

EAST MIDLANDS REGIONAL ASSEMBLY

FINAL REPORT :
CONSULTATION ON THE
REGIONAL HOUSING
INVESTMENT STRATEGY
(RHIS)

CENTRE FOR COMPARATIVE HOUSING
RESEARCH (CCHR)
DE MONTFORT UNIVERSITY

JUNE 2007

Contents

1.	Introduction	p 3
2.	Approach	p 4
3.	Key Issues	p 5
4.	Specific Issues	p 9
	4.1. Overall Budget	p 9
	4.2. Affordable Homes and Market Renewal	p 9
	4.3. Gypsies and Travellers Site Grant Allocations	p 13
	4.4. Meeting the Decent Homes Standard in the Social Rented Sector	p 14
	4.5. Meeting the Decent Homes Standard for Vulnerable Households in the Private Sector	p 14
	4.6. Research and Development of Sub-Regional Work	p 15
	4.7. Additional DCLG Issues	p 16
	4.8. Other Comments on the RHIP	p 17
	4.9. Broader Issues on Regional Housing Policy	p 17
	Appendix A : Written Consultation Responses	p 18
	Appendix B : RHIS Template for Responses	p 20

1. Introduction

The aims of this report are to:-

- Provide a brief overview of the consultation approach;
- Highlight key issues arising from the consultation process; and
- Focus on responses to the specific questions identified in the draft regional housing investment strategy (RHIS).

After the consultation process commenced, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued further guidance on 29th March 2007. Regional assemblies were asked, for example, to provide information and commentaries on additional issues including the priority for family accommodation, contribution to mixed communities and other concerns. These issues were considered at the consultation event (see below). In addition, the DCLG letter resulted in an exchange of correspondence between the Government and the English Regions Network (ERN) on, for example, the need for a race impact assessment. This has helped to clarify some of the issues – for instance, the DCLG is seeking guidance from the regional assemblies on where priorities might ‘particularly assist those from black or other ethnic minority groups and if so an estimate of the likely impact’ rather than a comprehensive impact assessment statement.

It should be noted that this report does not list or consider the detailed commentaries and observations made by some consultees on specific paragraphs on the draft RHIS. Similarly, it does not focus on requests to prioritise investment in specific local authority areas. The objective of the consultation process has been to consider overall regional allocation priorities, and thematic and sub-regional investment issues.

The next section of the report focuses briefly on the consultation approach. This is followed by an overview of the key issues. The final, and most substantial section, covers the questions posed by EMRA (together with additional issues raised by DCLG).

2. Approach

The consultation process has involved two elements:-

- Consultation workshop on 16th May 2007; and
- Written comments on the consultation paper that was made available in the middle of March 2007.

Approximately 50 delegates attended the consultation workshop from a wide range of organisations. After an initial briefing session, the delegates were divided into eight groups to discuss the questions raised in the consultation paper by EMRA and the additional issues raised by DCLG. Each group reported back to a plenary session highlighting two key priorities. In addition, facilitators took notes on the discussions in each of the eight workshops.

Written comments were received from 34 organisations. A list of respondents can be found in Appendix A. The deadline for comments was Tuesday 29th May 2007. In six cases, CCHR staff followed up the written responses to seek clarification on issues raised. The nature of the written responses varied considerably with some organisations commenting in detail on many of the issues, while others focussed on a limited number of specific questions. In a small minority of cases, respondents questioned the overall approach to the RHIS. Finally, some of the comments raised wider issues (such as the need to argue for a greater degree of funding for the region from the comprehensive spending review).

The geographical spread of written responses adequately reflected the RSS sub-areas and sub-regional housing market areas with the exception of the northern sub-area. There were only four responses from housing associations (although the NHF East Midlands made two representations) and no feedback was obtained from private sector organisations. There were a particularly high number of responses from organisations focussed on rural housing issues.

The workshop groups and the written responses were analysed using a template based on the EMRA consultation questions and the additional DCLG issues (see Appendix B). Copies of these templates have been made available to EMRA. Because of the nature of the consultation process, the analysis is based on a qualitative approach rather a numerical response to questions.

It should be noted that throughout the consultation process, it has been made clear to respondents that there will be no specific feedback to each organisation. Instead this paper on the consultation process and the response by EMRA will be made available.

Finally, the consultation process has generated a considerable amount of in-depth commentaries on regional housing policy. Key points are briefly highlighted in section three and at the end of section four. There is a strong case for making use of the material in the forthcoming review of the regional housing strategy.

3. Key Issues

This section highlights key issues for EMRA to consider in relation to the overall approach on the RHIS as well as setting the context for the more specific questions. It should be appreciated that there are complex overlaps and inter-linkages between these key issues. For example, the concerns over the affordability of intermediate housing and the suggestion that more emphasis should be placed on social renting does not necessarily sit easily with support for mixed and balanced communities.

Specific points for EMRA to consider are in italics.

The key issues from the consultation workshop and written responses are:-

- General support for overall principles set out in the draft East Midlands RHIS 2008-2011.

A number of written responses were extremely positive and complimentary about the report and the consultation process.

- Key headline priorities are affordable housing and meeting the decent homes standard in the private sector.

In relation to the former, there was, however, a lack of clarity over 'affordable housing'. Some respondents focussed on 'new' affordable housing, while others explicitly emphasised the need to make more effective use of existing stock through, for instance, the delivery of empty homes strategies and purchase and repair schemes.

It would be useful for EMRA to explicitly clarify the term, 'affordable housing'.

- Balance between social rented housing and intermediate housing : A key challenge highlighted in the majority of written responses and by each of the consultation workshop groups is the degree to which intermediate housing is accessible and affordable to low income households.

This is covered in more depth in 4.2.D below. *Some respondents indicated that a thematic research study on intermediate housing in the East Midlands would be a useful way forward.*

- Importance of investment decisions delivering mixed sustainable and balanced communities

The issue raised by the DCLG in its letter of 29th March 2007 was highlighted by nearly all of the workshops. In addition a number of written responses emphasised the importance of achieving mixed and balanced communities. In most cases, there was an acknowledgement that this issue was relevant for both new housing areas and the remodelling of existing neighbourhoods. One respondent argued strongly that the

approach for the RHIS should start with a focus on mixed and balanced communities rather than thematic and geographical priorities for investment. At least one other written response implicitly endorsed this type of approach.

There is a strong case for emphasis to be placed on investments contributing to the delivery of mixed sustainable and balanced communities.

- Sub-Regional Allocations and Housing Market Studies.

The consultation workshops highlighted that the sub-regional housing market area studies (when completed) would provide evidence for geographical allocations. In addition, the workshops and a number of written comments focussed on these housing market areas in their observations on allocations. This was a particular topic that CCHR staff followed up with some consultees who felt that the RSS sub-area allocations were in principle appropriate but wished to see these broken down into housing market areas.

This issue is linked with the current situation with the sub-regional housing market area studies and the GTAAs. A majority of workshops and a number of written comments recommended that the issue of sub-regional allocations should be revisited in 2008 once the evidence base has been improved across the region.

It was, however, unclear how EMRA would take account of these new sources of information. The Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM) has already noted the lack of consistency in approach between the housing market assessments. It is, therefore, difficult at this stage to see how the sub-regional allocations can be modified in a fair and transparent manner to reflect the outcomes of these studies.

It is suggested that EMRA maintains its current geographical allocation approach. But it is suggested that this is revisited and reviewed in 2008 in the light of guidance arising from a likely GOEM study on housing market assessments.

- Importance of support for sub-regional housing market areas in researching, developing and delivering housing and mixed communities

With one exception, there was strong support for maintaining the current level of funding for the research and development of sub-regional working (see 4.6.L below). A specific issue that was highlighted is the need for funding to further develop sub-regional capacity through, for example, establishing secretariats (which have been successful in improving sub-regional working in other regions). It is of course worth noting that EMRA wrote to local authorities and lead officers for strategic housing market assessments in mid May 2007 indicating that funding would be available in 2007/2008 for taking forward action plans to develop sub-regional working.

EMRA should consider whether the best means of building up sub-regional housing policy and delivery from 2008-2011 is through part-funding of sub-regional secretariats based on either RSS sub-areas or sub-regional housing market areas. Lessons from the 2007/2008 programme may be relevant.

- Growing interest on how to improve delivery

Explicit and implicit in much of the feedback was the issue of delivery of projects and schemes. There were concerns, for example, over whether investment allocations for Gypsy and Traveller sites and for meeting the private sector decent homes standard would be achieved. It was also acknowledged, however, that re-allocating unspent funds to other priorities (e.g. affordable housing) would be unpopular. There was, thus, a consensus that the emphasis should be on tackling blockages in the delivery process.

There were examples quoted of emerging excellent practice in delivery of affordable housing (e.g. Northamptonshire) and sub-regional delivery (e.g. Peak sub-region).

EMRA should consider the best way forward in improving the delivery of policies and investment allocations. The promotion of good practice would be an appropriate step.

- Importance of ensuring that housing investment decisions are co-ordinated with, for instance, economic development, transport, infrastructure and health & social care investment

Some respondents expressed concern that the RHIS process might not result in co-ordinated investment if links were not more effectively established now with other allocation streams such as physical infrastructure and health and social care. For example, a strong case was put forward that investment in affordable housing to tackle homelessness would also help achieve health and educational attainment targets.

It was however emphasised that working arrangements over supported housing had improved significantly in recent years.

EMRA should make it even clearer how the RHIS will link into other regional investment strategies.

- Inadequacy of resources for housing in the East Midlands (see also section 4.8)

A small number of respondents explicitly argued that EMRA should use the RHIS process to request additional funding from the Government. It was suggested that initiatives such as Midlands United should be used to support this case.

A number of other respondents highlighted that there was a significant gap between the policies in regional strategies and the investment needed to deliver targets. A number of thematic areas were highlighted including affordable housing, Gypsy and Traveller sites and decent homes in the private sector.

EMRA need to consider whether it is appropriate to make the case for additional investment in the region through the CSR process.

4. Specific Issues

4.1 Overall budget

A. If the funding level for the 2008-11 regional housing pot remains close to that provided during 2006-8 should the structure of funding be kept the same or be changed, for example to enhance the capacity to deliver affordable homes or to accelerate progress towards achieving decent homes in the private sector? Also, if funding levels rise or fall say by 10% which scenario for investment mix would be closest to the ideal? Section one of the draft RHIS provides more details of funding scenarios.

There was a majority of respondents in both the workshops and from the written comments that favour the structure of funding being kept to a similar pattern as for 2006-2008.

There was some support for additional priority to be given to affordable housing. There were also a limited number of comments that priority should be given to private sector decent homes because of the neglect of this topic over the last decade. There were few suggestions made as to the scale of such changes and which thematic topics should be reduced – although one respondent indicated that the research budget might be reduced.

There was some discussion on whether affordable housing investment in later years might be increased because of slippage and delivery problems on other themes (e.g. Gypsy and Traveller sites) – see above.

If funding levels were to increase by 10%, the most favoured option was scenario 2. A number of respondents noted that scenarios 1 & 2 were very similar. Scenario 3 had little or no support.

If funding levels were to decrease by 10%, the majority view was that affordable housing and decent homes in the private sector should be protected as much as possible. Scenarios 2 & 3 were both well supported with the former having the greatest backing. There was little support for scenario 1.

4.2 Affordable homes and market renewal

B. There is considerable emphasis in the Draft Regional Plan on increasing the delivery of affordable homes. At present funding levels in the region could at least maintain the same delivery level of affordable homes in 2008-11. Should this proportion of funding be maintained, increased or decreased? How should any increase or decrease in the scale of the regional housing pot impact on the budget for affordable homes? Sections one and two of the draft RHIS cover these issues in more detail.

As has already been pointed out, there was backing for the need for increased numbers of affordable housing over the next three year period. This would inevitably raise issues over value for money. Respondents highlighted a number of inter-linked challenges including:-

- Increasing development costs and the need for higher grant levels even on section 106 schemes for social rented housing with developers more interested in one and two bedroom intermediate housing provision (often in the form of flats);
- Need for larger family size units (see also section 4.7 below) that affect scheme viability and necessitate higher grant rates; and
- Difficulties particularly in rural areas of identifying sites resulting in suggestions for delivery of affordable housing through making more effective use of existing stock (e.g. purchase and repair).

There were also examples quoted where considerable progress is being made on the delivery of increased numbers of affordable housing units (e.g. Northamptonshire).

An emerging issue is therefore the balance between the scale of funding and the type of outputs. In broad terms, there could be an increase in the number of affordable housing units, but this might be at the expense of mixed and balanced communities because of, for instance, the lack of larger family houses. As the draft RHIS notes, the issue is one of ensuring an appropriate equilibrium between quantity and quality.

C. Within the draft Housing Investment Strategy (Section two) there is information on affordable housing needs in the HMA sub-regions, and references to the evidence used for the production of the Draft Regional Plan. A key issue is how broadly to allocate this funding to different parts of the region. Preliminary proposals are set out in the draft RHIS: are these proposals acceptable taking into consideration factors such as affordability, local housing growth objectives and the capacity to deliver affordable housing from resources obtained through the development process itself?

There was considerable comment on this issue. There was in principle backing for the preliminary proposals for the RSS sub-areas. The vast majority of views were that allocations must be revisited in 2008 once the sub-regional housing market assessments (and other research reports) have been completed. It was also implied that the allocations would need to be disaggregated to the sub-regional housing market areas.

There were also at least five responses that emphasised the importance of ensuring allocations tied in with growth areas and growth points.

Few if any comments were made as to how these studies, that have adopted different methodologies, will be able to be brought together so as to identify geographical priorities. It is also important to note that GOEM is likely to undertake a study in 2007 on the implications of the different approaches utilised for strategic housing market assessments and whether they are in line with recent DCLG guidance (published in late March 2007).

D. A further choice to be made is for the broad split between provision of homes solely for social rent and intermediate housing, where homes are made available in part or wholly for sale. The paper proposes a mix, reflecting analysis in the Draft Regional Plan, which is also set out on a sub-regional basis. Is this the right mix?

This question generated the greatest number of written responses as well as much discussion in the workshop sessions.

On a point of information, there appears to have been some confusion among a few respondents over the nature of the split. The draft RHIS makes it abundantly clear that it is a financial split of 80 : 20 re social renting and intermediate housing. As a number of commentators highlighted, this equates approximately to 60 : 40 in terms of outturn. A number of responses seemed to suggest that 80 : 20 was appropriate in terms of number of units. At least two respondents, drawing on emerging housing market assessments, highlighted that an outturn of 80 : 20 would be more relevant.

The major concern that was raised was the affordability of intermediate housing. Responses from throughout the region questioned whether current products were affordable for low income households. It was suggested, therefore, that this was a thematic issue that should be subject to further research (see below).

It was nevertheless acknowledged that intermediate housing was frequently put forward by developers as a core part of a package under planning agreements. Furthermore, it was noted that intermediate housing helped to contribute to mixed and balanced communities as well as providing potentially a pathway to owner occupation (as emphasised in the Hills Report published by the DCLG in February 2007).

The emerging message from respondents is that an 80 : 20 funding split may be acceptable as long as products can be developed where households can initially purchase less than a 50% share of products.

E. What choices and priorities should be made for investments in thematic priorities for affordable housing? These are for housing market renewal, rural housing, supported housing provision, and

provision for BME groups. Are the targets and budgets which are proposed in the draft strategy about right?

Three key overall messages emerged:-

- Acknowledgement of the difficulties of deciding between competing thematic priorities - but at least four respondents commented that these themes overlapped e.g. the need for supported housing in rural areas;
- Importance of a flexible approach to reflect sub-regional housing market areas; and
- Need to review priorities in 2008 once sub-regional housing market area studies and other research (e.g. National Housing Federation study on black and minority ethnic housing requirements) is available. .

More specifically, there were a relatively large number of responses on rural housing and these included:-

- Need for additional funding for rural housing with frequent reference to the work of the Commission for Rural Communities on regional rural housing needs published in 2006 as well as emerging findings from the housing market analysis studies;
- Greater emphasis on funding for settlements with a population of between 3-10,000 population which are more likely to be sustainable than smaller villages;
- Requirement for affordable housing funding for investment in the existing stock including purchase and repair and tackling issues of empty homes;
- Need for higher grant levels to take account of high design and development costs;
- Request to increase the floor targets for rural provision (while acknowledging that outturn figures are likely to exceed these targets); and
- Requests from two organisations for funding to also be targeted on larger market towns with a population of 10-20,000 population.

There was also a number of responses on supported housing with the key points being:-

- Lack of capital funding compared to likely needs that have been identified in supporting people strategies and are emerging from sub-regional housing market studies; and
- Importance of aligning capital and revenue funding for schemes – though it was acknowledged that this has improved significantly in recent years.

There were a limited number of responses on the needs of black and minority ethnic housing groups and the following points were highlighted:-

- EMRA are required to carry out an assessment of the impact of the RHIS on BME groups
- The needs of BME groups is a cross cutting theme that ought to have been highlighted more strongly throughout the draft RHIS. For example, meeting the decent homes standard in the private sector may be as relevant as funding for affordable housing.
- There is no mention of the growing issues of the needs of A8 and A2 migrants.

It should be noted that the exchange of correspondence between the ERN and the DCLG has clarified the issue of a race equality statement. The latter has confirmed that it wishes to see an assessment of the likely implications of funding decisions on black and ethnic minority groups.

F. The Regional Funding Allocations exercise in 2006 offered a commitment to investing in housing market renewal projects. It also proposed to increase this funding if the overall Regional Housing Pot were to increase in future years. Should this stance be maintained?

There were a limited number of responses to this issue. There was a consensus that funding for housing market renewal should be continued (partly because of the long term nature of such policies).

Three organisations suggested the programme should be modified to incorporate more innovative approaches such as a focus on estate regeneration and, in relation to rural areas, dispersed renewal projects covering scattered numbers of properties across a local authority area.

G. The paper proposes that the Housing Corporation with RHG support should lead a bid-led approach to investment in housing market renewal. Is this the right approach; and if so how should bidding best be managed?

Again, there were relatively few comments on this issue. Most respondents suggested that there should initially be a review of the existing three schemes. This should be followed by a bidding approach based on clear criteria with bidders using robust evidence from, for instance, sub-regional housing market studies.

4.3 Gypsies and Travellers Site Grant Allocations

H. Are there any further considerations to be made regarding the funding proposed?

There were a large number of written responses to this topic. There was overwhelming support for the proposals. The majority of

comments highlighted broader contextual issues rather than adding further considerations.:-

- Importance of funding especially in the light of GTAA's – indeed it was emphasised that investment would need to be reviewed in 2008 once each of these sub-regional / county studies have been completed;
- Potential inadequate scale of funds to meet the emerging requirements from GTAA's; and
- Challenge of delivering sites and the possible likelihood of underspend.

4.4 Meeting the Decent Homes Standard in the Social Rented Sector

- I. Government Office for the East Midlands is currently undertaking an exercise to update the figures for what funding each housing stock-retaining local authority needs in order to deliver the decent homes standard by 2010, except where an extension to the target has been agreed with the Government. Until these figures are known precisely we are working with the latest figures available. The 2006-8 investment strategy proposes no offsetting reduction in a Local Authority's funding where the Decent Homes standard has now been met. Should the Regional Housing Investment Strategy propose to the Government no further funding for authorities which have met the target for the Decent Homes in the Social Sector, or should resources continue to be allocated perhaps to reflect past performance and to fund maintenance of good quality neighbourhoods?*

There was a divergence of opinions on this issue with stock owning local authorities emphasising the importance of continued funding beyond the decent homes target especially where there were other difficulties such as radon gas and non-traditional stock with structural deficiencies. It was also highlighted that the decent homes target was a basic standard. There was also some support for funding to move towards a decent neighbourhoods standard and it was pointed out that DCLG will probably establish such a target before the end of the three year period of the RHIS.

Nevertheless, it was emphasised by other organisations that the target was to achieve the decent homes standard by 2010 and that there were other routes available to councils to meet this and more challenging targets rather than stock retention.

4.5 Meeting the Decent Homes Standard for Vulnerable Households in the Private Sector

- J. Should there be support for some authorities to be funded to exceed decent homes standard locally reflecting their performance to date?*

As has already been pointed out in section 4.1.A, there is considerable support for giving increased priority to meeting the decent homes standard in the private sector. It, however, was highlighted by a number of respondents that the target of 70% of vulnerable households living in decent homes in the private sector was a basic standard. There was thus some backing for councils to have funding to go beyond the target especially if it could be joined up with other initiatives such as tackling fuel poverty.

Even so, there were a number of commentators that suggested that the basic target should be met across the region before an improved standard was funded.

K. Should guaranteed funding levels to local authorities cease, with the allocation of funds to be made on assessment of need and performance?

There were a variety of views on this topic from a limited number of responses with the majority favouring a system of allocation based on need and performance. The balance between needs and performance was a feature of the discussions and the consensus was that it should be based on a 50 : 50 split.

It is, however, important to appreciate that there were some organisations that favoured the retention of the guaranteed funding streams, or at least it should be included as an additional element to needs and performance.

A number of respondents pointed out that guaranteed funding for this stream was being abandoned by the DCLG.

4.6 Research and Development of Sub-Regional Work

L. The paper proposes approximately £1.5m of the budget for investment in research and development of sub-regional working. Is this an appropriate level? What priority should be given to research and support for sub-regional working?

Apart from one organisation that suggested a reduction in a third of the funding for research, there was support for the continuation of this strand of investment.

There were two types of research and support suggested:-

- Resources to establish and build up sub-regional capacity for policy and delivery. A number of respondents suggested funding should be used to help set up sub-regional secretariats. But it was unclear whether this referred to RSS sub-regions or sub-regional housing market areas – though it was implicitly more likely to be the latter. It

should be noted that EMRA has written to local authorities indicating that funding will be made available in 2007/2008 to promote sub-regional working.

- Substantive research on:-
 - Updating and improving sub-regional housing market studies;
 - Promoting best practice in thematic policy areas such as delivering the decent homes standard in the private sector and affordable housing provision on large sites; and
 - Thematic research on specific issues such as the affordability of intermediate housing (see above).

4.7 Additional DCLG Issues

It should be noted that the majority of written responses utilised the EMRA template published in mid March 2007 and therefore did not explicitly cover these issues. The main source of reaction was, thus, the consultation workshops.

X. Priority for Large Family Property

This was highlighted as a significant concern by each of the workshop groups. More emphasis was felt to be essential on ensuring that larger affordable family properties were prioritised. It was argued that this would contribute to meeting the needs of black and minority ethnic groups as well as helping to create mixed and balanced communities.

The scale and nature of this need was likely to be evident from the sub-regional housing market assessments.

The implications of prioritising this type of accommodation were also highlighted including the impact on investment because of the need for higher grant rates.

Y. Contribution to Mixed Communities

As has previously been highlighted in section three, at least one respondent argued that the RHIS should be restructured around this core theme. More generally, there was a view from many respondents that investment decisions in new housing areas and on remodelling existing neighbourhoods should take stronger notice of this issue.

There were, however, few if any suggestions on what types of funding, in addition to other thematic priorities, might be appropriate.

Z. Other Priorities

During the consultation process, the workshops and the written responses identified three topic areas

- Key worker provision : This was highlighted by a number of organisations particularly in rural areas.
- Environmental and eco-friendly housing : A number of agencies emphasised that this cross-cutting theme ought to be more strongly emphasised in the RHIS.
- Making more effective use of the existing stock : This issue has already been highlighted in section 4.2. Nevertheless, a small number of organisations argued that empty homes strategies should be given a greater priority with funding made available through the affordable housing and market renewal programme to tackle this issue.

4.8 Other Comments on RHIP

The major additional comments have briefly been covered in section three above.

The most significant issue was that a number of written responses and at least two of the eight workshop groups indicated that EMRA should utilise the opportunity through the comprehensive spending review to highlight the case for the region receiving additional funding. The justifications for this tied in with, for instance, the Midlands United campaign. It included:-

- Need for additional funding to meet the targets set in the Regional Plan;
- New and emerging Government policies such as growth points; and
- Value for money for the Treasury in investing in the East Midlands compared to the South East Region and northern regions.

In addition, there was concern expressed in one written response on the lack of focus on tackling homelessness. It was suggested that the draft RHIS should make more use of the findings of the draft regional homelessness strategy. It was also argued that this supports the need for additional investment in affordable housing.

4.9 Broader Issues on Regional Housing Policy

As has already been noted, there is a wealth of material from the RHIS consultation process that raised broader issues than the specific questions set out in the draft RHIS and posed by DCLG.

It is therefore important that the information is reviewed as part of the process for the review of the regional housing strategy in 2007.

Appendix A : Written Consultation Responses

Written responses were received by CCHR via EMRA from the following organisations:-

Local Authorities (15)

Charnwood
Corby
Daventry
Derby
East Lindsey
Hinckley and Bosworth
Leicester
Leicestershire
Lincoln
Newark & Sherwood
Northampton
Nottingham
South Kesteven
Wellingborough
West Lindsey

Consortiums (4)

Leicestershire Development and Strategy Officers Group
Lincolnshire Housing Forum
Northamptonshire County Council, North Northamptonshire Development Corporation & West Northamptonshire Development Corporation
Peak Sub-Region and Derbyshire Supporting People Core Strategy Group

Housing Associations (4)

East Midlands Housing Association
Midland Heart
Midlands Rural Housing Association
Peak District Rural Housing Association

Other Organisations (11)

Building and Social Housing Foundation
Chartered Institute of Housing East Midland Branch
East Midlands Regional Affairs Forum
East Midlands Regional Homelessness Forum
Meden Valley Making Places
National Housing Federation East Midlands
National Housing Federation East Midlands Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Group
Peak District National Park Authority
Shelter

South East England Regional Assembly
West Northamptonshire Development Corporation

Appendix B : RHIS Template for Responses

THEMES	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES
1. Overall Budget	A. Same budget as 06-08 Priorities	
	A +10% Budget Priorities	
	A -10% Budget Priorities	
2. Affordable Homes & Market Renewal	B. Maintain Proportion of Funding for Affordable Homes	
	C. Method for Allocating Proportion of Funding to the Sub-Regions	
	D. Split between Social Rent & Intermediate Housing	

	E. Thematic Choices and Priorities e.g. HMR, Rural, Supported Housing, BME Housing Needs	
	F. Increase in HMR if RHP Increases	
	G. Bid Lead Approach to HMR	
Gypsies & Travellers	H. Site Grant Allocations	
Decent Homes Standard in Social Rented Sector	I. Future Allocations if Decent Homes Standard Met	
Decent Homes Standard in Private Sector	J. Funding to Exceed Decent Homes Standard	
	K. Funding based on Need & Performance	

Research & Development of Sub-Regional Work	L. Priority for Research & Support	
Additional Government Themes (re letter; 29.03.07)	X. Priority for Large Family Property	
	Y. Contribution to Mixed Communities	
	Z. Other Priorities	
Other Comments on RHIP		
Broader Issues on Regional Housing		