statement he announced that the Government will consult with the sector on providing greater flexibility around how local authorities can use their RTB

(Right to Buy) receipts. He also restated the Government's commitment "to support local authorities to build more council homes"

3.13 The full text of the Minister's Statement was as follows (key text underlined):

"Nearly 2 million households have been helped to realise aspirations to own their homes through the Right to Buy since 1980. The Right to Buy gives more people the opportunity to own their home, improves social mobility and provides greater financial security. It brings the benefits of home ownership to those who would otherwise not have the opportunity.

In 2012 the Right to Buy scheme was reinvigorated and the maximum discounts were increased to realistic levels. Of the 90,730 sales since April 2010, 83,272 were under the reinvigorated scheme demonstrating there is a continued substantial demand for the Right to Buy.

Our record on the provision of affordable housing is a strong one with over 357,000 affordable homes delivered since 2010. This included 257,000 homes for rent. Whilst 69,000 local authority homes have been sold since 2010, there have been 127,000 new homes provided for social rent during the same period.

The Government is committed to a step change in council house building. However, statistics released today show that while the number of homes available for social rent has increased, some local authorities have not been building enough Right to Buy replacements to match the pace of their sales. It is clear that local authorities need to increase their rate of delivery of new homes.

Helping to support this, the Chancellor announced in the Autumn Budget that we will raise the Housing Revenue Account borrowing cap by a total of up to £1 billion in areas of high affordability pressure for local authorities who are ready to start building new homes. This will offer local authorities in such areas the opportunity to increase council house building to meet the needs of local communities.

Additionally, local authorities are able to bid alongside housing associations, or in partnership with them, for £9 billion Affordable Homes Programme grant funding (2016-21) to deliver a wide range of affordable homes. This includes £2 billion of additional funding announced at Autumn Budget to deliver affordable housing with funding also being made available for social rent in areas of acute affordability pressure. Alongside these programmes, we have also announced that local authorities and housing associations will be able to increase rents by up to CPI +1% from 2020. This will provide a stable investment environment to deliver new affordable homes.

In the Spring Statement we also announced a £1.67bn funding package for London, to build 26,000 more affordable homes that the capital desperately needs. This deal, as part of the government's commitment to actively boost affordable housing supply, will overall see 116,000 more affordable homes in London and bring the total funding for affordable housing in London to £4.8bn. This move is a key part of supporting councils and housing associations in the city to build more homes at rents that are affordable to local people. This additional funding was granted on the condition that some of it will be used to deliver high quality homes for social rent. This will be in addition to continuing to deliver homes for London Affordable Rent, flexible shared ownership and rent to buy. At least two thirds of the homes built with this additional funding must be for rent.

As well as increasing investment in new social housing, we remain committed to the Right to Buy, helping people into home ownership and replacing the homes sold. This year we will be rolling out a pilot of the Right to Buy for Housing Association tenants in the Midlands. We have engaged with local authorities to get a better understanding of the barriers to delivering new homes. To help councils build more homes, we believe there is a case for greater flexibility on the use of receipts from Right to Buy sales. We will consult further with the sector on providing greater flexibility around how local authorities can use their Right to Buy receipts, and how to ensure that we continue to support local authorities to build more council homes. We will consider social housing issues as part of our work on the forthcoming Green Paper.”

- 3.14 Following the Minister’s Statement we have been in touch with officials at MHCLG and have been put in contact with the officials leading on the consultation on RTB receipt flexibilities and it is understood that MHCLG intend to bring out consultation on RTB flexibilities alongside the prospectus for the additional £1bn HRA headroom and the £2bn additional resources in the AHP for social rented housing. We are still awaiting further details on all three announcements.
- 3.16 The situation regarding “**Bespoke Housing Deals**”, which was a key element of the Housing White Paper and was also referred to in the 2017 Conservative election manifesto, remains uncertain although a number of “deals” with Elected Mayors and City Regions have been announced including:
- A Greater Manchester Housing Package:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greater-manchester-housing-package>
 - A West of England Housing Package:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/west-of-england-housing-package>
 - A Oxfordshire Housing Deal:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/oxfordshire-housing-deal>
- 3.17 There have been no further announcements or signs of progress on the idea of “**Fixed Term Council Housing**” set out in the Conservative Party election manifesto which said:
- “We will work with (local authorities) to improve their capability and capacity to develop more good homes, as well as providing them with significant low-cost capital funding. In doing so, we will build new fixed-term social houses, which will be sold privately after ten to fifteen years with an automatic RTB for tenants, the proceeds of which will be recycled into further homes”*

4. Allocation of £2bn additional AHP resources for social rented housing

- 4.1 The Prime Minister at the Conservative Party Conference in 2017 announced plans for what she described as “a new generation of council and housing association homes” by increasing funding for affordable homes by a further £2 billion. However it still remains unclear how much of this will be available for council housing but discussions with MHCLG officials suggest the prospectus will be issued alongside the prospectus for the additional £1bn HRA borrowing headroom.

5. £1bn additional HRA Headroom

- 5.1 The Chancellor announced in the Autumn Budget a selected lifting of Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing caps “in areas of high affordability pressures” by up to £1bn across England by the end of 2022 subject to some form of bidding process. The government also promised to monitor how authorities respond to this opportunity, and consider whether any further action is needed. Councils will be invited to bid for increases in their caps from 2019-20, up to a total of £1 billion by the end of 2021-22.
- 5.2 The Prospectus and bidding process have still not yet been announced and we have been in touch with MHCLG officials to stress the importance of an early announcement to enable local authorities to plan accordingly and ensure that bids for the additional borrowing headroom are not undersubscribed. We understood that an announcement on the bidding criteria is expected “soon”.

6 Future rent policy post 2020

- 6.1 The announcement on a return to a rent policy of CPI+1% beyond 2020 will be reflected in a direction to the Social Housing Regulator (even though the Rent Standard does not apply to local authorities) and the government promised formal consultations on this in 2018. We await publication of the consultation document. In the meantime the report by Capital Economics which ARCH jointly commissioned with the LGA has been completed and published and will assist in formulating a formal ARCH response to consultations on the new Rent Policy: <http://www.arch-housing.org.uk/news/latest-news/report-calls-for-new-government-thinking-on-affordable-rents.aspx>

7. Welfare Reform

- 7.1 The Government came under increasing pressure to pause and reform the roll out of Universal Credit (UC) and the Chancellor in the Autumn Budget made a number of concessions including:
- From January 2018 those who need it, and who have an underlying entitlement to Universal Credit, will be able to access up to a month's worth of Universal Credit within five days via an interest-free advance. The government will extend the period of recovery of any advance from six months to twelve months. New claimants in December will be able to receive an advance of 50% of their monthly entitlement at the beginning of their claim and a second advance to take it up to 100% in the new year, before their first payment date
 - From February 2018 the government will remove the seven-day waiting period so that entitlement to Universal Credit starts on the first day of application. ARCH has previously called for the seven day waiting period to be removed in our report “Pause for Thought” submitted to the government in August this year.
 - From April 2018 those already on Housing Benefit will continue to receive their award for the first two weeks of their Universal Credit claim.
- 7.2 In a further surprise announcement on 29 March in a Written Statement to Parliament the Work & Pensions Secretary, Esther McVey, announced the

government would “amend regulations so that all 18 to 21-year-olds will be entitled to claim support for housing costs in Universal Credit”.

8. Housing Green Paper

- 8.1 The Social Housing Green Paper which was expected “in the Spring” is now expected to be published before the Parliament rises for the summer recess on 24 July. Following the ARCH Board meeting on 21 May 2018 the draft paper prepared by ARCH “Social Housing we can all be proud of” has been further refined and a copy of the latest draft is attached as **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 8.2 In advance of the Housing Green Paper the Government have published consultation on “**Strengthening consumer redress in the housing market**” setting out options and seeking ideas for a simpler and better system for dealing with housing complaints so future disputes can be resolved faster and consumers can access swift redress and compensation where it is owed. The closing date for responses was 16 April and we are awaiting the Government’s response to that consultation.
- 8.3 In the meantime the **Grenfell Public Inquiry** has begun to take evidence from the victims and relatives of the bereaved. More is expected to be revealed about the causes of the fire in the coming weeks as initial reports into the cause of the fire and reasons for its spread are submitted in evidence.

9 Independent Review of Building Regulations & Fire Safety

- 9.1 The Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety, chaired by Dame Judith Hackitt, has recommended introduction of **a new regulatory framework** to improve building safety and to rebuild trust among residents of high-rise buildings.
- 9.2 In her final report published on 17 May 2018, Dame Judith sets out a list of some 53 recommendations around a new regulatory framework which she says should apply in the first instance to residential properties which are 10 or more storeys high – referred to in her report as **Higher Risk Residential Buildings (HRRBs)**.
- 9.3 The report and its recommendations are framed around a series of 10 themes:
- Parameters and principles of a new regulatory framework
 - Design, construction and refurbishment
 - Occupation and maintenance
 - Residents’ voice
 - Competence
 - Guidance and monitoring to support building safety
 - Products
 - Golden thread of building information
 - Procurement and supply
 - International examples

9.4 Some of the key elements of this new regulatory framework include:

- The establishment of a new regulator – a **Joint Competent Authority** (JCA) comprising Local Authority Building Standards, Fire & Rescue Authorities and the Health & Safety Executive based on a full cost recovery model. (Recommendation 1.2)
- A system of **mandatory incident reporting** similar to that employed by the Civil Aviation Authority (Recommendation 1.4)
- The allocation by Government of broad responsibilities to Clients, Principal Designers and Principal Contractors responsible for HRRBs (Recommendation 2.2 and Table 2).
- The creation & maintenance of relevant information including:
 - A digital record
 - A fire & emergency file
 - Full plans; and
 - A Construction Control Plan (Recommendation 2.3)
- A series of **3 “gateways”** before occupation of any new HRRBs can commence:
 - First gateway – the Local Planning Authority should be required in law to **consult with the JCA** where it identifies that a building is a HRRB.(Recommendation 2.5)
 - Second gateway – **Full Plans Approval**. The JCA will undertake a thorough assessment of detailed design plans for HRRBs before giving permission for building work to commence (Recommendation 2.6)
 - Third gateway – **Completion Certificate**. The JCA undertakes a thorough test of the construction of HRRBs based on clear documentary evidence from the Principal Contractor and the Building Owner must complete a pre-occupation Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) and prepare a Resident Engagement Strategy (RES) all of which must be signed off by the JCA to enable occupation to commence. (Recommendation 2.7)
- Once occupied, responsibility for the safety of all parts of a HRRB must be held by a clear, **senior Dutyholder** which should be the building owner or superior landlord. (Recommendation 3.1a) and the name and contact details of the Dutyholder must be notified to the JCA (Recommendation 3.1b)
- The Dutyholder must nominate a named **Building Safety Manager** with relevant skills, knowledge and expertise to be responsible for day to day management of the building and a point of contact for the residents. The name and contact details of the Building Safety Manager must be notified to the JCA and residents and be displayed in the building (Recommendation 3.1c).
- The Dutyholder for a HRRB must proactively demonstrate to the JCA that they are discharging their responsibilities through a **Safety Case Review** conducted at regular intervals agreed with the JCA identifying hazards and risks and how they are controlled through a description of the safety management system in place. (Recommendation 3.3).
- The Dutyholder for a HRRB must demonstrate that a **Fire Risk Assessment (FRA)** has been undertaken by someone with relevant skills, knowledge and experience and reviewed regularly depending on risk (Recommendation 3.4)

- **Residents should have clearer obligations** in cooperating with the Dutyholder or Building Safety Manager to the extent necessary to keep the building safe for all those living there and the Dutyholder should educate, influence and ensure residents meet their obligations and the JCA should be able to intervene where there are immediate risks to persons (Recommendation 3.5).
- For HRRBs there should be **robust sanctions to drive compliance by Dutyholders** including ultimately criminal sanctions.
- The Dutyholder should have a **statutory duty to proactively provide residents with information** that supports residents understanding of the layers of protection in place to protect the building and residents should have a right of access to FRAs , Safety Case Reviews and information on maintenance and asset management relating to the safety of their homes. (Recommendations 4.1, 4.2). In addition the Dutyholder should notify residents of any relevant notices issued by the JCA, Environmental Health, the Fire & Rescue Service and any other regulators in relation to safety. (para 4.15)
- The Dutyholder should have a **Resident Engagement Strategy** in place to outline how information will be shared with residents, how they will inform them of their rights and responsibilities and how they will involve residents in decision making about changes to the building that could impact on safety. (Recommendation 4.3). The JCA should have a mechanism for checking and enforcing against Dutyholders who fall short of the requirement to engage with residents (Para 4.22).
- Crucially the **Government should provide funding for organisations working at both local and national level to provide advice**, guidance and support to residents, landlords and building owners on effective resident involvement to develop a national culture of engagement for residents of all tenures and **this recommendation should not be limited to the residents of HRRBs**. (Recommendation 4.4).
- Although not a specific recommendation, the Report refers to positive examples of **tenant scrutiny panels** and comments that **a residents' representative organisation operating on a national scale** would be an important advocate for residents in contributing to discussions with government, regulators and providers. (paras 4.2-4.7)
- After internal processes have been exhausted there should be a **clear and quick escalation and redress route available** for residents of all tenures to an independent body. (Recommendation 4.5)
- The professional and accreditation bodies within construction and fire safety sectors should present a proposal to government within one year including the role and remit of an **overarching body to provide oversight of competence requirements**. (Recommendation 5.2)
- Relevant parties should develop and define a system for the competence requirements for the role of Building Safety Manager and role in ensuring **residents in HRRBs have access to fire safety awareness training**. (Recommendation 5.4)
- **Guidance on how to meet the Building Regulations should be owned by the industry** and there should be a periodic review, at least every 5 years, of the effectiveness of the overall system. (Recommendations 6.1, 6.2)

- Dame Judith’s report does not specifically recommend the banning of non-combustible material but recommends that a clearer, more transparent and **more effective specification and testing regime of construction products** must be developed with clear statements on what systems products can and cannot be used for, with significantly reduced scope for substitution of any products used in a system without further full testing. (Recommendation 7.1)
- **Manufacturers must retest products** that are critical to the safety of HRRBs at least every three years (Recommendation 7.2)
- The construction products industry should work together to develop and agree **a consistent labelling and traceability system for products** (Recommendation 7.5)
- For HRRBs, principal contractors and clients should devise contracts that specifically state that **safety requirements must not be compromised for cost reductions** (Recommendation 9.1)

9.5 Significantly the report also highlights a number of the recommendations which Dame Judith recommends the government should consider applying the requirement to other multi-occupancy residential buildings.

9.6 The Report does not attempt to set out the costs or wider resource implications associated with the proposed new regulatory framework although the recommendations will require additional actions from those building and owning & managing HRRBs but says that research from the USA suggests where a digital record is utilised net savings in the region of 5% in the cost of construction of newly built projects are possible.

The Government’s response to the Hackitt Report

9.7 The Government have responded to Dame Judith’s Report and in a statement to Parliament on 17 May 2018 the Housing Secretary, James Brokenshire, supported the principles behind the report’s recommendations saying:

“Dame Judith is clear that the current system - developed over many years and successive governments – is not fit for purpose.

She is calling for major reform and a change of culture, with the onus more clearly on everyone involved to manage the risks they create at every stage and government doing more to set and enforce high standards.

This government agrees with that assessment and supports the principles behind the report’s recommendations for a new system.

We agree with the call for greater clarity and accountability over who is responsible for building safety during the construction, refurbishment and on-going management of high-rise homes.

The Hackitt review has shown that in too many cases people who should be accountable for fire safety have failed in their duties.

I am committing today to bring forward legislation that delivers meaningful and lasting change and gives residents a much stronger voice in an improved system of fire safety.”

9.8 He went on to say that in addition to a previously announced consultation on use of desktop studies (to which ARCH has responded), the Government would also now consult on **banning the use of combustible materials in cladding systems on high-rise residential buildings** and will continue work with industry to clarify Building Regulations fire safety guidance, and will publish this for consultation in July.

10 **Government offer 100% grants to remove and replace dangerous cladding**

10.1 In a surprise announcement the government said it will fully fund the removal and replacement of unsafe cladding by councils and housing associations, estimated at £400 million. The announcement was made on the 16 May – the day prior to the publication of Dame Judith Hackitt’s report into the review of building regulations and fire safety.

10.2 Local authorities and housing associations will be given access to the money to help with the reasonable costs of removing and replacing unsafe aluminium composite material (ACM) cladding from buildings which they own.

10.3 Until now the Government had refused to offer any form of grant for this work saying only that they would only consider, in exceptional circumstances, the offer of financial flexibilities to assist local authorities with essential fire safety work.

10.4 Ministry officials have told ARCH that they will set out further details shortly about how councils and housing associations can apply for funding, including conditions attached to the grant, although ARCH has been assured that the application process will be simple and straightforward.

10.5 Earlier this year the Metropolitan Police informed government that a fire door installed at Grenfell Tower designed to resist fire for up to 30 minutes – as required by building regulations guidance – failed after approximately 15 minutes when tested by the police. The Government’s Independent Expert Panel have undertaken further testing and investigations focusing on composite flat entrance fire doors manufactured by “Manse Masterdor” – a company that has not been trading since 2014.

10.6 Although the risk is assessed as low, the expert panel are now advising that owners of buildings with this type of door should review their building’s fire risk assessment and consider how quickly these doors should be replaced. The Government have not offered grant to assist councils and housing associations with the cost of replacing these doors.

11 **Review of Carbon Monoxide Alarms**

11.1 A government review into rules that require carbon monoxide alarms to be fitted in homes across England has been announced by Housing Minister Dominic Raab.

11.2 The review will examine the regulations closely to establish whether they remain fit for purpose. This will include whether there should be a blanket requirement to install alarms for all methods of heating, including gas and oil.

The review will also consider whether the cost of alarms is affecting installation rates and will look at new research into the number of carbon monoxide poisonings.

- 11.3 The announcement follows on-going discussions between ministers at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Eddie Hughes MP, who has called for extending the regulations to cover all social housing tenants and all combustion appliance types.
- 11.4 No timetable for the review has been announced at this stage and further details of the review's terms of reference will be announced later this year and any reforms recommended by this review will be subject to further consultation and scrutiny.

Author: John Bibby

Appendices: Appendix1: "Social Housing we can all be proud of"

Social Housing We Can All Be Proud Of

ARCH's views on the future of social housing

Introduction

1. The Association of Retained Council Housing (ARCH) represents councils in England and Wales that own and manage housing. There are 165 councils in England owning over 1.6 million homes. Around three quarters of these councils manage these homes directly; in the others the stock is managed by an ALMO (Arms Length Management Organisation).
2. One important and necessary consequence of the Grenfell Tower tragedy has been a widening public debate on the future of social housing. The Government has announced the forthcoming publication of a Social Housing Green Paper. The Labour Party has launched its own review of social housing policy, as have Shelter and the Chartered Institute of Housing. This paper is ARCH's initial contribution to the debate.
3. In announcing the Social Housing Green Paper in a speech on 19 September 2017 the then Secretary of State Sajid Javid referred back to the 1950s, when:

“Living in social housing carried no stigma, no shame, quite the opposite, in fact. For many, it was seen the gold standard for accommodation, not a final safety net for the desperate and destitute but something you could genuinely aspire to, housing you would actively choose to live in; and as a country we were all rightly proud of it”,

and he said:

“We need to return to the time, not so very long ago, when social housing was valued. It was treasured. Something we could all be proud of whether we lived in it or not. I know that's exactly what many of you in the sector have been trying to achieve for many, many years. Well, I'm proud to stand here today and say that you have a Secretary of State who's totally committed to the cause.”

4. Social housing we can all be proud of is an ambition ARCH is proud to share and we want to work with this and any future government to make it a reality. In this paper we set out how we think it can be achieved.

Key Points and Recommendations

The need for social housing

- The housing market is broken. Not enough new homes have been built for too many years. The Government's ambition of 300,000 new homes a year, announced in the 2017 Budget, should be regarded as a minimum requirement.
- There is a particular need for more social rented homes open to households on lower incomes who cannot afford to buy or rent privately. At least 100,000 new homes a year should be for social rent.
- Current definitions of affordable housing include both intermediate housing such as starter homes, shared ownership or rent-to-buy as well as housing provided at below-market "affordable" or social rents. "Intermediate" housing provided by councils and housing associations should be treated as additional to the target of 100,000 homes for social rent.
- The mix of market, intermediate and housing for social or affordable rent required in different areas varies widely; local authorities should be tasked to plan for the right mix to meet local needs.
- In areas where market rents are high, "affordable" rents (i.e. defined as up to 80% of market rates) are not affordable by the majority of those in need of social housing; each local authority should be tasked to ensure that the rents charged on social housing in their area are genuinely affordable by the tenants it is provided for.

Backing councils to build

- The target of at least 300,000 new homes a year will not be reached without councils taking the lead in enabling development and, more importantly, by taking a much bigger role in direct provision than they have done since the 1980s.
- Councils are responsible for ensuring that all housing needs in their areas are met, not only the need for social housing. Consequently, council involvement in house-building is not confined to the provision of homes for social rent; increasingly, they are involved, normally through partnerships of various kinds, or through local housing companies, in the provision of new homes for sale, shared ownership and market rent.
- The number of local housing companies, including partnerships and wholly-owned companies, has risen rapidly over the past 5 years, and around 200 are now thought to be operation. However, most are, as yet, operating on a relatively small scale and have completed relatively few new homes. The Smith Institute estimates that they could have the capacity, once fully operational, to deliver 10-15,000 homes a year.
- Councils that have retained their council housing have, in addition, unique potential to expand house-building using the financial strength of their Housing Revenue Accounts (HRAs).
- The HRA self-financing settlement, which took effect in April 2012 with broad cross party support should have enabled the 165 councils with housing to maintain their existing stock to Decent Homes standard and build around 20,000 new homes a year for 30 years. These reforms were intended to endure for the long term, enabling council landlords to plan for the long term through the development of robust and sustainable 30 year housing business

plans. However this potential has been undermined by subsequent Government decisions.

- To restore the full potential of the original settlement the Government should:
 - Lift HRA debt caps to give all councils the scope to borrow up to the level they can safely expect to repay from rental income (the prudential limit);
 - Allow councils to retain the receipts from selling any of their housing assets, including those sold under the statutory Right to Buy, in order to re-invest them in improving the existing stock or building new homes;
 - Scrap the mandatory 1% rent cuts planned for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and extend the period covered by the new rent policy of CPI + 1% to ten years from 2018;
 - Consider whether to reimburse councils for the loss of rental income since April 2016 by a one-off payment to reduce HRA debt, or freedom for councils to increase rents by more than CPI + 1% to the level they would have reached but for the rent cuts;
 - Give councils explicit powers to build for sale and market rent within the HRA, to help cross-subsidise the provision of homes for social rent;
 - Scrap plans to introduce a levy on Higher Value Assets;
 - Review the statutory Right to Buy and the arrangements for “one for one” replacement of homes sold under the Right to Buy.

Investing in council housing

- The original self-financing settlement was designed to ensure that all councils would be able to bring their stock up to the Decent Homes standard and keep it there, allowing for planned replacement of key elements such as windows and roofs. Many councils planned to do more, often to improve thermal insulation and reduce energy consumption, adopting and planning to meet locally agreed standards higher than the Decent Homes Standard. In many cases, the rent cuts have forced these plans to be cut back or deferred.
- The findings of the Grenfell Public Inquiry and the Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety, when published, are likely to point to the need for significant investment both within dwellings and in common parts to provide an absolute guarantee of fire safety. In parallel, substantial improvement to the energy efficiency of the stock is essential if the UK is to meet its targets for reducing carbon emissions and provide affordable warmth for tenants. In returning to the original principles of the HRA self-financing settlement, the Government should be expected to ensure that councils have the resources to meet all these needs for investment in the existing council stock.

Review of the statutory Right to Buy

- In announcing the Social Housing Green Paper the Secretary of State promised that the Green Paper “would be the most substantial report of its kind for a generation” and promised “a wide-ranging, top-to-bottom review of the issues facing the sector”. Many ARCH member councils support the Right to Buy; others don’t. However, it would be wrong to conduct a “wide ranging, top to bottom review” of social housing without including a comprehensive review of the Right to Buy and its impact, particularly at a time when other devolved governments in the United Kingdom in Wales and Scotland have undertaken

similar reviews. All ARCH members can agree that the review should ensure workable arrangements for at least one-for-one replacement of homes sold.

Giving tenants a stronger voice

- Social housing tenants need a stronger voice in how their homes are managed, both in shaping policy and planned maintenance or improvements, and, when they complain when things go wrong, in getting prompt and effective responses & redress from their landlord.
- Councils are expected to follow the Tenant Involvement and Empowerment (TIE) Standard set by the Social Housing Regulator. The requirements of the Standard are clear and comprehensive, and describe well what a good landlord should strive to do, but there is no systematic evidence to show how well landlords are performing against the Standard or allow tenants and their landlords to compare their performance with others across the sector.
- ARCH remains committed to the principles of co-regulation. We do not see a major extension of the powers of the Regulator as the answer but would like to see steps that will improve transparency and strengthen the capacity of landlords to compare their performance with others and encourage sharing of experience and exchange of good practice, and enable tenants and their representatives to do the same. These should include investment in developing good practice in handling and responding to complaints and in particular in the use of complaints procedures to identifying service failures and improving services would bring dividends. There is a potential role for an appropriately funded regulator in promoting, disseminating and monitoring such good practice.
- Consideration should be given to a requirement on all social landlords to undertake and publish the outcome of an annual survey of tenant satisfaction along the lines of the HouseMark “Star” survey and to report the outcome of such surveys to the Regulator for national publication.
- A renewed focus on the landlord’s responsibility under the TIE Standard (paragraph 2.1.2) to report publicly on the number and nature of complaints received, and how they have been used to improve performance, may help improve organisational focus on learning from complaints. A requirement on all landlords to report annually to the housing regulator on the issues raised by tenants and how their landlord has responded might also be useful and would enable the regulator to identify issues of concern and consider support and intervention where necessary.
- ARCH supports the call from the major national tenant organisations for reinstatement of a “National Tenant Voice” at the heart of government policy making; the form & nature of which should be subject to wide consultation with tenants and social landlords.

The Need for Social Housing

5. In 2017 the Government's Housing White Paper acknowledged that the housing market is broken and no-one disagrees. Not enough new homes have been built for too many years. This chronic shortage of housing has helped to drive up house prices and market rents across the country, putting home ownership out of reach for four out of five newly forming households. Rising homelessness is further evidence of a particular lack of secure and affordable accommodation.
6. The Government's 2012 housing strategy was based on an estimated demand for 232,000 extra homes a year over the following 20 years. This estimate was similar to the minimum annual target of 231,000 proposed in a previous appraisal for the Government in 2008. But, since 2008, output has fallen woefully short of these numbers. In the four years from 2009 to 2013 annual new house completions averaged only 111,000 compared with 152,000 a year in the previous four years. Output has slowly increased since 2013 but, taking the last decade as a whole, around a million fewer homes have been built than were needed.
7. The latest household projections, based on 2014 data, show a slightly reduced demand for 227,000 extra homes each year. The encouraging increase shown in the 2016/17 figures brings new home completions and other additions to the housing stock to within 10,000 of this figure. But a level of output that just matches household growth does nothing to meet the backlog of housing need by permitting a reduction in the numbers of concealed and sharing households, or make provision for any rise in the numbers on second homes or vacancies arising from turnover in the additional stock¹. Against this background, the target of 300,000 homes a year announced by the Government in the 2017 Budget should be regarded as a minimum requirement.
8. As important as the number of new homes added to the housing stock is the match between the make-up of demand and the type of housing supplied; there has been an acute shortfall in the supply of affordable housing. In 2012, respected forecaster Alan Holmans estimated, based on the characteristics of the households making up the demand for new housing, that around a third of the total new supply should be for rent at social rent levels or within Local Housing Allowance limits². There is good reason to expect that this broad estimate remains valid, as it is consistent with other evidence on the need for social housing.
9. The number of council-owned homes has declined by over 2million from 3.67million homes in 1994 to 1.6 million in 2017. Despite a parallel growth in the number of homes owned by housing associations, the overall stock of social housing has decreased from 4.39 million in 1997 to 4.12 million. The total number of social lettings by local authorities and housing associations reached its lowest level for 10 years in 2016/17. Annual lettings by local authorities declined by 9% on the previous year to 103,000 and housing association lettings declined by 11% to 231,000. Partly in consequence, there were 1.16 million households on local authority waiting lists in April 2017, and as at 30 September 2017 there were 79,190 homeless households living in temporary accommodation – including 121,360 children or expected children.
10. There is a strong economic case for investing in social housing. Research commissioned from Capital Economics by a coalition of housing organisations including ARCH in 2015, updated in 2016 to reflect the potential impact of Brexit, shows that investment in social housing would bring substantial long-term savings to the Exchequer in reduced spending on benefits³.
11. Taken together, this evidence makes the case for an annual target of 100,000 new homes for social rent to be provided by local authorities and housing associations, as an integral part of the Government's overall target of 300,000 new homes a year.

12. Holman's made no separate estimate of the demand for "intermediate" housing, such as shared ownership, for households with incomes high enough to pay market rents but with an inability to raise a deposit to buy outright. If, as at present, councils and housing associations build for shared ownership or other low-cost home ownership initiatives, or for market sale or rent, these homes should be counted as additional to the supply of social rented homes that are needed. The number of affordable homes needed, in the broad sense of "affordable" used in the Housing and Planning Act 2016, and elsewhere, which embraces starter homes for discounted sale, shared ownership and rent-to-buy alongside homes for social and affordable rent, is more than a third of the annual requirement – more than 100,000 a year.
13. These are national estimates; it is clear that the proportion of affordable homes needed varies widely in different parts of England, and within the different categories of affordable homes the relative demand for social and affordable rent and for intermediate products such as shared ownership will vary. In Greater Manchester the councils have estimated that, although the social housing stock needs substantial investment to improve its quality, there is no need for a net increase in the number of social rented homes. In parts of the Midlands and North of England, where market rents are lower, social and affordable rents are not far apart, and either is accessible by prospective tenants on low incomes. In London, the position is again different, the gap between "affordable" rents at up to 80% of market rates, and social rents can easily be £100 per week, putting Affordable Rents far out of the reach of many lower income working households. We would argue that each local housing authority should be tasked to base its plan for new housing in the area on an assessment that treats the demand for each of the relevant types of affordable housing separately, recognizing that they are not interchangeable categories.

The Role and Purpose of Social Housing

14. The current role of social housing is best described as a "safety net" for households unable to pay the market price – whether to rent or buy – for housing adequate to their needs. This is reflected in access and lettings policies giving priority to low income households in high housing need, including councils' statutory duties towards homeless people.
15. It was not always so. In putting councils at the forefront of the post-war house-building drive, Labour's Housing Minister, Aneurin Bevan, set out to remove what he regarded as the "ridiculous inhibition" that council housing should only be for the working classes⁴. From the late 1940s to the end of the 1970s, while, under both Labour and Conservative governments, councils consistently built more than 100,000 new homes each year, lettings went to a spectrum of households, among them young families escaping overcrowded conditions in private lodging houses or with friends or relatives, former slum dwellers of all ages and incomes and households taking up new jobs in New Towns or Garden Cities. The author of *The Housing Survey in England and Wales* reported in 1964 that council tenants "tended to be in the middle of the income range".
16. This is the period described by Sajid Javid, in his speech launching the Green Paper, as a time when social housing was treasured, when living in it "carried no stigma, no shame, quite the opposite, in fact. For many it was the gold standard of accommodation, not a final safety net for the desperate and destitute but something you could genuinely aspire to, housing you would actively choose to live in; and as a country we were all rightly proud of it."
17. While there were some notorious examples of poor council housing – most notably the system-built high rise blocks exemplified by Ronan Point – the fact is that most were of a quality of design and construction at least as good as those of the volume housebuilders. Standards were often higher, with private builders criticized for skimping on space standards and building

uninspiring “little boxes”. Equally important to public perception of the new council homes was the difference from what they replaced. For many thousands, a new council home was their first experience of an indoor bathroom and toilet and a front and back garden.

18. Much has changed. Two major factors explain why. The first is the collapse in affordable housebuilding, which has not exceeded 50,000 homes a year since 1982, and has often been much less. 72% of council homes were built between 1945 and 1980 and are now at least 38 years old. With the consequent fall in new lettings, councils have been obliged to focus increasingly on applicants in the greatest housing need, often homeless, and with least prospect of access to any alternative form of accommodation. The second factor is the sale of almost 2 million homes under the Right to Buy, predominantly to the tenants with the highest household incomes. The result is that the demographic profile of social housing tenants today is profoundly different from that prevailing in the 1960s. Two thirds need help from housing benefit to pay the rent. According to the 2011 Census, only half of social tenants are either working (41%) or unemployed (8%); of the rest, 28% are over 65, and the remainder either full-time carers or have a long-term sickness or disability.
19. As the council housing stock has aged and council tenancies have become restricted to a narrower range of households, attitudes to council housing and council tenants have shifted. Council housing and council tenants now have a poorer reputation than they deserve. While 52% of council homes are houses or bungalows, the predominant public perception is of grim high-density blocks of flats. While, council housing is, on average, in a better state of repair than privately-owned or rented homes the fact is seldom recognised. Media comment and public debate about council tenants are too heavily dominated by unfair stereotypes based on ignorance and prejudice. Government, councils and policy-makers should do more to promote the value of social housing and the contributions that social housing tenants make to society. To this end ARCH is a supporter of the “Benefit to Society Campaign”.
20. With Right to Buy sales continuing to outstrip new additions to the council stock, the ‘safety net’ role of council housing is becoming unsustainable in many local authority areas, as evidenced by the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation, which rose by 60% between March 2011 and March 2017, and now stands just below 80,000 households. Two futures are possible. One accepts the diminished supply of new council housing and narrows the eligibility criteria for council tenancies to match. This would bring council housing closer to what has been described as an “ambulance service”⁵, with the key change being the expectation that a council tenancy would be a form of temporary assistance provided on the understanding that the tenant should make every effort to improve their household circumstances, particularly income, to the point where they could move on to market renting or home ownership.
21. The other future involves a major expansion in council house-building. A modest expansion to, say, 30,000 homes a year could ensure the replacement of homes sold under the Right to Buy, elimination of the use of unsatisfactory forms of temporary accommodation for homeless households, and the sustainability of the ‘safety net’ role. A more ambitious expansion could, over time, bring council housing closer to the role it used to play in providing affordable housing for a wider range of households.
22. The council housing drive of the 1950s was founded on a rejection of the idea that poorer people deserve only poorer accommodation. Equally it reflected a view that poorer people should not be isolated from the rest of the community by the segregation of affordable from market housing. One expression of this view was Bevan’s vision of “the living tapestry of a mixed community” where “the doctor, the grocer, the butcher and the farm labourer all live on the same street”⁶, in the expectation that this would bring communities together and promote social cohesion. And, to a significant extent, the council housing programme of the 1950s and 1960s, under Bevan and his successors, notably Harold Macmillan, did begin to realise this vision, particularly in the New Towns celebrated by Sajid Javid in his references to this period.

23. Since Bevan and Macmillan's time the proportion of households owning their own home has doubled. But it was never essential to the vision of mixed communities that the doctor and butcher, as well as the grocer and farm labourer, should all be council tenants. What was important was that each community contained enough social housing to ensure that no household was priced out of the area, avoiding the consequent social segregation of every town and settlement into separate areas for rich and poor.
24. Councils are well-placed to ensure the creation of thriving, sustainable mixed communities in every area. In their capacity as strategic housing authorities they are tasked with ensuring an adequate supply and mix of housing tenures to meet future housing needs. Their planning and enabling powers can and are being used to shape and steer investment in new housing by private developers and others. But there are good reasons why councils should now be encouraged to take on a greater role in direct provision of new housing, not just for social rent but for other tenures as well.

Backing councils to build

25. New home completions have not exceeded 300,000 in any year since 1972/73, when 300,250 were completed, of which 90,550 were built by local authorities. The fall in output since that time is largely attributable to the decline of council house-building. Annual construction of private homes for sale has not passed 200,000 a year since the 1960s, and has averaged around 120,000 a year since the 1970s. Housing association output has never passed 40,000 homes a year. This strongly suggests that the new target of 300,000 new homes will not be achieved without councils playing a much larger role – a conclusion that is reflected both in the Government's Housing White Paper of 2017 and by the Labour Party in its proposal for a new programme of council house-building.
26. Councils can do more both by taking the lead in enabling development and by taking a much bigger role in direct provision than they have done since the 1980s. There is a case for all councils to start building again; there are particularly strong arguments for the 165 English councils which still own council housing to do more. Many are already building on a small scale or have begun to develop the skills and capacity needed to run new-build programmes and there is significant scope to provide additional homes by making more intensive use or redevelopment of land already occupied by council housing. Most importantly, the national stock of 1.6 million council homes yields an annual rental income of £9.5 billion, which provides an important resource that could be made available to support part of the cost of providing new council housing, supplemented of course by the additional rental income from any new council housing. But there are obstacles, in part created by Government policy and legislation, which need to be removed if councils are to fulfil their full potential.
27. Councils are not only responsible for meeting the need for social housing in their areas, but for ensuring that all housing needs in their areas are met. Consequently, council involvement in house-building is not confined to the provision of homes for social rent. Increasingly, councils are involved, normally through partnerships of various kinds, or local housing companies, in the provision of new homes for sale, shared ownership and market rent.
28. Partnership arrangements come in a variety of forms, usually involving a partnership or joint venture between a council and one or more partners, typically a developer and often a housing association, sometimes an institutional investor. These arrangements involve a formal long-term partnership or the establishment of a company in which the council is normally a minority shareholder. This enables the risks and rewards of development to be shared appropriately among the partners, so that the council benefits from any planning gain associated with the development and does not need to rely on s106 or similar arrangements. Homes may be provided for sale, including shared ownership, or letting at market or sub-market rents. If let, they are let on assured tenancies and the right to buy does not apply.

29. The application of this approach is, however, limited by the willingness of private partners to invest in housing development and the rate of return they expect on their investment. Set-up and governance costs associated with special purpose vehicles can be substantial, and the associated legal issues are complex and require specialist advice and support.
30. In an increasingly popular alternative approach, councils have set up arms-length companies they wholly own or control to develop housing for sale or rent, sometimes in conjunction with the development of commercial property. Alternatively, councils with ALMOs have extended their remit to include development of new homes. Housing provided through such arrangements is outside the HRA and, if let, is let on assured tenancies and not subject to the Right to Buy. Such housing development is classed as a trading activity, which means that councils can only do it through a company. However, the set-up and operating costs of such companies can be much lower than a joint venture with a private partner, particularly where the council is the only shareholder. While borrowing by the company counts as public borrowing, and is, in effect, part of the council's borrowing and subject to prudential guidelines, it is not subject to the debt caps imposed on HRA borrowing.
31. The number of local housing companies, including partnerships and wholly-owned companies, has risen rapidly over the past 5 years, and around 200 are now thought to be in operation. However, most are, as yet, operating on a relatively small scale and have completed relatively few new homes. The Smith Institute estimates that they have the capacity, once fully operational, to deliver 10-15,000 homes a year. However, these homes should not be seen as replacing the provision of housing for social rent through council HRAs. Only around a third of them are estimated to be for social or "affordable" rent, the rest being a mix of homes for sale and shared ownership, for letting at market rents and for use as temporary accommodation for homeless people. This is partly because companies have been set up in response to a range of housing needs, not only the need for housing at social rent, and partly because most companies are operating without access to grant assistance through the Affordable Housing Programme. This means that the deliverable amount of housing for social rent is limited by the cross-subsidy available from homes for sale or market rent. A few companies have registered as social landlords in order to access the AHP, but many have not wanted to be subject to the requirement to charge affordable rents.
32. Council HRAs provide an additional resource that can be tapped to support the provision of new homes. The self-financing system introduced by the Localism Act in 2012, with the support of Government and Opposition parties in Parliament, gave councils with housing the opportunity to make a substantial contribution to new house-building. As enacted, it devolved long-term planning and investment to councils with housing, whether managed directly or through an ALMO, and, by allowing them to retain rent income in full, provided sufficient resources to bring all homes up to the Decent Homes Standard and build a significant number of new council homes.
33. The settlement incorporated limits on HRA borrowing ("debt caps"), restricting overall local authority housing debt to £29.8 billion. The formula used to calculate each authority's debt cap left most authorities with some "headroom" for new borrowing, although in three out of four authorities this was less than £20 million. 28 authorities had no headroom at all. An ARCH survey in summer 2012 suggested that councils were planning to invest an average of £9000 per unit in their existing stock and build 25,000 new homes by 2018, but could potentially increase output by a further 60,000 homes if borrowing limits were lifted.
34. These reforms were intended to endure for the long term, allowing councils to plan for the long term through robust and sustainable 30-year HRA business plans. However, they have been undermined by subsequent policy decisions by successive governments. The original settlement was premised on the assumption, used by the Government in deciding how much debt each council could afford to take on as part of the settlement, that rents would rise annually by 0.5% above inflation, as measured by the Retail Prices Index, throughout the business plan period of 30 years. However, since April 2012 successive Government

decisions have significantly reduced the rental income expected to be available to councils, with corresponding impact on investment, both in the existing stock, and in construction of new homes:

- From April 2012, “reinvigoration” of the Right to Buy with significantly increased discounts led to a sharp increase in Right to Buy sales, currently running at around 15,000 a year; the loss of rent income from homes sold is only partially offset by savings in management and maintenance spending, and arrangements for replacement are not working.
- In June 2013, the Government announced that from April 2015 the rent increase formula would be based, not on the Retail Price Index, but on the Consumer Prices Index plus 1%, and the allowance of an additional £2 per week per unit to achieve convergence with housing association rents ended.
- In July 2015, the Government announced plans, later enacted in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016, to reduce council and housing association rents by 1% a year for four years from April 2016. By April 2020 rents will be 10% lower than they were in April 2016
- In October 2017, the Government announced that, from April 2020, local authorities will once again be able to raise rents by CPI + 1% for at least 5 years; however, this implies that rents will remain 10% below where they would have been before the rent reductions were applied.
- Since 2012, successive welfare reforms – the under-occupation charge, benefit cap, and roll-out of Universal Credit – have made it more difficult to collect rent from growing numbers of council tenants. Continuing roll-out of Universal Credit is likely to exacerbate this position.
- The Housing and Planning Act 2016 included provision for a levy to be raised from councils with housing to pay for discounts to housing association tenants exercising their proposed right to buy; the levy would be calculated by reference to the “higher value” stock owned by each council. While no levy will be payable before April 2019 at the earliest, uncertainty about future liabilities continues to blight councils’ investment planning.

35. The 2016 CIH and CIPFA Report *Investing in Council Housing*⁷ estimated the cumulative impact of these changes as follows:

“The original self-financing model showed potential capacity for authorities to build more than 550,000 units over 30 years. After taking into account the effects of inflationary changes (i.e. the switch from RPI to CPI) this capacity for building new units reduced to 160,000. ... The effects of the rent reduction mean that the capacity to build drops to just 45,000 units (or 8% of the capacity at the time of the settlement).”

36. Nevertheless, were the original principles of the 2012 self-financing settlement reinstated and councils given the long-term certainty needed to plan new investment, this analysis suggests that stock-owning councils have the potential to deliver around 20,000 new council homes a year without external subsidy in the form of Affordable Housing Grant. To make this happen the Government should:

- Lift debt caps to give all councils the scope to borrow up to the level they can safely expect to repay from rental income (the prudential limit);
- Allow councils to retain the receipts from selling any of their housing assets, including those sold under the statutory Right to Buy, in order to re-invest them in improving the existing stock or building new homes;

- Scrap the rent cuts planned for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and extend the period covered by the new rent policy of CPI + 1% to ten years from 2018;
- Consider whether to reimburse councils for the loss of rent since April 2016 by a one-off payment to reduce HRA debt, or freedom for councils to increase rents by more than CPI + 1% to the level they would have reached but for the rent cuts;
- Give councils explicit powers to build for sale and market rent within the HRA, to help cross-subsidise the provision of homes for social rent;
- Scrap plans to introduce a levy on Higher Value Assets;
- Review the statutory Right to Buy and the arrangements for replacement of homes sold under the Right to Buy.

Investing in the existing stock of council housing

37. The Decent Homes programme initiated by the Government in 2003 was designed to ensure that all council homes met a basic decent standard within 10 years. It focused on replacing bathrooms, kitchens and windows but did not cover thermal insulation, common parts or the external environment. The programme has been largely successful, and the number of non-decent council homes has fallen sharply and, according to the latest council returns, is now below 5%. The original self-financing settlement was designed to ensure that all councils would be able to bring their stock up to the Decent Homes standard and keep it there, allowing for planned replacement of key elements such as windows and roofs. Many councils plan to do more, often to improve thermal insulation and reduce energy consumption, adopting and planning to meet local standards, developed and agreed with their tenants, that were higher than the basic Decent Homes Standard. In many cases, the rent cuts have forced these plans to be cut back or deferred.
38. The Grenfell Tower tragedy has given urgency to substantial investment to guarantee fire safety, going far beyond the removal of unsafe cladding for which the Government has made funding available. If councils are to fund these works from HRA resources, alongside the other improvement works mentioned above that go beyond the current decency standard, these costs need to be quantified and acknowledged in a long-term rent settlement that gives councils the certainty and confidence to make long-term investment plans.
39. In the coming years, a proportion of the council housing stock will reach the end of its useful life, either through deterioration of the fabric or dwelling, or because dwelling or estate design and layout are no longer appropriate for future needs. There may be other reasons why major remodelling or demolition and redevelopment of estates is desirable or opportune, sometimes to increase density or facilitate more mixed communities by providing homes for sale or shared ownership alongside social housing. But it is essential that the mix of new dwellings in such regeneration schemes is driven by local housing need, not the need for sales receipts to generate enough cross-subsidy to fund the costs of redevelopment. We want to see the funding arrangements for regeneration schemes to explicitly recognise this point.

Review of the Right to Buy

40. Since its introduction in 1981 the Right to Buy has given hundreds of thousands of council tenants the opportunity to own a home they may not otherwise have been able to afford. But, because few of the homes sold have been replaced with new council or housing association homes, the social housing stock has fallen and the number of new lettings available to those on council housing waiting lists or the statutorily homeless has collapsed. Many households waiting for a council home are trapped in insecure, unsatisfactory and expensive accommodation in the private rented sector. Meanwhile, as Right to Buy purchasers move or

sell on, an estimated four out of ten ex-council homes are now let privately.

41. Since 2012, when the Right to Buy was “reinvigorated” with increased discounts and a national promotional campaign, Government policy has aimed at one-for-one replacement of homes sold (strictly, this applies only to the additional homes sold as a result of reinvigoration) by recycling a portion of the sales receipts, either through the HCA Affordable Housing Programme, or by giving councils the opportunity to invest receipts in new housing within three years. However there is no guarantee receipts handed to the HCA will be used in the local authority area they came from. These arrangements are not working. While Right to Buy sales have risen rapidly and are now running at around 15,000 a year, the number of replacements so far provided is only around a fifth of those sold. Many councils complain that restrictions on the use of receipts, in particular the timescale for spending the receipts and the requirement that they may contribute at most 30% of the cost of providing a replacement home makes it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to use them. Some have returned receipts to the Government unused after three years. A review of these arrangements is overdue.
42. In announcing the Social Housing Green Paper the Secretary of State promised that the Green Paper “would be the most substantial report of its kind for a generation” and promised “a wide-ranging, top-to-bottom review of the issues facing the sector”. Many ARCH member councils support the Right to Buy; others don’t. However, it would be wrong to conduct a “wide ranging, top to bottom review” of social housing without including a comprehensive review of the Right to Buy and its impact, particularly at a time when other devolved governments in the United Kingdom in Wales and Scotland have undertaken similar reviews. All ARCH members can agree that the review should ensure workable arrangements for at least one-for-one replacement of homes sold.

Giving tenants a stronger voice

43. The tragic and fatal fire at Grenfell Tower has renewed attention on how to give social housing tenants a stronger voice in how their homes are managed, both in shaping policy and planned maintenance or improvements, and, when they complain when things go wrong, in getting prompt and effective responses from their landlord.
44. The way forward on this issue should take full account of the findings of the Grenfell Public Inquiry, when published. In the meantime, Dame Judith Hackitt’s Review of Building Regulations & Fire Safety has made recommendations, which we support, to require landlords to provide better information for all residents on fire safety and to involve them more closely in decision-making, including through the support of residents associations and tenants panels. We believe this approach should not be confined to residents of high-risk residential buildings nor fire safety issues, but should be undertaken as an integral part of a wider drive to improve tenant and resident involvement in all relevant decisions about their homes. Similarly, Dame Judith’s recommendations on Government funding for national and local organisations providing advice, guidance and support for residents and landlords on effective resident involvement, and on a no-risk redress route should be implemented as part of a broader initiative to strengthen tenant and residents’ voices and access to redress, without, however, losing a sharp focus on the fire safety issues that have brought these issues to the top of the public agenda.
45. Current regulatory requirements for social housing make it clear that social landlords are expected to give tenants a real say in the way their homes are managed. Local authorities and housing associations are both expected to follow the Tenant Involvement and Empowerment (TIE) Standard set by the Social Housing Regulator. This includes a requirement for landlords to make arrangements to enable tenants to be effectively involved in all significant decisions about their housing, to offer a range of ways for tenants to complain and have clear service

standards for responding to complaints. The requirements of the Standard are clear and comprehensive, and describe well what a good landlord should strive to do. It may now be appropriate to amend the Standard to include specific requirements in relation to fire safety issues, but we do not see a broader case for amending them. If tenants' voices are not being heard, it is not because the TIE Standard is inadequate, but because landlord performance falls short of what is required. There is currently insufficient evidence to provide a comprehensive picture of how well landlords are performing against the Standard. The evidence that is available, including the experience of Grenfell Tower tenants, suggests that performance is variable, with some landlords falling well short of the required standard.

46. Good landlords recognise the business case for tenant empowerment, that not only will tenants be more satisfied but also their homes better managed if their views are listened to and acted on. Most councils will recognise that they can improve their arrangements for tenant involvement by learning from others, and for this reason we support the creation or strengthening of centres of expertise that can provide advice and support both to landlords and tenants, along the lines proposed by the Hackitt Review, not, however, confined to fire safety but with a broader remit covering the full scope of tenant involvement and empowerment. We recognise, however, that to provide assurance that all landlords will raise their performance to the required level, action is needed to address those who, for whatever reasons, are unwilling or unable to improve. Here, we see two basic options – to increase regulation, or to strengthen the powers of tenants. We favour the second option.
47. Current regulatory arrangements reflect the principle of co-regulation: landlords are not primarily accountable for their performance to the Regulator, but to their tenants. This is expressed in the expectation that landlords should “support tenants to shape and scrutinise service delivery and hold boards and committees to account”. ARCH remains committed to this principle; councils should treat, and be expected to treat, the TIE standard as something they “own”, and not something imposed on them by the Regulator. The onus is on them to mobilise tenants locally to scrutinise performance against the Standard. We believe this should continue to be the approach. Reform of the regulatory arrangements to require, for example, regular reporting of specified performance information to the Regulator or periodic assessment of each landlord's performance against the consumer standards, risks displacing management's focus from actually listening to their tenants to meeting the regulatory requirements or “performing to the indicators”. Any regulatory reform should focus on strengthening local accountability to tenants and enhancing their capacity to shape and scrutinise service delivery.
48. Such reforms could include a requirement on all social landlords to undertake and publish the outcome of an annual survey of tenant satisfaction along the lines of the HouseMark “Star” survey and to report the outcome of such surveys to the Regulator for national publication. This would provide a common basis, albeit crude, for comparing performance, to act as a “can-opener” for further investigation.
49. A renewed focus on the landlord's responsibility under the TIE Standard (paragraph 2.1.2) to report publicly on the number and nature of complaints received, and how they have been used to improve performance, may help improve organisational focus on learning from complaints. A requirement on all landlords to report annually to the housing regulator on the issues raised by tenants and how their landlord has responded might be useful and would enable the regulator to identify issues of concern and consider support and intervention where necessary.
50. The Hackitt Review makes two important recommendations on strengthening tenants' and residents' voices. The first is that tenants and residents associations should be encouraged and supported and that, in this context, tenants and residents, or their representatives, should have better access to advice and support on effective tenant involvement, not only landlords. We agree, and, as argued above, this should not be confined to fire safety issues. The second is the creation of a more effective, no-risk route to redress when things go wrong. Again, we believe this should not apply only to fire safety concerns. ARCH supports the creation of a

single Housing Ombudsman, and believe it has the potential, if properly resourced and supported, to play this role.

51. ARCH supports the call from the major national tenant organisations for reinstatement of a “National Tenant Voice” at the heart of government policy making; the form & nature of which should be subject to wide consultation with tenants and social landlords.

¹ Stephens, M et al, *2018 UK Housing Review*, Coventry, Chartered Institute of Housing, page 48.

² Holmans, A (2012) *Interim Revised Estimates of Future Demand and Need in England in 2006-2026*, Cambridge CCHPR

³ Capital Economics (2016) *Building new social rent homes*, SHOUT
https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/4socialhousing/pages/1/attachments/original/1475255900/SHOUT_Building_New_Social_Rent_Homes_V3.pdf?1475255900

⁴ Quoted in Foot, M, *Aneurin Bevan, Volume 2, 1945-1960*

⁵ Perry, J and Stephens, M, *How the purpose of social housing has changed and is changing*, in Stephens, M et al, *2018 UK Housing Review*, Coventry, Chartered Institute of Housing, pages 29-39

⁶ Foot M, *ibid*

⁷ John Perry and Glenn Smith (2016) *Investing in Council Housing: the impact on council business plans*, London, CIPFA and CIH



Responsibilities check list – 18 September 2018

Below is a list of the activities that need to be managed through the day. This shows time, activity and who is responsible. This is based as a guide only and some flexibility will be needed as required on the day. If you feel you need something to do or aren't sure on what is needed then please see Mani Hundal or Marlene and they can advise.

| TIME | ACTIVITY | RESPONSIBLE |
|--------------------|--|---|
| 7.30 am | Check set up of meeting rooms – all signage to be checked and put up around the venue | Mani, Rod & Beth - HM |
| 7.45 am | Delegate packs to be laid out in main room, reserved signs and check on AV | Mani & Rod – HM |
| 7.45 am | Set-up of registration and queries desk | Beth – HM |
| 8.00 am | Carole Halfacre arrives – help with registration set-up/signage | Beth & Gez |
| 8.15 am | Put up banners in Main room and outside the council house | Mani & Rod – HM |
| 8.30 am | ARCH task and finish group arrives for briefing – Familiarisation of venue with Mani | Task and finish group – Marlene to do brief with Mani |
| 9.00 am | Meet and greeters in place at main entrance stairs | Tenant Group Members x 2 Beth – HM to oversee |
| 9.00 am | Meet and greeters in place at the disabled entrance | Tenant Group Members x 2 Beth – HM to oversee |
| 9.00 am | Lift controller – The person that will take delegates to the conference floor (level 3) | Tenant Group Member x 1 |
| 9.00 am | Jenny to set up in the main room and familiarise herself with set up and presentations | Jenny Rod – HM |
| 9.00 am – 10.00 am | Query desk set up and manned for queries e.g Workshop changes, Taxi requirements, direction details (lifts, toilets, main room etc) | Tenant Group Members x 2 Beth – HM |
| 9.15 am | Registration officially opens but to be ready from 9.00 am for any early arrivals - badges set in alpha order by council then alpha order by name. | TG member TBC TG member TBC |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | Plus Beth – HM |
| 9.15 am – 10.00 am | Speakers met at reception and shown to the main room or breakout room. Any speakers that have not arrived by 10.00 am will be met by the late arrival staff and shown the location of their breakout session and then taken to the main room until their breakout session (or have a coffee if more appropriate) | TG member & Carole Halfacre Mani Beth |
| 9.50 am | Any delegates left remaining in the coffee room to be ushered to main meeting room for conference start | Anyone who is available |
| 10.00 AM | CONFERENCE STARTS (Mani and Rod to remain in room in case of any technical issues) | |
| 10.00 – 10.30 am | Late arrival registration – Beth and Tenant group member TBC to register and then guide late attendees to the room and seat. Late arrival seating to be reserved (see notes above on speaker arrivals). Beth to be on hand to answer any queries at break times at registration. | Beth – HM TG member tbc x 1 |
| After 10.05 am session | Audience Q&A following speaker – roaming mic | 1 x TG Member Mani- HM |
| 10.15 am | Break out rooms checked and names lists added to doors | Beth - HM |
| After 10.30 am session | Audience Q&A following speaker – roaming mic | 1 x TG Member Mani- HM |
| 11.00 am | Coffee break | |
| 11.00 am | Main room to be cleared of any dirty cups and water replenished | Mani & Rod – HM with Birmingham colleagues |
| 11.10 am | Chairs to be ready at workshop session and settle speakers (insert room numbers) Welfare Reform Benefit to Society Effective Tenant Involvement Chair the workshop. Keep to time, field questions, thank speakers and close the workshop. Write down on card 3 key bullet points from the session to feedback after the workshop. Advise participants where they go next for next part of the programme | Tenant Group Members x 3 for Chair roles (TG member, Gez and TG member to float between sessions) |
| 11.15 am | Team in place to guide people to breakout sessions – aim is to gather people in one place for each session and then lead to rooms: Welfare Reform Benefit to Society Effective Tenant Involvement | Rod - HM Beth – HM Mani – HM Gez – HM (meet & greeters also on hand) |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | |
| 11.20 am | WORKSHOPS START | |
| 12.20 pm | Photographer - Yaw will be on hand for 2 hours to take committee shots, general conference shots and the award. | Gez – HM TG member |
| 12.20 pm | Return to main room – chairs of workshops to guide people back. Followed by feedback from breakout sessions to the audience by chairs | Tenant Group Members x 3 |
| 12.30 pm | Check that lunch is ready – water on tables | Mani/Beth – HM |
| 12.35 pm | Clear breakout rooms – take out laptops | Beth /Mani – HM |
| 12.50 pm | Award made to winner and photos taken by Yaw (photographer) | Jenny and John Bibby TG member |
| 1.00 pm | LUNCH (put out feedback forms onto tables) | Beth, Mani and Rod |
| 1.05 pm | ARCH committee photograph – stay in main room | All ARCH committee |
| 1.50 pm | All delegates return to the main room: • Staff on hand to move people through | HouseMark All |
| 1.50 pm | CONFERENCE RESTARTS | |
| After 1.50 pm session | Audience Q&A following speaker – Roaming Mic | 1 x TG Member Mani- HM |
| After 2.20 pm session | Audience Q&A following speaker – Roaming Mic | 1 x TG Member Mani- HM |
| 2.45 pm | Check that taxis are in place for departures | Beth - HM |
| 3.00 pm | CONFERENCE ENDS Gather all lanyards from departing guests at entrance to hotel. Collect conference feedback forms | 3 x TG Member Gez Beth - HM |
| 3.15 pm | Save final presentations to memory stick | Mani - HM |
| 3.15 pm | Room to be cleared and banners taken down | ALL |
| 3.45 pm | All depart! | |

General- At and after conference

- Tweets to be set up to run through the day – Gez to do some live tweeting for retweeting by others
- Gez to prepare report for conference after the conference
- TG member send photos to Mani
- Circulate photos to Tenants Group or provide Flickr link for viewing
- Posting report to ARCH website with photos-HM
- Collation of feedback and informing ARCH Tenants Group and ARCH on learning for next year

| |
|--|
| ASSOCIATION OF RETAINED COUNCIL HOUSING LTD TENANTS GROUP ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING MONDAY 18TH JUNE 2018 |
|--|

ITEM 6: ARCH Tenants' Group Expenditure

Author: Gez Kinsella

1. Purpose

Update the Tenants Group on expenditure for the Tenants' Group for financial year 2017/18 and a comparison with 2016/17.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The Tenants Group is requested to note the content of the paper

3. Background

3.1 The information in the chart below provides a summary of expenditure for the year for the Tenants Group with some explanatory notes. A comparison to last year's expenditure is also provided.

4. Tenants Group Expenditure summary for 2016/17 and 2017/18

| | | 2016/17 | 2017/18 |
|----|--|------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Postage/Stationery | £0 | £0 |
| 2. | Travel and accommodation expenses | £2,077.65 | £3,182.33 |
| 3. | Meeting venue/lunch costs | £2,907.00 | £3,901.12 |
| 4. | Conference and training attendance (not ARCH conference) | £0 | £0 |
| 5. | Marketing materials | £0 | £0 |
| | | £4,984.65 | £7,083.45 |

Notes:

Travel and accommodation expenses were for Tenant Group members for meetings and for other Tenants Group business. The increase in costs are due to a higher number of Tenant Group members and more consistent attendance at Tenant Group meetings. Members of the Group have been more actively engaged in working with others and attending meetings such as; Dame Judith Hackitt workshops, the Voice for Tenants Steering Group and Benefit to Society Campaign

Increase in meeting venue/lunch costs are in part because since March the Group no longer use the free venue at the CIH offices.

Due to changes in the ARCH contract, the charge for facilitating and supporting the Tenant Group is now built into the contract fee.

Item 12: Work Plan ARCH Tenants' Group 2018

| Work stream | Jan- March 2018 | April – June 2018 | July- Sept 2018 | Oct –Dec 2018 |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Meetings of Tenants Group | 8 January 26 March | 14 May 18 June (AGM) | 3 September – lunch with Exec & afternoon meeting | 5 November |
| 2. Chair & Vice Chair attending ARCH Executive meetings | 15 January | 9 April 21 May | 9 July 3 September –see above | 12 November |
| 3. Consultation on policy, legislation and regulation to feed into ARCH responses | At meetings and by email | Consultation on Housing Green Paper | Consult on HouseMark support services contract specification. | At meetings and by email |
| 4. Tenants Conference Date: tbc - Sept 2018 | Liaising with HM Event Manager Working Group set up Venue identified Time scheduling for conference activities | Working Group phone conference Visit venue with Event Manager - April Programme planning – 14 May/18 June | Working Group activity Final planning with event Manager - Sept Conference - Sept | Feedback at 5 Nov meeting Promotion of outcomes from conference |
| 5. Presentations to Tenants Group | Scrutiny and the future resident engagement agenda (Stevenage BC) – 8 January Welfare reform Update (Jo Linney) - 26 March | Review of consumer redress issues - Housing Ombudsman – 14 May or 18 June meetings. Providing an effective challenge - using data to empower tenants – 14 May | Attending Exec meeting as observers | |

Item 12: Work Plan ARCH Tenants' Group 2018

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | Blogging & Vlogging – cascading Benefit to Society training – 26 March | | | |
| 6. ARCH seminars attendance by Chair/ Vice Chair and members of Group if place booked for them by their Council | Topics and dates to be confirmed for the year. Some sessions cancelled due to limited take up | | | |
| 7. Communication and marketing | <p>On-going bulletin articles fortnightly</p> <p>Website pages updated by GK</p> <p>Benefit to Society campaign – photos added to website</p> | <p>On-going bulletin articles fortnightly</p> <p>Sharing what your council is doing</p> <p>Benefit to Society campaign – implement marketing plan</p> | <p>On-going bulletin articles fortnightly</p> <p>Sharing what your council is doing</p> <p>Publicity around Tenants Conference in September</p> | <p>On-going bulletin articles fortnightly</p> <p>Sharing what your council is doing</p> |