

# Public Document Pack

## **JOHN WARD**

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Philip Coleman, Member Services Manager  
Tel: 01243 534655 Email: pcoleman@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House  
1 East Pallant  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1TY  
Tel: 01243 785166  
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 1 - East Pallant House on **Tuesday 7 July 2015** at **9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

## SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

- 12 **Developing a New Strategy for the Visitor Economy** (Pages 1 - 3)  
Appendix 3 – Visit Chichester letter to Cabinet
- 18 **Review of the Internal Lettings Agency (Homefinder)** (Pages 4 - 9)  
Appendix 1 – Review of the Internal Lettings Agency (Homefinder) – this paper replaces Appendix 1 in your agenda.

Dear Councillors Mr. Dignum and Mrs. Keegan,

The Visitor Economy

Visit Chichester (VC), the Council's officially recognised Destination Marketing Organisation (DMO), understands that your Cabinet, at their meeting on the 7th July, will consider a reference from your Overview and Scrutiny Committee from their meeting in March 2015. Specifically, we understand that the Cabinet will be considering a recommendation that:

*'the Council sets out a brief but clear three to five year plan which sets the aspiration, establishes the baseline information and leads the initiative required to bring partners together to develop the visitor economy under one robust and coherent strategy'*

This recommendation is consistent with VC's own plans to review its Destination Management Plan (DMP) which expires at the end of this year.

As members of the Cabinet might be aware the decision to withdraw public funding from the tourism sector was made by the District Council in 2012. Since that date the only group working to sustain the promotion of tourism sector across our District has been VC. It must be noted that VC is made up entirely of unpaid industry sector professionals drawn from both the private and public sector, who give up significant amounts of their own time to support the local visitor economy. VC is supported, to a small extent, by paid marketing and administrative support on a scale consistent with its resources. VC enjoys no on-going public funding.

During the time since Chichester District Council withdrew its funding VC has:

- *Delivered many of the outcomes and objectives contained in the approved DMP particularly around marketing, social media, web-site and thematic developments*
- *Focussed on marketing the destination both locally and nationally – a financial imperative given the absence of public sector funding*
- *Provided a level of strategy input to groups such as LEADER and Chichester City Centre BID*
- *Contributed to the continued growth of the tourism economy, despite the recession, as identified in available Cambridge tourism statistics*
- *Developed a new interactive and mobile responsive website – one of only a handful of such tourism sites across the south coast*
- *Developed and expanded its social media presence on Twitter and Facebook*
- *Maintained its membership numbers*
- *Developed a relationship with adjoining areas to jointly market and promote tourism*
- *Continued to produce high quality print (holiday and attractions guides) to support the sector*
- *Provided continual support to tourism business on request around areas such as planning, marketing, and social media*

VC has met with your officers and Committee members during 2014/15 whilst the review has been ongoing. We have consistently stressed the fact that we wish to do more but that our ability is limited by a lack of resources and hampered by the absence of any public funding. We have invited the Committee and its task and finish group to work closely with us to design a solution that we can collectively take forward and deliver. We have received no response to that request and have been most disappointed with the rather insular approach adopted by the Committee. Indeed, the overall tone of the meetings has consistently been one of blame and criticism of VC, characterised by a lack of collegiality and respect for the work we have been doing. VC has stepped into the vacuum, occasioned by the then financial climate, and it is very disappointing that this effort remains unrecognised and unsupported. We cannot understand this approach and the Council has, by its own actions, contributed to the disaggregation of the sector further, for example by approving grants to separate organisations to develop tourism related websites without consultation with the District's recognised DMO, despite this being stipulated as part of the funding agreement, as known by officers. Moreover, CDC officers have a rather unrealistic expectation of VC in terms of destination management, as VS has no direct control or influence over many aspects of the visitor experience such as car parking, signage and the operation of visitor information centres.

VC has its own vision, which has been made known to your Task and Finish Group. This seeks to:

- *Develop a new Destination Management Plan to set and support the future direction of the visitor economy*
- *Attract funding to sustainably support the administration function of VC*
- *Further develop visitor themes across the District and beyond where appropriate, building on the capability within the recently developed website*
- *Improve representation on the DMO from senior members of key local organisations to provide a comprehensive "one voice" for the sector*

VC has been consistently criticised for not being strategic and lacking any long-term aspiration. This is a point we would strongly refute and the Council must recognise that grand aspirations can only be met if the resources are there to support them. With its available resources, VC has sought to prioritise key actions, particularly around ensuring the continued availability of print (still a significant prerequisite for visitors) and the development of a contemporary, engaging, and mobile responsive website that provides the shop-window for the local visitor economy. Notably all these actions are key strategic points included in Visit England's Modernising Visitor Information Action Plan.

VC does however, fully acknowledge that more could and should be done (as reflected in our aspirations above). The return of the District Council to this arena, with the potential of public sector funding support, will assist, particularly in attracting the private sector back when the withdrawal of public sector funding damaged that ability.

We very much hope that in considering any recommendations from your Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the pivotal role of VC in holding things together in the past and in being a major part of the solution, with public sector funding in the future, is recognised. VC has considerable assets, including its website, company structure, staff expertise and industry goodwill, which should help facilitate improved support for the District's tourism sector. We hope that the next piece of work can be undertaken in a much more positive and collegiate manner with VC playing a valued and leading role in the process.

We have not been privy to the report that will be submitted to you but await its publication with interest. We would very much appreciate, as the Council's approved DMO, an opportunity to address your meeting when you consider your report.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew Clegg". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'A'.

Dr Andrew Clegg  
Chairman of Visit Chichester

cc. S. Oates / J. Hotchkiss / P. Coleman

## Appendix to Agenda item 18

### Review of the Internal Lettings Agency (Homefinder)

#### Introduction

On 1 November 2011 the Cabinet approved the setting up of an in-house lettings agency, subject to review after 18 months. Commuted sums money not to exceed £105,000 over three years was set aside for the purpose to be used if the level of bad debt exceeded the projected amount.

On 8 October 2013 Cabinet considered a review and resolved that the internal lettings agency be continued subject to a further review after it had been running for three years. Cabinet also resolved that the £105,000 unspent commuted sums money allocated to the Homefinder Scheme be transferred to fund the Rural Enabling Officer post on a fixed term contract for up to three years as detailed in the Affordable Housing Delivery report (minute 483).

The agency was set up to assist the Council in dealing with the issues arising from the Localism Act 2011 and the welfare reforms. It was anticipated that welfare reforms would lead to an increase in homelessness because homes in the private rented sector would become unaffordable for some households. The initiative would also allow the Council to discharge its homelessness duty into the private rented sector in an attempt to break the link between homelessness and access to social housing.

The proposal was to manage dwellings on behalf of private landlords and to let to them to homeless households or those threatened with homelessness at the Local Housing Allowance Rate. The scheme was based on the model used in successful established schemes elsewhere, such as Exeter and South Hams.

The internal lettings agency commenced on 1 April 2012 and was called Homefinder. The various participation levels and benefits are set out in table 1 below.

**Table 1: Homefinder benefits**

	Service Provided	Cost
Homefinder Bronze	One month's rent in advance and a deposit bond.	Free
Homefinder Silver	As Bronze plus tenant find service, accompanied viewings, referencing, drawing up of tenancy agreements and free energy performance certificate	£150
Homefinder Gold	As Silver plus full management service and rent guarantee whilst property is occupied.	8% of rental income plus £150 for each new tenancy.

The outcomes to be achieved were as follows:

1. An increase in the supply of private rented dwellings sufficient to meet both the current demand, as well as the additional properties that will be required to enable us to discharge our homelessness duty into the private rented sector.
2. Outcomes to be measure by comparing the current level of access to the private rented sector with the levels of access achieved via this initiative. Tenancy

sustainment (the length of time a tenant remains in the property as a tenant) will also be measured.

It is accepted that outcome 1 was rather ambitious as the scheme was unlikely to meet the demand in full.

## Outcomes

The number of dwellings being managed by the Homefinder initiative is set out in Table 2 below. The number under full management is lower than the number projected in the Cabinet Report dated 1 November 2011.

**Table 2: Number of dwelling under full management**

	Number of dwellings under full management (Homefinder Gold) at year end.	
	Projected	Actual
Year 1	27	22
Year 2	54	34
Year 3	81	38

It has been difficult to attract landlords to join the scheme and let their properties at the Local Housing Allowance rate because the rental market in the district is buoyant and consequently landlords can let properties at substantially higher rents. Many households have been unable to buy homes due to the cost of housing in the district and the need to provide a substantial deposit. Consequently the demand for private sector rented dwellings has continued to increase.

Officers have conducted advertising campaigns in the local press, extolled the virtues of the service at three landlord forums and have written to all known landlords explaining the benefits of the service in order to attract more landlords to join the initiative at Homefinder Gold level.

The managed portfolio ranges from studio flats in Selsey to a three bedroom house in Chichester. The majority of the dwellings are in the Selsey area where the rent tends to be lower than the rest of the district but Homefinder does manage homes in Hambrook, Fernhurst and Tangmere.

Landlords appear to be satisfied with the service provided because only three properties have been withdrawn from the Homefinder Gold scheme. Two were withdrawn because the owners wished to sell the dwellings and the third because the unusual layout of the property made it difficult to let to households with young children and we were unable to find a suitable tenant.

Table 3, below, identifies the number of households that have been placed in the private rented sector since the initiative commenced along with the number of tenancies provided via the previous scheme known as the Private Sector Housing Access Scheme.

**Table 3: Households Housed per Year via Homefinder or the Private Sector Housing Access Scheme**

	Private Sector Housing Access Scheme				Homefinder		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Number Housed	32	36	38	37	77	61	39

The data demonstrates that during the first two years of operation Homefinder significantly increased the number of households placed in the private rented sector and by that measure alone the initiative must be considered to be making substantial progress.

However, in the third year the number of placements reduced for a number of reasons, mentioned below. Landlords have been increasingly reluctant to let to tenants in receipt of Housing Benefit because they are concerned that when Universal Credit is implemented they will no longer be able to receive direct payment of Housing Benefit.

The Local Housing Allowance Rate was changed from 1 April 2011 from the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market rent to the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market rent. This meant that from that date it became increasingly difficult to access properties at a rent affordable to low income households.

The other issue is that to an extent we have become a victim of our success because there has been very little tenant movement in the homes we manage through the Homefinder Gold scheme or that are accessed via the Homefinder Bronze scheme. Tenants and landlords appreciate the fact that the team can be relied upon to deal with issues that arise relating to the tenancies and this encourages stability. This is demonstrated by the fact that we have only created 44 tenancies in the Homefinder Gold properties in the three years that the scheme has been running.

Tenants are assured that the property they rent via the scheme is free from hazards that can affect their health and safety because all of the properties are inspected by a member of the Environmental Health to ensure that they meet the minimum housing standard before they are accepted as suitable for inclusion. This is an important factor because dwellings in the private rented sector are more likely to have a category 1 housing health and safety hazard than other types of housing. The housing stock modelling project 2015 identified that 19% of private rented sector properties have a category 1 hazard for excess cold.

### **Tenancy Sustainment Outcomes**

Tenancy sustainment work is carried to assist tenants, of properties that are not included in the Homefinder scheme, in order to prevent them becoming homelessness. The Homefinder Officer has successfully sustained 40 tenancies that without his intervention would have led to the tenant being evicted. In almost every case the tenant was in rent arrears and eviction would have led to the tenant becoming potentially intentionally homeless and this would have had a devastating impact upon the tenant's family.

An example of a sustainment case was a household with five children who had rent arrears in excess of £6,000. The Homefinder Officer negotiated with the landlord and

tenant and they agreed to a repayment plan of £120 per month to pay off the arrears, which allowed the tenant to retain the tenancy.

### Income and Costs

The projected income from management fees has proved to be optimistic and was based on the agency taking on three new gold level properties a month for the first three years with a drop-out rate of 25% per annum. The fee income is set out in Table 4 below:

**Table 4: Homefinder Fee Income**

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Projected Fee Income	£18,504	£36,648	£50,256
Actual Fee Income	£6,359	£15,459	£22,068
Actual Income as a Percentage of the Projected Income	34.4%	42.2%	43.9%

The report to Cabinet in November 2011 projected the cost of the scheme based on marginal costs with no account taken of staff costs. The Homefinder Manager costs were in the base budget and the Homefinder Officer was on a three year temporary contract funded by the homelessness prevention grant. It was envisaged that from year four onwards the income generated by Homefinder would be used as base budget growth to fund the Homefinder Officer post but this has not been achieved.

Savings made elsewhere have allowed the Housing Service to fund the Homefinder Officer post from the base budget so any future surplus income is available for re-investment or as a saving towards the budget deficit.

The cost of running the Homefinder Scheme from 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2015 is set out in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Cost of the Homefinder Initiative**

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	Total
Net Cost of Service in £s	-775	72,349	52,825	124,399

The costs for 2012/13 are lower than projected because there was an allowance of £20,000 made for bad debt, very little of which was used.

The budget for 2012/13 did not include any provision for staff cost because, as mentioned above, both members of staff working on the initiative were funded from other areas within the Housing Services budget. For 2013/14 onwards staff costs have been allocated to reflect the overall cost of the service, there have been commensurate savings in other areas within the Housing Service.

### Value for Money

In order to consider the value for money that Homefinder has provided in the first three years operation it is appropriate to add the staff costs for year one into the equation. If

staff costs of £60,080 (taken from the 2013/14 closing balance) was added to the net cost of running Homefinder during 2012/13 (-£775) it would provide an overall cost of £59,305 for 2012/13 and a three year cost of £184,479.

Homefinder has housed 177 households threatened with homelessness from 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2015 and sustained an additional 40 tenancies. The unit cost for each of these homelessness preventions was thus £850 (£184,479 divided by 217). For comparison the average cost of placing a household in bed and breakfast accommodation for 10 weeks is £3,150. Whilst these costs could be met by Housing Benefit many households in such accommodation fail to complete or claim form or fail to provide sufficient evidence for the claim to be processed.

If we had not prevented homelessness in the 217 cases there could have been significant impacts upon not only our budgets, but partners such as the Police, West Sussex County Council, Stonepillow and the National Health Service. It is likely that a number of applicants housed via the Homefinder scheme would have become street homeless. Some street homeless people have a tendency to engage in criminal activity and often have drug and or alcohol issues. These behaviours impact upon the local Police force, mental health services, community services and Stonepillow. They also have an adverse impact upon the community in general and make the city centre less attractive to residents and visitors.

Research carried out in 2007 by Herriot-Watt University indicated that preventing homelessness can save money when compared to the cost of helping someone who is already homeless. It was estimated that the cost to the public purse of providing temporary accommodation and re-housing afterwards amount to £5,300 per case per year.

## **The Future**

Homefinder is an integral part of the Council's work to prevent homelessness and in its absence we would have to deal with a significantly higher number of homeless applications. This would lead to our temporary accommodation at Westward House being at full capacity and would result in the Council having to utilise expensive bed and breakfast accommodation.

Homefinder should strengthen its links with landlords and local lettings agents in order to increase the supply of private rented sector dwellings at the Local Housing Allowance Rate. To that end we are running a joint landlords forum with the National Landlords Association so that we can promote the scheme.

It also should be considered whether it may be advantageous to offer a full management service at no charge to the landlord in order to entice landlords to provide accommodation at an affordable rent. At the present time landlords are expected to provide accommodation at the Local Housing Allowance Rate and then pay a management fee of 8% plus VAT. This means that their income will be considerably less than if they let it at a market rent through a commercial letting agency. Officers will explore this option when undertaking a review of the Council's Housing Strategy.

## Conclusions

Whilst the Homefinder scheme has not achieved level of income that was projected it has met the key objective of the initiative to improve access to the private rented sector for households who are homeless or threatened with homelessness.

The evidence demonstrates that Homefinder has increased the number of properties that the Council has been able to access in the private rented sector at the Local Housing Allowance rate. This is particularly impressive given that the local private rented sector market is very buoyant with a high level of demand with commensurate high rental levels.

The Homefinder scheme has reduced the burden on the Housing Options Team, which is experiencing an increasing demand for housing advice as a result of the welfare reforms and the demand is likely to continue to increase when Universal Credit is fully implemented and benefit expenditure is reduced.

Homefinder provides excellent value for money at net cost of £850 per homelessness case prevented. In the absence of Homefinder the Council's costs in discharging its duties to the 217 applicants assisted through the scheme the costs would have far exceeded the cost of running Homefinder.

Tenants obtaining a home through the scheme have the security of knowing that the home meets the minimum housing standards and will be free from hazards that could impact upon their health and safety.

Lastly, Homefinder has a positive impact upon vulnerable households that are threatened with homelessness. Without the scheme there would be an increase in homelessness, which may result in an increase in rough sleeping or placements into temporary accommodation including bed and breakfast.