

CABINET 13 MARCH 2024

Report title: Revising Lambeth's Allocation Policy

Wards: All

Portfolio: Cabinet Member for Better Homes and Reducing Homelessness: Councillor Maria Kay

Report Authorised by: Fiona Connolly, Corporate Director for Housing and Adult Social Care

Contact for enquiries: Chris Flynn, Director of Housing Needs and Commissioning,
cflynn@lambeth.gov.uk

REPORT SUMMARY

This report proposes options to amend the Housing Allocation Scheme; the scheme had its last major review in 2012. There is a very limited supply of social lettings, and we need to ensure we are making the best use of what is available.

The proposed changes are a result of ongoing efforts to enhance the effectiveness and responsiveness of the policy based on community feedback and evolving housing needs.

FINANCE SUMMARY

The financial impact of the policy change set out in this report is expected be that c118 households per annum are moved on from Temporary Accommodation which would avoids costs of c£1m per annum against the Temporary Accommodation General Fund budget.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To agree the proposed changes to the Allocation Scheme

1. Households in Temporary Accommodation to move from Band C1 to Band B.
2. Offers are generally limited to one for homeless households and two for other households.
3. Band D will be removed.
4. Waiting time to be from time in Band rather than time of initial application.
5. Applicants will generally be required to log in annually to keep their accounts active.

1. CONTEXT

1.1 The council allocates about 800 council and housing association tenancies a year. Under Part 6 of the Housing Act 1996, all housing authorities are required to have a housing allocation scheme which sets out how relative priority will be determined between applicants and the process to be followed in the allocation of social housing. Housing may not be allocated other than in accordance with the published allocation scheme.

1.2 The scheme must address issues such as:

- Who can apply for housing
- What size housing can they be offered
- How much priority will they have relative to other applicants
- How applicants can exercise choice regarding what housing they are offered
- Scope of discretion to modify the scheme or deal with exceptional cases

1.3 There is very high demand for housing in Lambeth, and as a result the council cannot meet all housing need by providing social rented housing. The number of people applying for social housing far exceeds the amount of housing available. For most people, applying for social rented housing is not a realistic housing option. The Housing Allocation Scheme must therefore be seen against a context of wider housing options, including private rented accommodation. The Housing Allocation Scheme must make the best use of a scarce resource by targeting the provision of social housing at those who need it the most. It must also be sufficiently clear and easy to understand so that it is seen to be fair, including by those who are not housed.

1.4 Since the current Scheme was agreed by Cabinet ten years ago pressures on housing have increased; back in 2012 we had 2,000 lettings a year compared to the 800 today. There are over 43,000 households on the housing register. The numbers and associated costs of households in temporary accommodation have also increased considerably, this trend is likely to continue due to the macro-economic environment.

2. PROPOSAL AND REASONS

The existing scheme

2.1 In 2013 Lambeth introduced a new Allocation Scheme. The scheme it replaced was much more complex with eight different bands and priority within those bands base on levels and points. The current scheme comprises only four bands and no points-based element. Having a system based on Bands, rather than a more complicated system which gives more cumulative preference to those with multiple needs is supported by case law.

2.2 The following table summarises the Bands, and the number of households within each band (as of October 2023):

<u>Band A: Emergencies and Strategic Priorities</u>
--

Emergencies and strategic high priority groups ¹

2,700 households

¹ Emergency transfers due to risk of violence • Life threatening medical emergency • Care leavers • Decants of council tenants • Where housing is required to prevent significant harm to a child • To facilitate discharge of child from care • To facilitate discharge from residential care or hospital • Council and housing association tenants downsizing.

Band B: High Priority

Households with an urgent housing need: Severe overcrowding (lacking 2 or more bedrooms) Urgent need to move on medical grounds. Those at risk of homelessness who are working with the council to prevent homelessness.

5,600

Band C: Medium Priority

Level 1: Homeless households being provided with temporary accommodation by the council,
Level 2: Households with an identified housing need, but without a high priority: Overcrowding (lacking 1 bedroom) or sharing bathroom/kitchen facilities. A less urgent need to move on medical grounds
Homeless households (not being provided with temporary accommodation)

C1: 3,800

C2: 20,000

Band D: Low Priority

All those not in other groups

Those who are adequately housed

11,400

- 2.3 Currently, when people with the same band bid on the same property the person who has been waiting the longest wins. The time on the register is taken from when they first joined. So, for example if someone joined the register as a teenager but only became a higher priority applicant many years later, they would be in a much stronger bidding position than someone who only joined the register when their housing situation reached crisis point.
- 2.4 There is no requirement for applicants to re-confirm their interest and household details periodically to remain on the register.

Offers

- 2.5 If an applicant bids successfully on a property, they are made an offer. Currently, there is no limit on the number of offers which an applicant can be made. This makes Lambeth unusual in comparison to the approach taken by other London Boroughs, the vast majority of whom only make one offer to homeless households and limit the number of offers to other households to one, two or three.

Band B – “Preventions”

- 2.6 These are applicants who have been threatened with homelessness but who are working with us to prevent their homelessness. This means either that they have accepted our offer of help into the private rented sector or they have continued living with family or friends. A typical situation would be when a grown-up child becomes pregnant and their parents are convinced to let them stay in the familial home, with the understanding that they will have a high priority to bid for social housing in the future. These applicants are generally in relatively appropriate accommodation compared to other priority households.

2.7 In 2022/23 year 43% of successful bids to Band B applicants went to “prevention” households.

Band D

2.8 There are over 11,000 applicants on Band D. Band D applicants are considered adequately housed, with the correct number of bedrooms for the household members etc. There have been 20 annual allocations to Band D households on average over the last 5 years. When these cases are looked at most of these have a special reason for being successful, such as people accessing homes through the GLA’s ‘Housing Moves’ scheme. Many local authorities restrict access to the housing register for applicants who have no realistic chance of ever successfully bidding for a home.

Pressures on Temporary Accommodation

2.9 There are growing numbers of people living in Lambeth temporary accommodation. This reflects the general national trend which is a particular challenge for London boroughs due to the nature of our housing market, inflation and the cost of living crisis. Statistically someone living in London is eight times more likely to be in temporary accommodation (TA) than in the rest of England.

2.10 66% of our households in temporary accommodation at the end of March 2023 were accommodated in a different local authority district principally in neighbouring Croydon, Lewisham, Merton, Bromley and Southwark. This proportion is on the increase. The negative effects for families in terms of health, education and other outcomes caused by living in TA are well documented.

2.11 Three quarters of TA occupants are in ‘nightly paid’ accommodation. This is self-contained private accommodation of variable quality. It is also expensive and due to limitations on what housing benefit will pay, on average the net cost to the council for each household in nightly paid accommodation is circa £9,000 per year as the rents are higher than can be covered by Local Housing Allowance.

2.12 Over 90% of TA households who have been authorised for housing are in Band C1. 8.5% are in Band B.

Benchmarking

2.13 We have carried out benchmarking with other local authorities (Brent; Bromley; Croydon; Haringey; Lewisham; Southwark; Tower Hamlets; Waltham Forest; Wandsworth; Westminster). The table underneath shows the approaches taken by other London LA social landlords.

Lambeth Approach	% of LAs taking the same approach
Prevention cases have priority over TA	20%
Unlimited number of offers	10%
No restrictions to joining the register (Band D)	40%

Proposed changes

2.14 On the basis of the analysis above the council identified a number of potential changes to the allocations policy: changing the relative priorities of people in Temporary Accommodation, and ‘prevention’ households in Band B; changing how waiting time is calculated; preventing those

with no housing need from joining the housing register, limiting the number of housing offers, and requiring people to check in periodically to keep their accounts active.

- 2.15 A consultation on these topics was launched on 12 October 2023, initially for a six-week period which was extended until 19 January 2024 in response to community demand. The appended consultation report presents results from the survey questions graphically and then splits reasons for the views into different themes. Where people agreed or disagreed with the proposals, what were the main reasons for doing so. We will also publish all the survey answers on a large anonymised excel spreadsheet for full transparency. The online survey was supplemented by a series of in person workshops and drop in sessions. There was an excellent response to the survey with 2,000 participants. An equality breakdown of the consultees who filled in their details is as follows:

Ethnicity

Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White
3.5%	47.9%	8.3%	19.1%	21.3%

Age

<18	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75-84	84+
0.1%	3.2%	24.3%	29.8%	21.3%	15.2%	4.5%	1.1%	0.4%

Gender

Female	Male	Other term
72.6%	26.5%	0.9%

Consider themselves to have a long term illness or disability

Yes	No
38.3%	61.8%

- 2.16 One organisation that has made a significant contribution to this consultation is Housing Action Southwark and Lambeth (HASL). They are a volunteer run community housing group made up of individuals who are homeless, living in overcrowded accommodation or facing other housing problems. They submitted a detailed response to the proposals and also submitted 218 individual responses on behalf of their members by email. The detailed analysis of the results in the attached consultation report considers the impact of these answers counting each answer individually and as a single response, showing how it affects the overall proportions of those in support or against the proposals.

2.17 **Should we give more priority to people in Temporary Accommodation?**

Overall there is a majority of support for this proposal with more people agreeing (62%) than disagreeing (17%). There are more people who neither agree nor disagree (21%) compared to those who disagree. The highest level of support for this proposal is among Band C1, those living in temporary accommodation where 96% of people agree.

Where people agree or strongly agreed they thought families need stability and a permanent place to live. There was concern for the poor living conditions in temporary accommodation, the constant moving endured, and the length of time families spent in situ considering it was proposed as a temporary solution. Comments considered the health, safety and wellbeing of families,

homelessness prevention, lack of access to adaptations and cost and legal obligation to the Council.

Where people disagree or strongly disagreed thought the proposal was unfair as those in Band B had waited a long time and this proposal would cause further delays. Some comments stated being in Temporary accommodation meant families had shelter and were not homeless.

OUR RESPONSE AND RATIONALE – Move TA occupants from C1 to Band B. We are doing this to increase the number of lets to homeless households and reduce reliance/spend on nightly paid accommodation and to resettle homeless families into longer term accommodation. It was supported by the consultation results.

2.18 Should we give lower priority to “prevention cases”?

Overall opinion here was much more divided, with slightly more people disagreeing than agreeing and the remainder undecided. This question is similar to the first one about more priority for people in temporary but whereas 62% of respondents agreed with that proposal, only 35% agree that prevention cases should have lower priority. Those in Band B are the most likely to disagree with the proposal.

Where people agreed or strongly agreed they said it was because they believed other priorities were more important, particularly if they thought it would benefit their own situation. Some thought that if people were adequately housed, they shouldn't have a priority.

Where respondents disagreed, they thought it would be unfair to penalise by de-prioritising applicants who have worked with the council. Families opted for this as a temporary solution on the promise it would lead them to be given more priority to be eventually rehoused and would feel betrayed.

OUR RESPONSE AND RATIONALE – “Prevention Cases” remain in Band B. We are not introducing this change as it may be unfair to those who took the prevention option. This proposal was also not supported by the consultation results.

2.19 Should we limit the number of offers?

For homeless households there is a majority support for this approach in all Bands with more people agreeing with the proposal than disagreeing. There is less support from people in Band B and Band C1 than the other groups. Those who have been homeless or threatened with homelessness are less likely to support this proposal than those who have not.

For other households there is also an overall majority of support for this proposal with more people agreeing (46%) than disagreeing (33%). Different to the question on homeless offers, for two of the Bands, A and B, more people disagree with the proposal than agree. The highest level of support for this proposal is among Band C1, those living in temporary accommodation.

Where people agree or strongly agreed they thought that people should be more accepting of any home particularly when they are homeless.

Where people disagreed or strongly disagreed many made comments that Lambeth shouldn't force anyone to live somewhere and that because there was such high demand it should always be easy to find someone else to take the property. There was concern over people being made to live in unsuitable accommodation.

OUR RESPONSE AND RATIONALE – Homeless households limited to one offer, two for other households. We would affect this change by having people removed from the housing register and having to reapply. Homeless households would have their housing duty discharged. We are doing this to make the allocations system more efficient and reduce void turnaround time. The proposal was supported by the consultation. We will not be enforcing this for care leavers and under occupiers.

2.20 Should we restrict access to the housing register to those that have a chance of being allocated a home?

Overall more people agreed that access to the housing register should be restricted (43% agree compared to 34% disagree). All Bands had more people agreeing except for Band D where the majority disagreed (52%).

Those who agree or strongly agreed thought this approach would reduce the number of bidders per property and remove residents who did not have an urgent housing need. This would result in the Council focusing on those who have priority and using resources more efficiently. There was concern that tenants on the register who had little to no chance of being allocated a home would have ‘false hope’ which could have a negative effect on a person’s wellbeing.

Where people disagree or strongly disagree, they thought it was unfair and would take away individual choice. Restricting access to the register, is against equality of opportunity. It was thought that everyone should have access regardless of how unlikely a person is to be allocated a home.

OUR REPONSE AND RATIONALE – Band D will be removed from the housing register. We are doing this to avoid providing false expectations to households that have no chance of receiving an offer and to reduce the administrative burden. This proposal had overall support from the consultation.

2.21 Should waiting time be based on time within a band rather than the time of initial application?

Almost 50% of respondents agree or strongly agreed that waiting times should be based on the time within a band which was the majority vote compared to a third who disagreed.

Many responses sympathized with those who have waited for a long period but felt strongly the process should be needs based rather than time based. It was felt that those who have been on the list for a long time do not have needs which are urgent.

For those who disagreed It was considered unfair to those who had been waiting longer. Prioritising those based on time within a band, would cause significant delays to those who had been waiting a long time. It was highlighted that this would cause a negative impact on the wellbeing of those who had to wait for a long period of time.

OUR RESPONSE AND RATIONALE – Waiting time will be based on time in Band. We are doing this so that we prioritise those who have been in urgent need for the long time. The proposal was supported in the consultation.

2.22 Should we require applicants to log in occasionally to keep their accounts active?

There was a high level of support that people should be required to log in from time to time, with 73% supporting the idea that this should be required. Of these the vast majority thought that a period of every year would be the best time period.

Where people said that we should keep the system as it is they raised concerns that people might just forget, and that it could be an issue for vulnerable residents. Questions were raised about what the purpose of such an initiative might be and whether we were looking to deliberately take people off the list possibly for political reasons. Others made the point that it could be bad for mental health to be constantly bidding for a home unsuccessfully.

Those that supported annual logins made references to making sure people still had a need for housing and that it's important the council has up to date details. Checking in once a year seemed like a reasonable request to many respondents. Some who supported the concept only did so with the proviso that people would be made aware of this requirement and that something was in place for people who aren't online.

OUR RESPONSE AND RATIONALE – Applicants will be required to log in annually to keep their accounts active. We are doing this to have a better understanding of housing need in the borough and reduce administration. Certain groups will be excluded from the requirement, including those with medical needs, downsizers, and TA occupants.

Other Comments and our response

- 2.23 We received a wide range of suggestions both from the surveys, emailed responses and discussions at the workshops. Our responses to these are included in the consultation report from page 28.

3. FINANCE

- 3.1 The Temporary Accommodation budget had an overspend position at the end of 2022/23 of £6.749m due to significant increases in demand over and above the level that was estimated for the growth that was added to the budget. There was an increase of almost a net 600 additional households entering the service in-year. This is a 20% increase. This increase is expected to accelerate again in 2023/24 to a net 900 new households in-year, again significantly outstripping the growth agreed in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). This would be a 24% increase.
- 3.2 There were savings agreed for the service as part of the MTFS which related to specific service changes. These need to be delivered otherwise the financial pressure outlined above will become worse.
- 3.3 The financial impact of the policy change set out in this report is expected be that c118 households per annum are moved on from Temporary Accommodation which would avoids costs of c£1m per annum against the Temporary Accommodation General Fund budget.

4. LEGAL AND DEMOCRACY

- 4.1 Section 166A of the Housing Act 1996 requires every local housing authority in England to have an allocation scheme for determining priorities, and as to the procedure to be followed, in allocating housing accommodation. The scheme must include a statement of the authority's policy on offering people who are to be allocated housing accommodation—
- (a) a choice of housing accommodation; or
 - (b) the opportunity to express preferences about the housing accommodation to be allocated to them.

- 4.2 As regards priorities, the scheme is required to be framed so as to secure that reasonable preference is given to people:
- (a) who are homeless;
 - (b) owed a duty under part 7 of the Act;
 - (c) occupying insanitary or overcrowded housing or otherwise living in unsatisfactory housing conditions;
 - (d) who need to move on medical or welfare grounds (including any grounds relating to a disability); and
 - (e) who need to move to a particular locality in the district of the authority, where failure to meet that need would cause hardship (to themselves or to others).

The scheme may also be framed so as to give additional preference to people within one or more of paragraphs (a) to (e) being descriptions of people with urgent housing needs.

- 4.3 The scheme however must be framed so as to give additional preference to a person with urgent housing needs who falls within one or more of paragraphs (a) to (e) above and who:
- (a) is serving in the regular forces and is suffering from a serious injury, illness or disability which is attributable to the person's service,
 - (b) formerly served in the regular forces,
 - (c) has recently ceased, or will cease to be entitled, to reside in accommodation provided by the Ministry of Defence following the death of that person's spouse or civil partner who has served in the regular forces and whose death was attributable to that service, or
 - (d) is serving or has served in the reserve forces and is suffering from a serious injury, illness or disability which is attributable to the person's service.

- 4.4 The scheme may also take into account when determining priorities in allocating housing accommodation to people
- (a) the financial resources available to a person to meet their housing costs;
 - (b) any behaviour of a person (or of a member of his household) which affects his suitability to be a tenant;
 - (c) any local connection.

4.5 Subject to the above provisions, and to any regulations made under them, the Council may decide on what principles the scheme is to be framed

- 4.6 In preparing or modifying its allocation scheme, the Council is required to have regard to—
- (a) its current homelessness strategy;
 - (b) its current tenancy strategy; and
 - (c) the London housing strategy.

- 4.7 Before adopting an allocation scheme, or making an alteration to its scheme reflecting a major change of policy, the Council must—
- (a) send a copy of the draft scheme, or proposed alteration, to every private registered provider of social housing and registered social landlord with which they have nomination arrangements; and
 - (b) give those persons a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposals.

4.8 Section 169 of the 1996 Act requires the council in exercising its functions under Part 6 of the Act to have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

4.9 Sections 202 and 294 of the 1996 Act gives applicants a statutory right of review of any decision by the council as to the suitability of accommodation offered by way of a final offer of

accommodation or a final part 6 offer, following which they can appeal to the County Court on a point of law.

4.10 When Members consider whether to adopt the recommendations of this report, they will be exercising discretion within the constraints of the duties referred to above and should therefore have in mind the following principles of administrative law:

- (a) The decision must be within the Council's powers
- (b) All relevant information and consideration, including the Council's fiduciary duty to the Council Tax payer, must be taken into account; and
- (c) All irrelevant considerations, including unauthorised purposes, must be ignored.

4.11 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 sets out the public sector equality duty replacing the previous duties in relation to race, sex and disability and extending the duty to all the protected characteristics i.e. race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership and gender reassignment. The public sector equality duty requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:

- (a) Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under that act
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it; and
- (c) Foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it, which involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
 - (i) tackle prejudice; and
 - (ii) promote understanding.

4.12 Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—

- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, including, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities;
- (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

4.13 Compliance with the duties in section 149 of the Act may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under the Act.

4.14 The Equality Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken - that is, in the development of policy options, and in making a final decision. A public body cannot satisfy the Equality Duty by justifying a decision after it has been taken.

4.15 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 21 August 2023 and the necessary 28 clear days' notice has been given. The report will be published for five clear days before the decision is considered by Cabinet (Constitution, Part 7, Chapter A). Should it be approved and following the publication of the Cabinet minutes, a further period of five clear days,

the call-in period, must then elapse before the decision becomes effective. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

5. CONSULTATION AND CO-PRODUCTION

5.1 The main form of consultation has been via an online survey. We had had an excellent response to this survey with over 2,000 returns. In addition to the survey, we have run a series of five drop-in sessions at the Civic Centre for people who wanted help responding. We have run workshops for members of the public and community groups / partners, and the allocation policy was a topic of conversation at the Residents' Assembly, an event for Lambeth Tenants and Leaseholders held in November 2023. We also promoted the consultation by putting up posters on estates with paper copies of the survey available for those that requested them.

5.2 The attached consultation report presents the quantifiable information graphically and then summarises key themes from the free text questions with a sample of quotes provided as evidence. We want to be fully transparent in our presentation of the consultation results. The full survey results have been anonymised and are being made available on the consultation page of our website for full transparency.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Item	Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Score	Control Measures
1	IT capacity to implement system changes	2	3	6	Early engagement with LamTech. Phased introduction of changes
2	Increase in change of circumstance requests leading to backlog and delays	3	2	6	Phased communications so requests don't all come at once and we can learn the expected volume of requests
3	Mixed messages from staff as the new policy is rolled out	2	2	4	Comprehensive and ongoing comms to staff

Key

Likelihood	Very Likely = 4	Likely = 3	Unlikely = 2	Very Unlikely = 1
Impact	Major = 8	Serious = 4	Significant = 2	Minor = 1

7. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out on the allocation changes and was considered by the Corporate EIA panel on 21 February. The assessment identified that care leavers should be excluded from having a limited number of offers.

7.2 Those with medical conditions, care leavers and those in temporary accommodation will not be required to log in annually to keep their accounts active.

- 7.3 We intend to have a comprehensive communication plan so that everyone is aware of the changes, including providing information in different languages.
- 7.4 The project will be tracked with EDI analysis carried out at each stage to see if there are any disproportionate effects on different groups, and if there are how these can be mitigated. We will assess the impact to Band B lets (overcrowding and medical needs) and if necessary, could restrict access so that more of these households can bid successfully. We will see if different diversity groups are disproportionately refusing offers or failing to log in annually.
- 7.5 We will work with third parties such as the CAB and community groups to help support residents with their awareness of the changes and bidding support where applicable. We will also look to add more bidding support from teams within the council.
- 7.6 Any unsuitable offer – for reasons including not meeting the medical needs of households, would not count as an offer.

8. COMMUNITY SAFETY

- 8.1 Not applicable.

9. ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Environmental

- 9.1 Not applicable

Health

- 9.2 Not applicable.

Corporate Parenting

- 9.3 Not applicable.

Staffing and accommodation

- 9.4 Not applicable.

Responsible Procurement

- 9.5 Not applicable.

10. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 10.1 It is intended to implement in a phased approach over the next financial year, starting with the change in priority for TA residents.

- 10.1 The table below details the stages and deadlines for implementing the recommendations:

Activity	Proposed Date
Date published on Forward Plan	21.08.23
Publication on Decisions online	05.03.24

Officer or Cabinet Member Decision	13.03.24
End of Call-in Period (key decisions only)	26.03.24
Execution of Contract	N/A
Mobilisation Period for Contract	N/A
Commencement of Contract	N/A

AUDIT TRAIL

Name and Position/Title	Lambeth Directorate	Date Sent	Date Received	Comments in paragraph:
Councillor Maria Kay	Cabinet Member for Better Homes and Reducing Homelessness	02.07.24	07.02.24	
Fiona Connolly, Corporate Director Housing and Adult Social Care	Housing/ Adults Social Care and Health	02.02.24	02.02.24	
Shanka ShivaAnanthan Finance	Finance and Property	01.02.24	02.02.24s	3.0
Greg Carson, Legal Services	Legal and Governance	01.02.24	01.02.24	4.1 to 4.14
Mary Bosah, Democratic Services	Legal and Governance	05.02.24	08.02.24	4.15

REPORT HISTORY

Original discussion with Cabinet Member	13.12.23
Report deadline	29.02.24
Date final report sent	29.02.24
Part II Exempt from Disclosure/confidential accompanying report?	No
Key decision report	Yes
Date first appeared on forward plan	21.08.23
Key decision reasons	Community Impact
Background information	Current Housing Allocation Scheme Housing Act Part VI Government statistics on homelessness
Appendices	Appendix 1: Allocations Consultation Report Appendix 2: Allocation Equality Impact Assessment