

### Item 3: Regeneration policy and practice – rehousing of tenants and leaseholders

Prepared for the Regeneration & Resources Scrutiny Sub-Committee, 30 November 2005

The table below suggests possible issues for consideration during a scrutiny review about decanting of estates.

Issue	Notes	Suggested by
<p><b>Communication</b> Are there arrangements in place to ensure that adequate communication is sustained with residents during the entire decant process?</p>	<p>Past evidence presented to scrutiny indicates that communication is generally very good in the early stages of a project, but drops off during the implementation phase.</p> <p>Contributing factors may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assumption that everyone in the area was in receipt of the original information about the project and will pass it on to anyone new</li> <li>• reliance of the T&amp;RA or voluntary project team members to keep people informed of developments; a communication channel which becomes less effective once people start being decanted.</li> </ul>	<p>Scrutiny team.</p> <p>From evidence and discussions heard at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Scrutiny 2004/05, Bellenden Renewal Scheme;</li> <li>• OSC, 11/10/05, Wooddene Estate [following deputation of Wooddene residents to Council Assembly on 14/09/05].</li> </ul>
<p><b>Security in areas being rehoused</b> Is there an increased fear of crime on decanting estates and how can this be minimised?</p>	<p>Security considerations raised during an OSC discussion about the Wooddene Estate were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether community alarm schemes would benefit all tenants remaining on the estate and therefore should be extended?</li> <li>• the need for a better police response to resident concerns</li> <li>• the need to ensure that adequate security arrangements are in place throughout the decanting process e.g. ensure that all lights and lifts are working.</li> </ul>	<p>Scrutiny team.</p> <p>From evidence submitted to OSC meeting, 11/10/05, Wooddene Estate [following deputation of Wooddene residents to Council Assembly on 14/09/05].</p>
<p><b>Impacts on other services</b> Is there cross-departmental working and consideration of the wider impacts of decanting schemes, and is any relevant information fed through to departments/ service delivery agencies early in the process?</p>	<p>The focus of previous scrutiny discussion was the impact of decanting on school populations. This was often sudden, and affects school budgeting, planning and staffing. However, services other than schools may also be affected by decanting.</p> <p>[The Joint Children’s Services Meeting of Education &amp; Youth and Health &amp; Social Care scrutiny sub-committees intends to revisit joint working arrangements in relation to Children’s Services. This may pick up on the concerns about the impact of decanting on schools.]</p>	<p>Scrutiny team.</p> <p>Picked up from discussions at Joint Children’s Services meeting of Education &amp; Youth and Health &amp; Social Care scrutiny sub-committees, 17/10/05.</p>

<p><b>Leaseholders: rehousing and compulsory purchase</b> How reasonable are the options available to leaseholders being decanted?</p>	<p>This relates to the council's policy and practice in respect of leaseholders in regeneration areas. For example, are they able to finance purchase of a new property so as to remain in or near the regenerated area. What are the council's legal obligations on the rehousing of leaseholders?</p>	<p>Chair, having regard to the deputation of from Wooddene tenants and residents to Council Assembly on 14/09/05.</p>
<p><b>Rehousing capacity</b> Is there sufficient rehousing capacity?</p>	<p>This concerns the likely problems of rehousing occupants of the Heygate and Aylesbury Estates at approximately the same time. What are the issues around 'right to return'?</p>	<p>Chair</p>