

A review of local authority housing allocations in the Liverpool City Region

March 2020

Executive Summary



Completed by
Amber Christou, Liz Griffiths & Neil Morland



**LIVERPOOL
CITY REGION**
COMBINED AUTHORITY



Property Pool Plus



NEIL MORLAND CO
HOUSING CONSULTANTS

Liverpool City Region Combined Authority

The Liverpool City Region Combined Authority (LCRCA) is a local authority covering the City of Liverpool, the metropolitan boroughs of Knowsley, St Helens, Sefton and Wirral and the borough of Halton. Founded in 2014, an elected mayor leads the authority, together with the council leaders of the constituent local authorities. The LCRCA administers devolved powers from the UK Government, such as transport, economic development and regeneration functions.

Property Pool Plus

Property Pool Plus (PPP) is a housing allocation scheme which operates across the local housing authority areas of City of Liverpool, the metropolitan boroughs of Knowsley, Sefton, and Wirral and the borough of Halton. PPP is a partnership between the aforementioned local housing authorities and numerous private registered providers of social housing. PPP provides a common procedure and approach to allocating social rented housing, using a choice-based method to let homes.

Under One Roof

Under One Roof (U1R) is housing allocation scheme which operates across the local housing authority area of St Helens. U1R is a partnership between the aforementioned local housing authority and Torus62, a private registered provider of social housing. U1R provides a common procedure and approach to allocating social rented housing, using a choice-based method to let homes.

Neil Morland & Co

Neil Morland & Co (NM&Co) are housing consultants. Formed in 2011, NM&Co work throughout England, Scotland and Wales with local authorities, housing associations, voluntary organisations and others. NM&Co's ambition is to reduce housing inequalities by improving social policies. NM&Co uses authoritative evidence and their unique expertise to create better outcomes for people in housing need.

Acknowledgements: This review was commissioned the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority on behalf of the Property Pool Plus partnership and the Under One Roof partnership. The review was written by Amber Christou, Liz Griffiths & Neil Morland. The authors wish to thank Joanne Barrett, Alan Broadbent, Neil Davies, Tony Mousdale, Kate Owen, Patricia Preston, and Stephen Tracy for their invaluable support and assistance. The commissioners and authors of this review are grateful to everyone who generously contributed time and/or materials.

Disclaimers: All views and any errors contained in this report are the responsibility of the authors. The views expressed should not be assumed to be those of the commissioners, sponsors, authors, nor any person who contributed to this report. The information contained in this report is accurate at the date of publication. The information in this report should not be considered legal advice. The commissioners, sponsors and authors are not authorised to provide legal advice. No responsibility for any loss or damage incurred, by any person or organisation acting or refraining from action as result of any statement in the report, can be taken by the commissioners or the authors.

Introduction

Social rented housing remains a popular housing option for many people. There are almost four million households renting accommodation from social landlords throughout England, with more than one million households waiting for an allocation of social rented housing across the country. The provision of social rented housing ensures people, whose housing needs cannot be met by the general housing market, have somewhere decent to live.

It was in Liverpool that the first social housing in Britain was built, in the late 19th century, as part of a pioneering strategy to tackle public health problems associated with living in poor housing conditions. Differing views on which persons should be prioritised for an allocation of these first public-built homes shows that debate about how best to allocate social rented housing has been a matter of discussion since social housing was first made available to-let.

This report brings the conversation about how to allocate social rented housing into the 21st century. Local authorities retain a legal duty to operate a scheme for allocating social rented housing, even when they have transferred their housing stock, as is the case with all councils in the Liverpool City Region. In such a scenario, it's particularly important for local authorities to have effective joint working arrangements with private registered providers of social housing, to ensure all legal obligations can be fully satisfied. There is substantial statute that governs how local authorities allocate social rented housing, meaning the rules and procedures for matching people to properties can appear to be overly bureaucratic, when compared to the light-touch regulations that private registered providers are expected to comply with. However, it is very apparent that there is a huge appetite from local authorities and private registered providers to co-operate when allocating social rented housing. The priorities of local authorities when allocating social rented housing are more aligned to those of private registered providers than not.

Demand for an allocation of social rented housing exceeds the supply available. Therefore, it's especially important that the Liverpool City Region housing allocation schemes make best use of the stock available to let, because this will help to create balanced communities. Equally, the Liverpool City Region housing allocation schemes must also ensure those most in need of social rented housing are prioritised for a letting, as this will help to reduce inequalities so no one is left behind. Finally, the Liverpool City Region housing allocation schemes must satisfy all requirements set out in law, as this will improve cross-boundary working between local authorities and private registered providers.

Findings

A detailed methodology for carrying out the review was agreed prior to the review commencing, to ensure all parties understood the steps that would be taken to complete the review. This included regular reporting of progress to local authorities and other key stakeholders.

A range of contextual factors informed and influenced the review, including:

- the law concerning how local authorities allocate social rented housing;
- private registered providers' responsibilities regarding allocations;
- arrangements for contracting-out the administration of housing allocation functions;
- the current set-up of Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof; and
- the priorities of local homelessness strategies and the Liverpool City Region tenancy strategy.

A quantitative analysis of Liverpool City Region local authority social rented housing allocations revealed:

- People being allocated accommodation are typically aged 36-38 years, of a white ethnic origin, female (in general needs housing) and male (in supported housing), and living alone (social rent general needs) or with one child (affordable rent general needs). There is no data available on characteristics of applicants who are not eligible or are disqualified from Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof.
- Properties being allocated typically have two bedrooms, are a house/bungalow and are let as social rent general needs housing. The number of allocations made reduced by 25% between 2013/14 – 2017/18, with the relative rate of reduction being greatest in support housing social rented accommodation and general needs social rented accommodation experiencing the largest actual reduction.
- The place where most allocations are made is the City of Liverpool (36% of all allocations), with the remaining allocations being fairly evenly spread throughout the rest of the local authorities. The majority (60%) of all allocations made in the Liverpool City Region are done so via Property Pool Plus. More allocations are made to new tenants compared to existing tenants (61-65% compared to 35-40%).
- In Property Pool Plus, just over one-third (38%) of applicants are placed in Band E and just over half (56%) require a one-bedroom property (this data isn't available for Under One Roof). Over the past five years, the number of applicants waiting for an allocation fell by almost half in all Liverpool City Region local authorities, except for Liverpool City Council where numbers have increased by 24%. Almost half (48%) of applicants are waiting for an allocation via Liverpool City Council. Property Pool Plus Band B applicants are more commonly allocated via choice-based lettings (40% of all allocations), whereas Property Pool Plus Band E applicants are more likely to be allocated via available now and direct matches (this data isn't available for Under One Roof).
- Social rent general needs tenancies account for the majority (70-90%) of allocations. Most (90%) of allocations are made to UK Nationals. Between one-quarter and one-

third of allocations are made to homeless applicants. Some private registered providers are inconsistent in submitting lettings data to the UK Government, especially in regard to lettings made to applicants with a reasonable preference.

- The majority (49%-79%) of affordable rent general needs lettings are made to applicants who do not have a reasonable preference, whereas the majority (49%-79%) of social rent general needs lettings are made to applicants who do have a reasonable preference. Of those households who are afforded a reasonable preference, those with medical and/or welfare needs are slightly more commonly allocated homes as compared to other factors for a reasonable preference. On average less than one in ten (7%) of lettings are made to applicants who are homeless. Very few (4%) properties meet wheelchair user standards.
- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of Property Pool Plus allocations were made via choice-based lettings, with direct match and available now collectively accounting for the remaining one-quarter of lettings (15% and 12% respectively), although there is some considerable local variation. Very few reviews are commenced (137 in 2017/18) and fewer proceed to the second stage of the review process (97 in 2017/18). The majority of bids are made via the Property Pool Plus website (52-61%), with a significant number also being made via the mobile site (32%-40%).

A qualitative analysis of Liverpool City Region local authority social rented housing allocations revealed:

- The current rules, procedures and policies for allocating social rented housing have clear objectives, however there is a lack of clarity as to the different purpose of each document, resulting in significant overlap. This makes it difficult for administrators and applicants to understand the process that must be followed and the associated rights and responsibilities.
- The current rules, procedures and policies contained much good practice that should feature in any future amended documents, such as the degree of choice afforded to applicants. However, there is a great deal of content that is not compatible with current statute, statutory guidance, regulations and orders.
- It was more than evident that employees of local authorities and private registered providers, charged with administering housing allocations, were very committed to their roles and sought to deliver an excellent service. Notwithstanding this, there are inconsistencies with how services are delivered between each local authority and private registered provider, especially in respect of access to advice and support, how applications are processed, use of discretion to medical assessments and training of employees.
- Property Pool Plus is governed via a mutual arrangement established between the five local authority members of the scheme. A range of simple measure could be introduced to improve the management of Property Pool Plus, such as a new constitution alongside some key management tools. There has been some frustration from private registered providers about a lack of input into decision making processes, which has resulted in serious consideration of establishing alternative arrangements. A range of options are available to alter the governance of Property Pool Plus, subject to how local authorities and private registered providers might wish to develop a common approach to social housing allocations in the future. The absence of a post to coordinate Property Pool Plus on behalf of the Contract Board is detrimental to the delivery of the scheme. Under One Roof has no formal governance

arrangements in place, but is instead subject to a more informal partnership. There would be benefits to establishing a constitution between the key parties involved.

- The method used to calculate charges levied to Property Pool Plus for advertising properties via the scheme vary considerably, as do the rates applied, and the arrangements for invoicing. The disparity of these arrangements is inefficient for both local authorities and private registered providers, and understandably these inconsistencies are of significant frustration.
- The current week-long cycle for private registered providers to advertise properties and wait for bids is inefficient and unnecessarily increases void-times. A move to daily bidding cycles that close within 3-5 days is used elsewhere and some areas have abandoned choice-based lettings altogether.
- The current IT software used to administer both Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof is supplied by Civica. The software is vital to enabling the successful delivery of both schemes. A range of upgrades and further improvements are available to install, which would result in enhancements for local authorities, private registered providers and applicants.
- The operation of two choice-based lettings schemes within the Liverpool City Region could be disadvantageous from the perspective of private registered providers and applicants, as they have to contend with two sets of arrangements. To an extent, there are also disadvantages for local authorities, as the full potential for generating cost and operational efficiencies from having one common scheme for the whole City Region cannot be realised. However, from another perspective, any local authority opting out of the sub-regional scheme is able to retain its autonomy when administering housing allocation functions.

This review recommends alterations to the rules, procedures and policies that govern Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof, along with amendments to nomination agreements. These adjustments will ensure both schemes are compliant with law and incorporate good practice. Further recommendations are being made in regards to governance arrangements, charging arrangements, administration, IT software, bidding cycles, and joint working between local authorities and private registered providers.

Recommendations

1. Procedures

The current procedures for each of Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof require amendments, to bring the administration up-to-date with the latest legislation. In particular, the following rules will require changing:

Qualification	
Revisions will be needed to how decisions are made about applicants who:	
A	are incapable of holding a tenancy. Persons lacking mental capacity need to be included in this group.
B	are guilty of anti-social behaviour. Persons with spent convictions cannot be disqualified for any period of time. They can only be disqualified for the reasons that any other applicant can be disqualified. The definition of what constitutes anti-social behaviour needs to be more specific.
C	have outstanding property related arrears. The minimum threshold of arrears and the method set for repayment of arrears needs to reflect the specific circumstances of an applicant.
D	have breached tenancy conditions. The definition of what constitutes a breach of tenancy conditions needs to be more specific.
E	don't have a local connection. The minimum threshold needs to be two years, although exemptions must apply for armed forces veterans, victims of domestic abuse and persons needing to move due to employment or education-related reasons (see recommendation 2).
F	currently own a home. Social rented housing is for people who needs cannot be met by the commercial market. A homeowner can be said to have had their needs met by the commercial market. However, exemptions should apply to persons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who are in negative equity; • whose property has severe structural faults; • who are at risk of domestic abuse; or • where it is not possible to adapt a property due to the physical arrangements of the dwelling and/or the cost of adaptations is prohibitive.
G	have savings and assets. Adopting a definition consistent with the DWP's upper saving limits for claiming welfare benefits would be the fairest methodology.

Other matters	
Other minor adjustments required include procedures relating to:	
A	Eligibility.
B	Information, applications, decision-making and reviews.
C	Determining eligibility.
D	Notification of decisions.
E	Renewed applications.
F	Determining priority for an allocation.

G	Local letting schemes.
H	Avoiding discrimination and enhancing equality of opportunity.
I	Best interests of children.
J	Discretion.
K	Choice.
L	Direct lets.
M	Arrangements with private registered providers.

Prioritisation			
There should be a reduction in the number of bands, down to four, to reduce confusion and make it easier to shortlist applicants for offers. The four proposed are:			
Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Applicants entitled to a reasonable preference that are being afforded an additional preference for an allocation.	Applicants entitled to a reasonable preference for an allocation.	Applicants with a general need/want for an allocation.	Applicants who have been given a reduced preference, due to non-compliance with scheme rules.

2. **Local connection**

There should be consideration by Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof to extending the meaning of local connection to cover anywhere within the Liverpool City Region, rather than just being local authority specific as is presently the case. This might help to mitigate the requirement to increase local connection to a minimum of two years (see recommendation 1, paragraph e of the Qualification section).

3. **Choice-based lettings**

Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof should consider either abandoning the choice-based letting model or adopting a daily bidding cycle to speed up the letting of properties, with the latter being the preferred option. The current one-week cycle is not satisfactory for private registered providers or applicants and the alternatives would have the following advantages:

- a. Abandoning the choice-based lettings model could save money and it could be replaced with a model that facilitates a direct match of properties to applicants, while still affording them some choice of property allocated. The aspects of choice-based lettings that promote transparency should be retained, such as reporting the length of time an applicant waited to be allocated a property and the degree of priority of applicants who were allocated a property.
- b. Adopting a daily cycle, whereby properties are advertised on a daily basis, with bidding closing 3-5 days later would help private registered providers to reduce void times and associated loss of rental income. These factors are the main reason why some private registered providers seek to advertise some properties via other outlets.

4. **Nomination agreements**

A new nomination agreement is required between all local authorities and all private registered providers, to make the administration of nominations fully compatible with current statutory guidance and regulations, as there have been changes since the publication of the current nomination agreements. No change is being proposed to the rate of nominations agreed between individual local authorities and private registered providers. Local authorities should consider whether to adopt a common nomination agreement with all private registered providers.

5. **Common housing allocation scheme**

There should be consideration by each local authority as to whether its wishes to continue being a member of Property Pool Plus or Under One Roof. Having a common database of applications and common rules for allocating social rented housing, can be advantageous to local authorities, private registered providers and applicants alike. It helps local authorities (including the Combined Authority) to formulate strategic housing plans, and helps private registered providers to plan their development programmes. Applicants have only one application form to complete, a single point of contact regarding securing social rented housing and need only understand one set of rules for how allocations are made (especially beneficial in respect of how applicants are prioritised). Local authorities have the right to withdraw from any common housing allocation scheme. In the event of a decision to withdraw, a local authority would administer the registration of applications and make decisions about allocations, separately from any similar activities being carried out by other local authorities or private registered providers. Local authorities should determine which of the following options is in their best interest (see also recommendation 6):

Option A	Be a member a sub-regional common housing allocation scheme – this is the current arrangement adopted by five local authorities, being members of the sub-regional Property Pool Plus scheme, which those authorities have agreed to continue. A sub-regional common allocation scheme exists where two or more local authorities, usually together with one or more private registered provider (although there is no requirement for such organisations to be involved for such a vehicle to exist), agree to have a common database and/or common rules for administering housing allocations.
Option B	Be a member of a borough-specific common housing allocation scheme – this is the current arrangement adopted by St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council and Torus62, who have agreed to continue it. A borough-specific common housing allocation scheme exists where a local authority and one or more private registered provider (typically an organisation created as a result of stock transfer) agree to have a common database and/or common rules for administering housing allocations.
Option C	Not being a member of any common housing allocation scheme – there are no such arrangements currently in the Liverpool City Region, however such arrangements were common prior to stock transfer. In such a scenario, a

	local authority has its own stand-alone database and set of rules for administering housing allocations.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. Co-operation with private registered providers

All local authorities should consider the following options for future co-operation with private registered providers, with Option B being the agreed preferred option, but Option A being an agreed alternative:

Option A	Local authorities and private registered providers have a common database of applicants, but have separate rules for making an allocation. In this scenario, the following would occur:
	i. Applicants complete a common application, regardless of whom they are seeking an allocation of social rented housing from, which is easier for applicants to understand and carry out. However, a disadvantage of this approach is that applicants have to navigate multiple sets of rules to determine if they qualify for an allocation and how they will be prioritised.
	ii. Local authorities use the information held on the shared database to allocate all nominations in accordance with their own rules. A key advantage of this approach is that local authorities can set their own rules independently, although a common set of rules exclusively between two or more local authorities is permissible. In this scenario, local authorities might consider the qualification criteria, see recommendation 7 below.
	iii. Private registered providers would use the information held on the shared database to allocate lettings in accordance with their own rules. A common set of rules exclusively between two or more private registered providers is permissible.
	iv. Local authorities and private registered providers have shared governance arrangements to oversee the common database, but separate governance arrangements to oversee the administration of every set of rules. This means that there are fewer points to be negotiated and agreed between all parties.
	v. Local authorities and private registered providers share the costs of the common database, which is an advantage for all parties. However, each party is still separately responsible for the costs of administering their respective set of rules.
Option B	Local authorities and private registered providers have a common database of applicants and common rules for making an allocation. In this scenario, the following would occur:
	i. Applicants complete a common application, regardless of whom they are seeking an allocation of social rented housing from. An advantage of this approach is that there is only one set of rules for applicants to understand to determine if they qualify for an allocation and how they will be prioritised.

	<p>ii. Local authorities and private registered providers use the information held on the shared database to allocate lettings in accordance with a common set of rules. This has the advantage that all applicants are treated in the same way which could reduce the potential for disgruntled applicants where similar cases are dealt with differently by different parties.</p>
	<p>iii. Local authorities and private registered providers have shared governance arrangements to oversee the common database and the common set of rules. This could lead to efficiencies in practice, but would require more collaboration between the parties and each party having less individual control in setting rules.</p>
	<p>iv. Local authorities and private registered providers share the costs of the common database and the associated administration of the common rules, which could be a key advantage.</p>

Option C	<p>Local authorities and private registered providers have separate databases of applicants and separate rules for making an allocation. In this scenario, the following would occur:</p>
	<p>i. Applicants would complete multiple applications and have to contend with multiple sets of rules which could be difficult and time-consuming.</p>
	<p>ii. Local authorities use the information held on their separate databases to allocate all nominations in accordance with their own rules (a common set of rules exclusively between two or more local authorities is permissible).</p>
	<p>iii. Private registered providers would use the information held on their separate databases to allocate lettings in accordance with their own rules (a common set of rules exclusively between two or more private registered providers is permissible). This could lead to inconsistent results and the parties may miss valuable information from each other due to separate databases.</p>
	<p>iv. Local authorities and private registered providers have separate governance arrangements to oversee each database and each set of rules. This may be an advantage as each party would have complete control over its systems and rules.</p>
	<p>v. Local authorities and private registered providers would separately meet the costs of each database and the associated administration costs of each separate set of rules. This could be a big disadvantage as there would be no possibilities of economies due to joint working.</p>

7. **Qualification**

If either Property Pool Plus or Under One Roof becomes local authority specific (e.g. private registered providers choose not to have a common set of rules with local authorities, see recommendation 6, Option A(ii) above), they should consider

disqualifying all applicants that are not entitled to a reasonable preference, or selected to be afforded an addition preference. This would reduce some administrative costs for local authorities.

8. **Co-ordinator**

Property Pool Plus should consider re-establishing a post to co-ordinate the activities of this sub-regional scheme. This will lead to improved accountability and deliverability of Property Pool Plus’ activities. The post should be based at a local authority and report to the Property Pool Plus Contract Board. Especially important for this role would be:

- a. Ensuring compliance with procedures at all times when allocations decisions are being made.
- b. Organising a training curriculum for allocations employees, commissioning a training programme and evaluating learning outcomes and how these impact on the administration of housing allocation functions.
- c. Monitoring nominations activities between local authorities and private registered providers, including mediation between both parties when a nomination fails.
- d. Reconciliation of Property Pool Plus data against data published annually by the UK Government on social housing waiting lists and lettings.
- e. Harmonising charging and invoicing between local authorities and private registered providers.

9. **Administration**

Property Pool Plus should carry out a feasibility study to assess the efficiency and quality implications of co-locating all administrators on a single site. There may be a number of detailed issues and complications that need to be addressed as a result of co-locating all administrators, hence the need for a feasibility study. Such a change would initially involve making no changes to employer or employment conditions, but simply a change of work place. This will improve the consistency of decisions made about applications and allocations and the quality of information, advice and assistance provided to applicants. A further advantage would be a reduction in the costs associated with paying for administrators, as some posts could be reduced due to duplication of responsibilities. A local presence would need to be retained to provide the public with information, advice and assistance about the allocation of social rented housing and making an application to join Property Pool Plus. In the first instance, a single reviews officer or team could be established as a step towards bringing all staff together on one site. In due course, local authorities should consider pursuing any of the following options (which are not necessarily mutually exclusive and would constitute the contracting-out of housing allocation functions – see recommendation 10):

Option A	Seconding all Property Pool Plus’ administrators to a single body (this could be a local authority, a private registered provider, another public body, a voluntary organisation, or other organisation).
-----------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Option B	Employing all Property Pool Plus' administrators via a single body (this could be a local authority, a private registered provider, another public body, a voluntary organisation, or other organisation).
Option C	Creating a limited company to administer Property Pool Plus' activities (this could be owned collectively by the local authorities or jointly with any private registered provider).

10. Contracting out

There should be consideration by Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof as to whether changes are required regarding the contracting-out of the administration schemes. The options are as follows, with Option A being the current agreed position and Option B a possibility for the future:

Option A	Local authorities each make their own decision about whether to contract out or not. This is the current model, with most local authorities having contracted out to stock transfer private registered providers. However, it means considerable variation to contract terms, specification and monitoring arrangements. If this approach is retained, a common set of terms should be adopted for future use by all local authorities' purchasers with their private registered provider suppliers.
Option B	Local authorities make a collective decision about whether to contract out or not and either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. agree to contract out, appointing a single organisation (or potentially a single consortium of organisations) to undertake the administration on behalf of all local authorities that are members of Property Pool Plus. St Helens Council would also have the option of appointing the same provider to administer Under One Roof. The organisation could be a local authority or a private registered provider. This would result in a single set of contract terms, specification and monitoring arrangement, with one organisation (or consortium) which would improve consistency of administration; or 2. agree not to contract out and the administration would be done in-house separately by each local authority. Ideally this would be done alongside the administration of homelessness functions, to reduce costs, achieve service delivery efficiencies and improve the quality of advice and assistance provided. A common service delivery and monitoring framework could be adopted between the local authorities to help consistency of administration.

11. Training

There should be consideration by Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof to introducing a standard training programme for all existing employees administering housing allocations, as well as new employees. A half-day annual update on housing allocation case law should also be arranged. A curriculum could include:

- a. Understanding housing allocation law and statutory guidance.

- b. Understanding procedures.
- c. Nominating applicants to a private registered provider.
- d. Private registered provider allocation law and regulations.
- e. Tenancy law.
- f. Transfer applicants.
- g. Determining eligibility for an allocation of social rented housing.
- h. Determining qualification for an allocation of social rented housing.
- i. Notifying applicants of decisions about eligibility, qualification and the allocation of social rented housing.
- j. A person's rights when applying for and being allocated social rented housing.
- k. Providing information, advice and assistance about the allocation of social rented housing and making an application to join a housing allocation scheme.
- l. How to determine priority for an allocation (including reasonable preference and additional preference).
- m. Offering choice when making allocations of social rented housing.
- n. Local lettings schemes.
- o. Reviews and appeals concerning the allocation of social rented housing.
- p. Co-operation between local authorities and private registered providers when allocating social rented housing.
- q. Dealing with fraud when making an allocation of social rented housing.
- r. The role of elected councillors in allocating social rented housing.

12. IT

Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof should consider investing in IT enhancements to both the system used in the back office by staff and also the customer facing website. Essentials components of any system should include:

- a. Application management.
- b. Decision review management.
- c. Workflow process task management.
- d. Online application form.
- e. Document uploads.
- f. SMS messaging.
- g. Bulk emails.
- h. Digital applicant case files.
- i. Advertising or offering/nomination system.
- j. Shortlisting.
- k. Bidding channels (if choice-based lettings is retained).
- l. Daily bidding.
- m. Proxy bidding.
- n. Auto bidding.
- o. Customised reporting.
- p. Digital signatures.
- q. Improved customer website featuring the following content:
 - i. Online application:
 - a) new application linked to a document upload facility;
 - b) change of circumstances form linked to a document upload facility;
 - and

- c) guidance on how to complete the form.
- ii. Advice and information:
 - a) pdf documents to download on the availability of social rented housing by location, types, number of bedrooms, costs and re-let frequency;
 - b) information on rights when making an application, including:
 - a. how decisions are made;
 - b. requesting facts about a case; and
 - c. rights to review;
 - c) online form to request assistance, via online assistance or an administrative assistant on the phone or in person (either immediately or by booking an appointment);
 - d) information on how applicants can exercise choice about the social rented housing they are allocated;
 - e) illustrated examples of persons who are/are not eligible and do/do not qualify;
 - f) examples of proofs required when making an application;
 - g) information on how applicants are prioritised;
 - h) specific information and advice for applicants who are
 - a. homeless;
 - b. victims of domestic abuse;
 - c. armed forces veterans; and
 - d. care leavers;
 - i) examples of what constitutes a local connection;
 - j) a tool that can forecast how long an applicant might have to wait for an allocation;
 - k) pdf full and summary versions of housing allocation rules and procedures; and
 - l) links to Liverpool City Region private registered providers' housing allocation rules and policies and other Liverpool City Region housing allocation schemes.

13. Financials

There should be consideration by Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof to amending the charging arrangements with private registered providers. Charges paid by private registered providers who use Property Pool Plus or Under One Roof should only relate to properties they let via the scheme (outside of any nomination agreement in force with a local authority who is also a member of the scheme). A common approach should be adopted by Property Pool Plus to determining charges for using the scheme and this should be based on up-to-date information about all of the costs of administering the scheme. Invoicing should also be centralised with one local authority issuing invoices on behalf of all others to all private registered providers.

14. Data quality

The inconsistency in data collection, reporting and analysis needs to be resolved. This would ensure there is comprehensive and accurate data about allocations to inform:

- a. local decision making about housing allocation policy and practice; and
- b. broader strategic housing priorities and plans.

A fixed-term working group needs to be established to help data inputters from private registered providers resolve inconsistencies about what is recorded on CORE compared to what the Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof databases show. A future IT system should be designed to help private registered providers to compile the data required for the CORE reporting regime.

15. Strategy

Data available from Property Pool Plus and Under One Roof databases and also via CORE should be made available to inform the objectives of the next Liverpool City Region Tenancy Strategy. This intelligence could also be relied on to inform broader housing supply planning.



NEIL MORLAND CO

HOUSING CONSULTANTS

Message Call FaceTime Mail
07816 935620
neil@neilmorland.co.uk

Website
www.neilmorland.co.uk

LinkedIn
<https://www.linkedin.com/company/neil-morland-co-housing-consultants>

© Neil Morland & Co Housing Consultants, 2020

Registered Office: 78 Borough Road, Altrincham, Greater Manchester, WA14 9EJ
Company no: 7776084
VAT no: 135466214
Neil Morland & Co Housing Consultants is a trading name for Neil Morland Housing Consultant Ltd

For a copy of this document in Braille, larger print, audio or other languages, please contact us. We consider requests on an individual basis.