Housing Allocation
Review 2013

All housing authorities must have an allocation scheme. The current allocations scheme came into effect on 27/7/09. When framing or modifying their scheme, authorities must have regard to their current tenancy and homelessness strategies (s.166A(12)). The Council’s tenancy and homeless strategies are currently being reviewed and the allocations scheme needs to be reviewed to reflect any changes that are introduced.

The allocations scheme also needs to be reviewed following recent changes introduced by the Localism Act and to take into account the new Allocations Code of Guidance issued by The Communities and Local Government in June 2012. The new code of guidance titled; “Allocation of accommodation: guidance for local authorities in England” has replaced all previous codes of guidance and the Council’s Allocations Scheme needs to be reviewed to reflect this guidance.
1

Are you currently on the Housing Register in Oxford?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85% (229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15% (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2

We are interested in finding out if you have a local connection to Oxford. Do you...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live in Oxford</td>
<td>92% (248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Oxford</td>
<td>56% (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have close family relatives that live in Oxford</td>
<td>56% (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3

The new Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council should be able to take into account whether an applicant has a local connection to Oxford when deciding whether they can qualify for inclusion on the Housing Register with some exceptions; including members of the armed forces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46% (126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39% (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither, agree or, disagree</td>
<td>7% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3% (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4

The new Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council should normally exclude housing applicants, or adult members of their household, with £16,000 or more in capital and savings and/or sufficient income to resolve their own housing situation (with some exceptions for complex or high needs cases and those applying for shared ownership properties only).

To what extent do you agree with this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27% (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35% (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6% (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5

The new Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council should be able to take into account rent arrears when considering if an applicant should qualify for inclusion on the Housing Register. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>34% (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36% (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>18% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4% (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council should be able to exclude a housing applicant from inclusion on the housing register where they, or a member of their household, have been responsible for ASB unless they can evidence their behaviour has been amended and another tenancy has been successfully maintained.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56% (151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32% (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither, agree or, disagree</td>
<td>7% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you on the Council's housing register because you are homeless or going to be homeless?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16% (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84% (228)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council is proposing to reduce the priority given to some Homeless Applicants on the housing register. To improve the chances of other housing applicants in similar housing need on the Housing Register being made an offer of accommodation and to help re-house them before they become homeless. This includes housing applicants living in overcrowded or unsuitable accommodation with their parents, other family members or in the private sector (see the draft allocations scheme for further information).

We are proposing moving priority homeless applicants currently in band 2 (homeless families, pregnant applicants) to band 3 and non-priority homeless from band 3 (single applicants and those not considered vulnerable) to band 4.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33% (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>27% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10% (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council prioritises housing applicants in the same Housing Need Priority Band by their Priority Band Start Date instead of the time they have been on the housing register.

Existing applicants will be protected by transitional arrangements to minimise the initial impact of this change. So applicants currently on the housing register when the new Allocations Scheme comes into effect will have their Registration Date used as their Priority Band Start Date if this is earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23% (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48% (128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5% (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of Household Members

The draft Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council increases the age at which children of the opposite sex are considered to be able to share a bedroom:

From -“Two children of the opposite sexes aged under 7” to “Two children of the opposite sex aged under 10”

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28% (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17% (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24% (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19% (51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The draft Allocations scheme proposes that:

The Council increases the age at which children of the same sex are considered able to share a bedroom:

From

“Two children of the same sex where the oldest child is between 10 and 15 and the age gap is less than 10 years”

To

“Two children of the same sex aged under 16”

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>19% (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13% (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Under-Occupiers in Social Housing

The Draft Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council continues to allow tenants on the Transfer List who are currently in a property that is too big for them to be able to move to a smaller property even if it has 1 bedroom more than they require if they can still afford the rent to free up larger family housing.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32% (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43% (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>12% (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3% (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under-Occupation in Other Circumstances

The Draft Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council allows housing applicants to be offered a property larger than they would normally be considered to require if they are:

A long term Foster Carer (who has fostered children continuously for 3 years or more) or a housing applicant with a person in their household with high housing needs due to a health or disability, for example a child who cannot share with another due to their disability where they are still able to afford the rent.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33% (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47% (128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>13% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council proposes that it no longer “counts” an unborn baby as a household member when assessing the number of bedrooms a housing applicant will require until the baby is born.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23% (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36% (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9% (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council proposes that it no longer “counts” adult children or household members for the purposes of assessing the size of property they will require and assessing their housing need where they are studying away from home and living elsewhere for part of the time in student, private rented or other accommodation.

&

There is not an over-riding health need for the adult child, or other adult resident, to live with the applicant and be included on their housing application as person requiring housing.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33% (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>27% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7% (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The draft Allocations Scheme proposes that:

To allow applicants with a 4 bedroom housing need living in a 2 bedroom property (or smaller) or temporary homeless accommodation to apply for suitable 3 bedroom houses.

If an applicant opted to do this, then they would not normally be able to apply for a Transfer to another home within a year of moving in.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52% (139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>21% (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Allocations Scheme proposes:

The Council will normally (with some exceptions) suspend a housing applicant on the General Register or Transfer List from bidding for properties for 12 months if they refuse two offers of accommodation without good reason in less than 12 months.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35% (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36% (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>14% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11% (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing applicants on the homeless list will now only be made one suitable offer of accommodation which could be in the Private Rented Sector.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26% (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35% (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17% (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9% (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>