

Appendix I: Phase 2 (£23000 cap) and further Housing / Welfare Reforms - 2016

The benefit cap was reduced further in Autumn 2016.

Prior to this reduction, there were 243 households capped in the borough.

Between November 2016 and March 2017, a further 209 households had the cap applied.

In the first quarter of the current financial year (April – June 2017) a further 40 households have had the cap applied.

At the end of March 17 there were 331 households capped in the borough.

To date (end of June 2017) there are 336 households currently capped in the borough.

Table I – Breakdown of Impacted Families by Tenure

<u>By Tenure</u>	<u>At end of March 17</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>At end of June 17</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>% of 2013 TBC cases as comparator</u>
Council Tenants	76	23%	85	26%	20%
EOA/temp accommodation	20	6%	22	7%	
Housing Association tenants	131	40%	125	38%	20%
Private Tenants	104	31%	100	30%	60%
Total	331		332		

Table 2 - Potential Financial Impact by Household.

	Number of households losing the following amount per week due to Benefit Cap (end of March 17)	%	Number of households losing the following amount per week due to Benefit Cap (end of June 17)	%
£350.01 to £400	0	0%	0	0%
£300.01 to £350	0	0%	0	0%
£250.01 to £300	3	1%	2	1%
£200.01 to £250	4	1%	4	1%
£150.01 to £200	12	4%	16	5%
£100.01 to £150	32	10%	31	9%
£50.01 to £75	51	15%	51	15%
£75.01 to £100	53	16%	55	17%
£25.01 to £50	91	27%	91	27%
Up to £25	85	26%	82	25%
Total	331		332	

Summary Update on Engagement:

- The Welfare Reform Team continues to prioritise TBc referrals from the highest cap amounts, descending.
- WRT continue to refer to GLLaB for employment support, although households do not always engage. Monthly update meetings are held between WRT and GLLaB to identify any complex cases.

Appendix 2: Arrears and homelessness

- At the end of 2016/17 520 households were living in temporary accommodation. At the end of 2015/16 there were approximately 400.
- In 2016/17, RBG prevented 1765 households from becoming homeless through preventative casework compared with 1691 in 2015/16.
- At total of 414 tenants approached the council for assistance due to threat of eviction or eviction in 2016/17. Of these 379 were private sector tenants and 35 were approaches from RSL tenants.
- Royal Greenwich accepted 545 households as statutorily homeless compared with 450 in 2015/16. This is over twice the number that the service accepted in 2011/12.

Arrears and homelessness	12	13	14	15	2016/17			
	/13	/14	/15	/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Number of RSL tenants who approach the council for assistance due to threat of eviction or eviction	23	42	38	59	6	8	8	13
Number of private sector tenants who approach the council for assistance due to threat of eviction or eviction	58	435	455	525	104	107	76	92
Number of households accepted as homeless	290	232	365	450	143	116	158	128
Number of households currently living in temporary accommodation (snap shot at end of period)	235	293	397	1704	474	523	550	520
Number of households for whom homelessness has been prevented through casework support	1483	1423	1798	1691	472	407	409	477

Social Sector Size Criteria

- Just over 2000 Greenwich households were affected at the end of 2016/17. This is a reduction of just under 45% on the 3665 when the reforms were introduced.
- Just under 80% of households that are under occupying are doing so by just one bedroom

- 1157 (57%) of those affected are Council tenants. The number of affected council tenants has reduced by over 1,000 since the reform was introduced.
- The Majority of Discretionary Housing Payments are to those households affected the Social Sector Size Criterion.
- Since the reform was introduced 918 affected council households have registered for rehousing because they want to downsize.
- At total of 150 were successfully downsized to appropriate housing to meet their needs in 2016/17. Of these 96 have moved to smaller accommodation through allocation policy and 54 have been helped to move through mutual exchanges.

Council tenants seeking to downsize (cumulative)	Total 13/14	As at end of 14/15	As at end of 15/16	As at end of Q1 16/17	As at end of Q2 16/17	As at end of Q3 16/17	As at end of Q4 16/17
Number of affected council tenants who have registered for rehousing because they want to downsize	*177	420	507	878	876	903	918
- By 1 bed		179	251	529	524	573	538
- By 2 or more beds		241	256	349	352	366	381

Actual Moves	Total 13/14	Total 14/15	Total 15/16	Q1 16/17	Q2 16/17	Q3 16/17	Q4 16/17
Number of affected council tenants who have moved to smaller accommodation through allocation policy	134	132	131	35	39	12	10
Number of affected council tenants who move through mutual exchanges	64	67	59	15	9	19	11

Appendix 3: Greenwich Fairness Commission recommendations

Each recommendation was set against one of the five themes and a 'fairer policy' heading.

Education

No.	Recommendation
1	<p>Given the excellent provision and outcomes for children at early years stage, the Royal Borough of Greenwich should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on increasing Children's Centre take-up in the East and South areas• In the long term, expand the availability of excellent nursery places
2	<p>The Royal Borough should promote opportunities for children to experience tertiary education and workplace settings that raise aspiration and inform future career choices, perhaps through a partnership of Futureversity and Bromley Children's University.</p>
3	<p>The newly established Greenwich Partnership should create a sub-group as a "Progression Partnership" consisting of educational providers and relevant community groups</p>
4	<p>National government should investigate ways of introducing auto registration for pupils entitled to Free School Meals, in order to ensure that resources are reaching all eligible children.</p>
5	<p>Given the perception that the impact of higher proportions of pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disability on overall school performance is not fully included in school evaluations, the Royal Borough of Greenwich should initiate a dialogue with Ofsted about how to ensure this.</p>
6	<p>Schools should, with the support of the Progression Partnership, make greater use of peer mentoring as a tool to share the success of high-attaining pupils with low-attaining ones. Schools should also take advantage of the best practice from other schools through school-to-school improvement strategies.</p>
7	<p>Addressing underperformance at secondary level must continue to be a top priority for the Borough. The Council should work with schools to draw up a programme of action, drawing from the best available evidence of what works.</p>

8	Royal Borough of Greenwich Children's Services should work with schools to further balance the use of resources throughout a student's time at secondary school, and schools should establish a collective approach to improving Key Stage 3 outcomes through school-to-school improvement strategies.
9	Community groups and voluntary organisations in the Progression Partnership should develop a plan to address parental support and engagement at secondary level, and the Royal Borough should use its reach and resources to assist in this.
10	The Royal Borough should continue to support secondary school effectiveness through developing Peer Review and support networking; and in the longer term, increase the volume of high quality choices by supporting the set-up of new schools.
11	The Royal Borough should continue closely monitoring off-rolling to ensure that it is not being incorrectly used, and work to get exclusion levels below national averages.
12	The Royal Borough should work with other boroughs to identify best practice for those retaking GCSEs. It should encourage, through the Progression Partnership, more work across schools and colleges in the year 11/12 transition to assist young people in attaining English and maths GCSEs.
13	Further education providers should increase efforts to raise awareness of the provision of good further education and apprenticeship provision in Greenwich.
14	The Progression Partnership should establish a joined-up programme of support for young people progressing through secondary, to further education, and on to higher education.
15	In order to maximise the potential of the Apprenticeship Levy, the Royal Borough should co-ordinate employers to create a borough-wide Apprenticeship Levy strategy. This strategy should focus on the creation of a 'local offer' to support local young people into apprenticeships.

Employment

No.	Recommendation
1	Royal Borough of Greenwich stakeholders should develop formal and strategic links to increase interaction between educational institutions and employers/businesses through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising existing links into the educational institutions' network (e.g. ask governors to arrange internships/work experience in their fields)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising existing community engagement of youth services (including Participation People, The Point, Charlton Athletic Community Trust etc.) • A sponsorship scheme aligning organisations based in the borough with local residents • Setting aside space for a multipurpose hub
2	<p>Greenwich Association of Disabled People, Royal Borough of Greenwich and local employers should explore how residents with disabilities and learning difficulties can be supported into the job market, through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local work experience opportunities • Ongoing support once they have entered employment
3	<p>The evidence has brought to light that a wider conversation between the Royal Borough of Greenwich and Greenwich based Jobcentre Plus needs to take place, to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How residents, identified as economically inactive and wanting a job, can be identified and supported into the labour market • How residents in low paid, insecure work can be supported to find higher quality work • How benefit sanctions can be applied more fairly, to reduce the appeal and overturn figures. • Re-establishing a weekly Jobcentre Plus presence at Greenwich Local Labour and Business employment office
4	<p>Royal Borough of Greenwich should roll out its London Living Wage (LLW) initiative and target a further 100 Greenwich based businesses, to become LLW employers by the end of financial year 2017/18.</p>
5	<p>Royal Borough of Greenwich should join the Living Wage Friendly Funder Scheme.</p>
6	<p>The Government should change its minimum wage policy, so that the National Living Wage is paid to everyone 18 years of age and over.</p>
7	<p>South-East Chamber of Commerce and Greenwich Local Labour and Business should partner and establish a baseline of in-work training offered by local employers and encourage local employers to increase the amount of in-job training provided.</p>

8	Royal Borough of Greenwich should continue its Greenwich Local Labour Programme (GLLP) and expand eligibility to residents who are long-term (5 years+) unemployed. GLLP has incredible success with participants who join the scheme, especially with long-term unemployed residents. This best practice scheme should be shared as widely as possible with other local authorities.
9	<p>The Greenwich Partnership should include a business investment strand to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act as business champions, for future investment in the Borough • Identify investment opportunities • Develop a ‘Businesses in the Borough’ strategy, including a Social Enterprise action plan, to set out Greenwich’s shared ambitions for social enterprise in the Borough • Identify economic areas to join up and establish ‘protection zones’ for local businesses and start-ups, by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving business support to grow start-ups and creating a clear Royal Borough of Greenwich offer to businesses • Explore local procurement from public sector • Create incubation hubs for start-ups and small and medium sized enterprises

Health

No.	Recommendation
1	The findings of the Royal Borough’s bespoke public health project on mental health should be incorporated into Oxleas NHS Trust and Greenwich Clinical Commissioning Group’s ongoing work to improve children Adolescent Mental Health engagement plans. All organisations should embed the findings into their Children Adolescent Mental Health engagement plans.
2	More ambitions for children and young people’s mental health should be embedded within the South East London Sustainability and Transform Plan.
3	Implement a targeted weight management programme (especially for hard to reach groups and children).
4	The Good Food in Greenwich Food Poverty Sub-group should monitor levels of food poverty annually and develop responses to the information monitored.
5	Royal Borough of Greenwich should share best practice on uptake of Healthy Start Vouchers with other local authorities.

6	Royal Borough of Greenwich should partner with Feeding Britain to develop a checklist by which to regulate cooking facilities in Greenwich's private accommodation. Once created, this checklist should be incorporated into RBG's Landlord Accreditation Scheme.
7	Royal Borough of Greenwich should partner with local Children's Centres and identify which actions to tackle food poverty can be delivered via them.
8	Royal Borough of Greenwich should establish a forum that allows for cross-section engagement around health, to include health service providers, community and advocacy groups (as well as statutory and business sectors).

Housing

No	Recommendation
1	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should further promote developments that address outlined in the recent housing white paper (adequate sheltered accommodation, for instance, could help free up family homes).
2	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should continue to undertake regular assessments of need for specific groups (such as Gypsies and Traveller communities), despite the removal of the legal requirement to do so. It should maintain robust assessment data to ensure it can meet the future needs of these communities.
3	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should ensure it is thoroughly prepared for the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act in anticipation that applications may initially rise significantly. It should consider partnering with other boroughs to consult with local authorities in Wales (which previously introduced similar legislation) as they will have useful learning.
4	If judged cost-effective, the Royal Borough of Greenwich should consider expanding the downsizing incentive to those downsizing by one bedroom, through mutual exchanges, or potentially including three-way swaps or partnering with other boroughs.
5	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should lobby government to lift the Housing Revenue Account borrowing cap so that the Royal Borough can expand its own development programme. The Borough should, in the meanwhile, expand on its previous successes and actively seek out partnerships with housing associations and developers.

6	Royal Borough of Greenwich should review Meridian Home Start and identify what is preventing development with a view to kick-starting progress. It should identify where there is learning to be gained from other London boroughs.
7	Through its strategic asset review, the Royal Borough of Greenwich should identify and publish a list of available land, and where necessary identify challenges to its release.
8	National government must re-examine welfare changes in light of the impact on homelessness and the rising cost of Discretionary Housing Payments, and establish a system that limits the need for emergency relief to a minimum. In particular, the shared accommodation rate of Housing Benefit should be reviewed in the context of risks to vulnerable young people.
9	The Royal Borough should undertake works as identified necessary by the housing stock condition survey.
10	The Royal Borough should ensure that residents receive clear and frequent communications regarding maintenance works.
11	Developers, both private and social, should ensure the needs of local communities are central in new developments, and continue to encourage 'mixed communities'. The London Mayor's "Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration" should be followed.
12	The Royal Borough should introduce additional licensing for all Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs). It should also consider using 'Article 4 Directions' to limit the number of HMOs in a certain area, if this is identified as necessary and beneficial.
13	Building on the learning from the Private Rented Sector Housing Enforcement Programme as well as the experience of other boroughs, the Royal Borough should consider introducing selective licensing on areas or types of properties which have above average incidence of poor conditions, either through utilising the 20% maximum allowance, or by applying to the Secretary of State for further powers.

Financial inclusion

No	Recommendation
1	Create a Council 'onestop shop', for residents with long-standing multiple debts.
2	The Royal Borough should revert Council Tax support to 100% for the Borough's most vulnerable residents (those residents in receipt of disability living allowance and personal independence payment).

3	In the first year of leaving care, a young care leaver should receive a full Council Tax exemption, with an annual incremental increase (up until the age of 25 years old, where they would be expected to start paying the full amount).
4	National Government should undertake a fundamental review of the application of benefit sanctions.
5	Royal Borough of Greenwich and Greenwich Jobcentre Plus should partner to review the application of benefit sanctions at a local level.
6	Greenwich Foodbank employees should receive financial awareness training so that they are able to provide first level advice and, where appropriate, signpost Foodbank service users to specialists.
7	Royal Borough of Greenwich should continue to provide on-going support for residents with Nil Recourse to Public Funds, whilst investigating best practice within NRPF-specific services to maximise savings.

Fairer policy

No	Recommendation
1	The Royal Borough should establish a uniform and accessible tendering process, including uniform Pre Purchasing Questionnaires (PPQs), so that small organisations have adequate time to respond.
2	Council contracts should stipulate that organisations, delivering commissioned services, should have implemented healthier workplace charters and pay the London Living Wage (LLW). LLW should be provided to employees working within the Greater London area.
3	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should review current contracts and establish which Council contracts could be delivered by local businesses, in line with the Social Value Act.
4	The Royal Borough of Greenwich should create a Compliance Monitoring function, to monitor and review the outcomes of the above recommendations.
5	To enable more local businesses to deliver Council contracts, the Royal Borough of Greenwich should review its trading history and risk aversion criteria. The Council must remain risk averse, but the vigilance should be in proportion to the size of the contract