

## TLC housing allocations consultation

### Offers:

- Still gives choice, just have to be more smarter when bidding.
- If you are getting social housing it shouldn't be expected to be premium.
- Takes away peoples choices, freedom and rights. Just because it is social housing doesn't mean people shouldn't have choice.
- Saving the council money, time and work shouldn't be a priority for implementing this.
- Should they have at least 2.
- Clear definitions on what is an acceptable refusal
- No other council in herts does this
- The PI's don't indicate that our void time is a problem
- People messing about causes delays for others most in need to move (homeless for example)
- PRS landlords wouldn't let you keep viewing and refusing, he would move onto someone else.

### Active/deferred

- Makes sense, there is no point building up hopes. Its better for the council to be honest.
- Change the name from deferred to something more relevant
- There is no clarity, it is false hope.
- What does nothing mean? How do we communicate this to customers?
- Likes the idea of a deferred list, because it is traditional to allow people to go on a list with an eventuality of housing. It has always been this way.
- If people make mistakes, could get deleted in error and miss those in need who may have a housing need but say mental health issues have made a mistake could end up being deleted in error.
- Have the deferred list for 3-6 months and then remove?

### Time on reg points:

- Just get rid of the deferred register
- If we keep the register get rid of the points for deferred

### Rent arrears

- Personal circumstances need to be taken into account, circumstances that lead to the arrears, what is considered an affordable amount for them, if they are deferred, what happens to them if we no longer have a deferred list? Who will make the overall decision? Panel, or an individual officer?
- 10 years ago this may have worked, but things have changed so much now and people getting into arrears arent always often given benefits etc so might be in arrears through no fault of their own... but shouldn't go into larger properties.
- We need to take into consideration where peoples benefits have stopped and who have been hit hard but something that isn't their fault.

- Write into the policy something that says we can refuse and for each case to be looked at individually. Something to cover our rights to review how to deal with low rent arrears, and larger sums and not allowing those to get themselves into worse debt by upsizing (example)
- If its to improve their circumstances this should be considered
- Leave as it is with a caveat

#### Homeless direct offers:

- When you are homeless you have nothing, just happy to get somewhere to live
- Should be able to have options to move on from TA
- Just because you are homeless the choice shouldn't be taken away.
- Keep as direct offers
- Very stressful to be bidding

#### Step siblings

- Should it be based on age? What if they don't get on? Medical defined issues should be looked at differently? What about sexual abuse? Sexual orientation of those children?
- Should be looked at as a household (case by case)
- Need to remember that we are the landlord and if they were buying a house they may not have that choice. It is the parents job to manage that. Put a line in to say 'parental guidance'
- Ages should be taken into account from the extreme point of views (such as a 1 year old and 15 year old)