

## Appendix 1 Cambridge City Council – proposed Lettings Policy changes

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
1.2a and throughout the document	To 'future proof' the document the policy will just refer to the Housing Act (1996) as amended and not cite specific Acts such as Homelessness Act 2002 or Localism Act 2011)	No		n/a
2.1.3	The policy is not explicit about who the applicant is. This is relevant in terms of decisions on who whether to disqualify an applicant from the register or place them in low housing need	No		n/a
2.1.3	The term 'nuclear families' is a bit restrictive and does not include single parents so the wording needs to change to reflect this	Yes	2.1.3 is relevant to the shortlisting process	Keep 'friends' in the section as it can be useful to consider sharers for hard to let properties. Cambridge can remove the reference to 'nuclear families' as not all partners have this
2.1.5a	'Future proof' change – removal of reference to	No		n/a

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
	the specific Act			
2.1.5b	Qualification is for social housing specifically	No		n/a
2.1.6	Wording required 'tidying'	No		n/a
2.3.1c	Cambridge City's move on allocations from supported housing were not operating under a consistent system. This change allows for greater consistency	No		n/a
3.1 and 3.1.1	Future proofing	No		n/a
3.1.2	Wording required 'tidying'	No		n/a
3.1.3 (please also refer to 3 and 5.4.1)	Flexibility to exclude from the register those who are subject to immigration control, not only as applicants but as household members	Yes	Banding/bedroom requirements	Yes – household eligibility assessment similar to priority need. Important to record the ineligible members on the application though in case the eligible household is re-housed & effectively overcrowds themselves – landlords need to know the information

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
3.3.1h	New wording to take account of the new Right to Move regulations	Yes	Local connection	Yes – needs to be re-worded so understandable to customers.
3.4.1	Closing a loophole to ensure that perpetrators of unacceptable behaviour could get rehoused simply by nominating another household member as the applicant. Also adding in the provision to bar transfer applicants or previous tenants who have allowed their properties to fall into disrepair.	Yes	Qualifying criteria	Yes – suggested re-wording in policy document
3.4.3	Closing the loophole as outlined in 3.4.1 above	Yes	Qualifying criteria	Yes – suggested re-wording in policy document
4.3.1	To reflect Cambridge City's practice on medical assessments	No		n/a
4.4.2	Minor wording improvement	No		n/a

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
4.8 (d)	Wording required tidying	No		n/a
4.10.2 (a)	If debts are not legally 'recoverable' or statute barred (i.e. where no correspondence about the debt has occurred in the last 6 years) then the authority cannot take these into account in allocations either.	Yes	Banding	Yes – re-wording suggestions in policy document
4.10.2 (b)	Closing another loophole around unacceptable behaviour that is not ASB.	Yes	Banding	Yes – re-wording suggestions in policy document
4.10.3	Minor wording change	No		n/a
4.10.4	See explanation for 4.10.2 (a) above	No		n/a
4.11.1	Technical legal point. In order to act deliberately improve your housing priority you need first to be aware of what the housing priority system is. The change would	Yes	Intentionally worsening housing circumstances	Yes – re-wording suggestions in policy document. This needs to apply only to the application/most recent address & also include the situation not just the property, e.g. whether they have taken in lodgers & caused overcrowding

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
	take away the implication that the applicant needed to know this before acting. It makes it a more similar principle to intentional homelessness – the applicant does not need to be aware of the legislation to be found IH			
4.12	New clause – reflecting national guidance on allocating social housing to homeowners	Yes	Assessment of need?	Yes – re-wording suggestions in policy document as reference to ‘social rented housing’ needs changing to include affordable rents
4.14.1	Minor wording improvement	No		n/a
4.14.1 (c) & (d)	Need to include rents as well as property prices in the assessment	Yes	Banding	Yes
4.15.1 (d)	Principle that band A represents ‘urgent need’ and, therefore, introduces the idea	Yes	Banding	Yes – but to go in section 7.8.1 about refusals. Suggested wording about making applicants unable to bid for a

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
	that the urgency and thus banding should be reviewed if applicants are refusing more than 3 offers or not bidding. Applicants can tactically 'clock up' priority date time in this way.			period of time added to policy document. Also a suggestion about 'freezing' waiting time priority while unable to bid but this would be a double penalty
5.1.1	The title at 5 better describes this section. 5.1.1 is, therefore, superfluous	No		n/a
5.4.1	To allow some discretion where it is not reasonable to consider a room as a bedroom e.g. where the room is too small to get a single bed in.	Yes	Banding	Yes – but applicants will need to be advised that LHA calculation may have an impact
5.9.1	Emergency housing status to be awarded to those who are terminally ill (as defined) and in band A as they do not have the luxury of time.	Yes	Banding	Yes

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
5.9.2	The City Council needs to award emergency status to tenants who need to be decanted from designated redevelopment sites. The existing parameters for emergency housing status did not allow this.	Yes	Banding	No – this can be dealt with under the current policy by Cambridge adding this to their ‘urgent transfer’ procedures. Wording changes needed in emergency status section have been added to the policy document
5.10.1 (d)	An alternative way of housing those who need to be decanted	Yes	Assessment of need	Yes
5.10.1 (e)	Where applicants are left in tenancies under Use and Occupation <b>and</b> it is felt it is unreasonable to move them e.g. elderly person who has lived in the property with his/her family for many years but has no succession rights	Yes	Assessment of need	Yes
Section 5.13	New section added to provide for	Yes	Banding	Yes – subject to removing references to emergency decant

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
	redevelopment sites. There is often time pressure to decant the existing scheme because HCA monies to redevelop are time-limited.			status
6.2.3	Sticks with the expressed aim that statutory reviews should be settled within 28 days but allows for an 8 week response time as detailed in guidance.	No		n/a
6.2.4	There is no legal right to appeal a review decision on banding so why are we inviting people to complain? The review should end the conversation.	No		n/a
6.3.2 & 6.3.3	Minor wording amendments	No		n/a
5.11.2 (not yet changed)	Offer homeless applicants a direct let at the point of acceptance and not	No		Yes as this is possible in current policy & some partners already do it. Wording in policy document to include that can

Relevant paragraph	Issue and rationale for change	Requires sub-regional approval* y/n	If yes, on what basis	HLMB approval granted? y/n
	allow a minimum 3 month period of bidding			bid while a direct let is found. Requires amendment to 5.11.2 to say that homeless applicants would need a direct let at the point of acceptance.

\*The following is an extract from the Home-Link Partnership Guide, which sets out which proposed changes are subject to sub-regional agreement:

### 10.1 Changing the Lettings Policy

Each Local Authority has its own Lettings Policy and is responsible for implementing any changes to that policy. Many elements of the policy have been agreed across the sub-region. Those elements cannot be amended in any allocation policy without agreement sub-regionally by the Home-Link Management Board.

These areas include:

- Eligibility criteria
- The banding structure and assessment of need
- Local connection criteria
- Sub-regional allocations
- Intentionally worsening housing circumstances
- Registration date and date in band definitions
- The shortlisting process