

Cabinet

24th May 2021

PRESENT:-

Councillors D. R. Hale (Chair), H, Bridges, A. Akbar, J. Black, D. Kirk, G. Lunn, S. McMurray, R Nicola, R. Pantelakis, and Councillor P. Webster.

IN ATTENDANCE:-

M. Jukes (Chief Executive), D. Bell (Director of Finance and Transformation), M. Jones (Director of Regeneration), I. Anderson (Director of Legal Services and Partnerships), P. Turner (Director of Children, Young People and Family Services), J. Weldon (Director of Public Health and Adult Services) and L. Scholes (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

C. Dearing (Renewals Programme Manager) – minute 4

APOLOGIES:-

None.

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/Deadline
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
1	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Councillor Kirk declared a personal interest in minute 4 insofar as he is a Director of a homeless hostel.	
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26th APRIL 2021 Agreed – (a) that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 26 th April, 2021, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chair (b) that the Cabinet wished to record their thanks to Councillor Brady for his sterling service as the Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet, and the outgoing Cabinet Members Councillors Harrison and Thompson as well as former Councillors Clark and Craker.	
3	PUBLIC QUESTIONS No public questions were received.	

NON-EXEMPT ITEMS		
Key Decisions		
4	<p>SUPPORTED HOUSING PILOT EXTENSION (MHCLG FUNDING)</p> <p>(Councillor Kirk declared a personal interest in this matter insofar as he is a Director of a homeless hostel.)</p> <p>The Director of Legal Services and Partnerships submitted a report which sought approval to accept the funding and mobilise the Supported Accommodation Review Team (SART) in accordance with the terms of the submitted application</p> <p>Members discussed what would happen once the grant funding ran out and how people would be trained to continue the work. The officer confirmed that the structures put in place would reduce the revenue expenditure. It was expected that there would need to be some physical checks of properties and resources would be covered in the base budget. Work had taken place on those properties which had been in the most difficult condition, it was key that housing management was in place and the landlord was aware of what the property was being used for and took responsibility for ensuring improvements were made. It was important that tenants were aware of what support was available and records were maintained, consideration was also needed to establish where possible people could move beyond supported accommodation. Supported accommodation was useful but it was important to review a person's need as it can prevent them from accessing employment and other services. Members also discussed whether this was a pilot for getting rid of exempt accommodation, it was better to have this type of accommodation than to not have it at all. Members highlighted that the establishment of this team had been the result of a Member initiative. The team would be welcomed in the City, as there were concerns over landlords buying houses and turning around them to rent out and disappearing once tenants were in place.</p> <p>Members commented on the need to improve the situation of some providers having limited professional support and clarification of what furniture should be supplied in furnished accommodation. Members queried whether the work referred to in paragraph 11.1 of the report in relation to the need for an assessment of the impact of the programme on equality had been undertaken. Members suggested there needed to be effective media</p>	

communication to say this bid had been successful and therefore the Council would have additional oversight and support to see how supported accommodation sites were being managed.

Members also discussed the impact of the exempt element of housing benefit that was 'hidden' which meant often the support available was not checked and could mean that people became trapped in supported accommodation as they were required to be on benefits to stay there and therefore struggled to move on. In order for the City to move forwards all residents needed to receive the support and advantages that came with the regeneration of the City. Members queried paragraph 5.2 of the report which explained that supported accommodation provided by non-Registered Social Landlords had resulted in a loss of subsidy loss to the Council of approximately £1.93million. The officer confirmed that during the design of the service the equalities impact would be established and that the cost of supported exempt accommodation provided through Registered Social Landlords could be claimed back through the housing benefit system, if it was a non-Registered Social Landlord the costs could not be recovered. Non-Registered Social Landlords were encouraged to become registered to improve quality of accommodation as well as to save in terms of the Council's finances, it was expected that Registered Social Landlords were registered for a reason and were happy to follow the set of procedures.

Members also commented on the concentrated pockets of supported accommodation, the sub-culture environment could normalise negative behaviour so it was important to ensure services were available in the right locations. There were some residents in the City who believed they were in a property with a Registered Social Landlord who wasn't, they believed their costs were being met and people were getting into a lot of debt with such landlords which would be very difficult to move on from. There needed to be clarity of what was expected in terms of goods in the property, what was being charged against the property, what expectations there were around support and how the Council was preventing people being kept in such situations. This was not all landlords, there were a number of very good landlords but the issue needed to be tackled and queried whether the structure was robust enough. The news of the Council getting the grant may not be well received by some residents as those living in or near these properties may feel that what is being done currently was not sufficiently robust, although having something in place was better than nothing, there needed to be changes to

	<p>ensure the City's vulnerable residents were not suffering as a result of the system..</p> <p>Members discussed the powers available to the Council in terms of dealing with housing which was not fit for purpose and whether there were guidelines of what was expected from the landlord and the property. The officer confirmed legal services were involved in using the private housing enforcement powers in the City where there were deficits in provision so action could be taken. A protocol had been adopted over what was expected from private housing, the powers that could be deployed were as a result of a policy adopted a few years ago by the Council.</p> <p>Members discussed the need for progress to be made in relation to housing support, the requirement from legislation was that the support needed to be 'more than minimal', it was expected that the Government would change this as a result of the pilots but it should be higher than 'more than minimal'. It was important to encourage non-Registered Social Landlords to become registered so that the cost was charged back to the government and the landlords were regulated. The Council had a direct line to the regulator and the trustees who have a legal duty to run the registered provider within the rules. It was important to maintain the dialogue with providers.</p> <p>Members discussed previous examples of supported accommodation and the use of timesheets to monitor how much time was spent supporting individuals.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Hale and seconded by Councillor Black –</p> <p>(a) That subject to formal confirmation of the approval of the MHCLG, that the Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods & Housing) is authorised to accept the funding of approximately £841,053 which will be issued via a resource grant under Section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003</p> <p>(b) That following receipt of funding, the Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods & Housing) in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder is authorised to mobilise the SART programme in accordance with the terms of the submitted application, and that the Member Steering Group received a report as to how these funds will be allocated.</p> <p>(c) That a meeting is set up before or after a Full Council meeting to brief all Councillors on this</p>	<p>(a-c) Director of Legal Services and Partnerships/ Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods & Housing)</p>
--	---	---

	<p>matter to raise awareness of what this team can and cannot do.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hull City Council was provided with guidance and invited to submit an application to Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's Supported Housing oversight pilot extension: April to September 2021 programme on 2 March 2021. • The deadline for application submissions was 9 March 2021 with funding awards/decisions in principle taking place week commencing 15 March 2021. • The pilot requires that work commence 1 April 2021 with conclusion of the programme required on 30 September 2021, as per MHCLG guidance. • Accepting funding of approximately £841,053 will contribute to the work currently undertaken by SART and will further develop the relationship with MHCLG 	
--	---	--

Start: 9.30 a.m.
Finish 10.10 a.m.

The above Executive Decisions will come into force and may be implemented on expiry of five working days after the publication of the decisions i.e. 7th June, 2021, unless called in by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

Published – 26th May, 2021.