

AGENDA

Meeting **Housing Committee**

Date **Wednesday 8 May 2019**

Time **2.00 pm**

Place **Committee Room 5, City Hall, The
Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/housing

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts where you can also view past meetings.

Members of the Committee

Sian Berry AM (Chair)

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair)

Andrew Boff AM

Leonie Cooper AM

Tony Devenish AM

Nicky Gavron AM

David Kurten AM

A meeting of the Committee has been called by the Chair of the Committee to deal with the business listed below.

Ed Williams, Executive Director of Secretariat
Monday 29 April 2019

Please note that this agenda was published ahead of the Annual Meeting of the London Assembly on 2 May 2019. Subject to the Assembly's decisions, membership of the Committee might change.

Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer; telephone: 020 7084 2825; email: jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk; minicom: 020 7983 4458

For media enquiries please contact Funmi Olutoye, Communications Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 7983; Email funmi.olutoye@london.gov.uk. If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf.

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা assembly.translations@london.gov.uk এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے assembly.translations@london.gov.uk



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda
Housing Committee
Wednesday 8 May 2019**

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

2 Declarations of Interests (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Jonathan Baker, jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk, 020 7084 2825

The Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Note the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

3 Minutes (Pages 5 - 78)

The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 March 2019 and 2 April 2019 to be signed by the Chair as correct records.

The appendices to the minutes set out on pages 5 to 40 and 45 to 78 are attached for Members and officers only but are available from the following area of the Greater London Authority's website: www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/housing

4 Summary List of Actions (Pages 79 - 84)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Jonathan Baker, jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk, 020 7084 2825

The Committee is recommended to note the outstanding actions arising from its previous meetings.

5 Action Taken under Delegated Authority (Pages 85 - 94)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Jonathan Baker, jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk, 020 7084 2825

The Committee is recommended to note the action taken by Sian Berry AM, the Chair of the Housing Committee during the 2018/19 Assembly year, under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members, namely to agree the Committee's response to a call for evidence from the Affordable Housing Commission.

6 Help to Buy in London (Pages 95 - 98)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Lorraine Ford; scrutiny@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4394

The Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Agree the areas for consideration set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report and note the report as background to the discussion with invited guests and notes the subsequent discussion.**
- (b) Delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.**

7 Housing Committee Work Programme (Pages 99 - 102)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Lorraine Ford, scrutiny@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4394

The Committee is recommended to;

- (a) Note the remainder of its meeting dates in the 2019/20 Assembly year, which are subject to approval at the Annual Meeting of the Assembly on 2 May 2019, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report.**
- (b) Note that the topic for its meeting on 13 June 2019 will be a review of the Affordable Housing Monitor, as agreed at the meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee on 8 April 2019.**
- (c) Delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the scope and terms of reference for the Committee's review of the Affordable Housing Monitor on 13 June 2019.**

8 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 13 June 2019 at 2.00 pm in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: Housing Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 May 2019

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests¹;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

¹ The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

Member	Interest
Tony Arbour AM	
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	European Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Member, LB Bexley
Shaun Bailey AM	
Sian Berry AM	Member, LB Camden
Andrew Boff AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Leonie Cooper AM	Member, LB Wandsworth
Tom Copley AM	Member, LB Lewisham
Unmesh Desai AM	
Tony Devenish AM	Member, City of Westminster
Andrew Dismore AM	
Len Duvall AM	
Florence Eshalomi AM	
Nicky Gavron AM	
Susan Hall AM	Member, LB Harrow
David Kurten AM	
Joanne McCartney AM	Deputy Mayor
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Keith Prince AM	Alternate Member, European Committee of the Regions
Caroline Russell AM	Member, LB Islington
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Fiona Twycross AM	Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience; Chair of the London Local Resilience Forum
Peter Whittle AM	

[Note: LB - London Borough]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
 - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
 - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

UNLESS

- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.

- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:
<https://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985	
List of Background Papers: None	
Contact Officer:	Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer
Telephone:	020 7084 2825
E-mail:	jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES

Meeting: Housing Committee

Date: Tuesday 26 March 2019

Time: 3.30 pm

Place: Committee Room 5, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/housing

Present:

Sian Berry AM (Chair)

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair)

Andrew Boff AM

Leonie Cooper AM

Tony Devenish AM

Florence Eshalomi AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Nicky Gavron AM, for whom Florence Eshalomi AM substituted, and David Kurten AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

- 2.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

2.2 **Resolved:**

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2019 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 Resolved:

That the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted.

5 Action Taken under Delegated Authority (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

5.2 Resolved:

That the recent action taken by Sian Berry AM under delegated authority, namely to agree, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, the Committee's response to the government consultation, *Biodiversity net gains in new developments*, be noted.

6 Response to Housing Committee Report - Hearing Resident Voices in Social Housing (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

6.2 Resolved:

(a) That the Mayors response to the Committee's report, *Hearing Resident Voices in Social Housing*, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

(b) That the Report Impact Review, attached at Appendix 2 to the report, be noted.

7 Update on the use of Transport for London Land to Build Homes (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on an update on the use of Transport for London (TfL) Land to Build Homes to the following invited guests:

- Graeme Craig, Commercial Development Director, TfL;
- Daniel Lovatt, Head of Property Development, TfL;
- Councillor Clare Coghill, Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest; and
- Lianna Etkind, Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust.

7.2 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 1**.

7.3 During the course of the discussion, Members requested the following additional information from Graeme Craig and Daniel Lovatt, TfL:

- Provide an update in March 2020 on how TfL are progressing towards their March 2021 housing target;
- Provide confirmation when the first residents will move into a home built on TfL land;
- Provide detail on the sites where TfL are working in partnership with Network Rail and how the two organisations are working together;
- Circulate the design charter used by TfL in discussions with developers;
- Provide information as to whether the procurement processes differ for those developers that are on the Framework Panel, compared to those developers that are not.

7.4 The Chair stated that, due to time constraints, the Committee had been unable to ask questions on TfL's partnerships with larger developers. She would therefore write to Graeme Craig and Daniel Lovatt, TfL on those question areas.

7.5 At the end of the discussion the Chair thanked the guests for their attendance and helpful contributions.

7.6 Resolved:

- (a) That the report and subsequent discussion be noted.**
- (b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the meeting.**

8 Housing Committee Work Programme (Item 8)

8.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

8.2 **Resolved:**

That the progress on the work programme, as set out in the report, be noted.

9 Date of Next Meeting (Item 9)

9.1 The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, 2 April 2019 at 10.00 am in Committee Room 5, City Hall.

10 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 10)

10.1 There were no items of business that the Chair considered to be urgent.

11 Close of Meeting

11.1 The meeting ended at 17.31 pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer; telephone: 020 7084 2825;
Email: jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk; minicom: 020 7983 4458

London Assembly Housing Committee – Tuesday, 26 March 2019**Transcript of Item 7 – Update on the use of Transport for London Land to Build Homes**

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That brings us to item 7, which is today's main item, an update on the use of Transport for London (TfL) land to build homes. Our Members' briefings cover the item in more detail. Can I welcome our guests? We have Graeme Craig, who is the Commercial Development Director at TfL; we have Daniel Lovatt, who is the Head of Property Development at TfL; we have Councillor Clare Coghill, who is the Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest, where some of this land exists; and we have Lianna Etkind, who is the Campaigns Manager for the London Community Land Trust (CLT) that has won some TfL land so we will be talking to you later on.

I wanted to get started on looking at how TfL is doing at reaching the quite ambitious target we have discussed before in the Committee. Previously, we have produced a report *Homes Down the Track* that recognised how ambitious this was and made recommendations for how to speed things up.

Before we start, we asked in advance of this meeting for updated data on progress towards the target. We first asked you on 16 January [2019], Graeme, so we would have time to give it proper scrutiny. Unfortunately we have received a lot of information in a big table, but we received it only a few days ago. We have not had time to really delve into that properly, so we are going to do some delving during the meeting. Can I ask why it took so long to get data on what is going on with your developments to the level of detail that we wanted?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): First of all, I apologise for the length of time that it took. What we were wrestling with is that it is live data so literally every week we have new information. We are also conscious it is commercially sensitive data. We are making decisions, again literally every week, with partners, so it is trying to provide information that is meaningful but not making it transparent to those people who are aware which partner it is that we are working with. We are also conscious we shared information in which we are being more public than we have been in the past with our plans for schemes, conscious we have not gone through proper process, local engagement and talking to boroughs.

All of which really is not an excuse, I am not going to pretend we ought not to have had the information before we did. We were trying to reconcile doing things properly, avoiding procurement risks, sharing information and we were guilty, I think, of trying to perfect what came to you rather than giving you the information. In general, I will say, we can always be much more transparent and much clearer in a private session. Therefore individually, or collectively as a Committee, if you ever want to delve into detail - I suspect this is part of what we will come to in the session itself - and on particular schemes you want to understand not only what it is here but what we actually think is going to happen and how we might get to those points, it is always much easier for us to be more transparent in a behind-closed-door session.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you very much for that.

Andrew Boff AM: Just on that point --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Sorry, Andrew, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: -- we are going to ask these questions again in future. Can you give us an undertaking that in future when we ask for it we can get something?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes, of course.

Andrew Boff AM: We totally understand that there are certain things that may have to be left out, we are not silly like that. However, it does get in the way of proper scrutiny if we wait until literally hours before the meeting before we can get data, so I would appreciate that.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I apologise, yes. Point noted.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): The other thing I wanted to ask is that obviously it is helpful to get this information out into [the] public [domain] as soon as possible. I appreciate what you are saying about essentially not wanting to alarm local communities by saying, "We want to build 1,000 homes on this site" and for them not to know what is going on. I can totally see that you might say in the local community, "Where are these plans? What plans have been made? What is being kept from us?" However, if this is all the information there is getting it out in public is quite useful and starts a conversation. Potentially then local groups can start making their own plans, as it were, and coming forward with ideas for you. I think it is good to be transparent.

Are you planning to put this kind of information out on websites in a more engaging and transparent form in future? We are the Housing Committee, people might come to look at what we are doing to find out more, but we are not the main method of reaching the public on what TfL is doing.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We have a lot of information on our website. It is a significant task to maintain that up to date when literally every week elements of it change. There is more we could do to make it up to date and there is more we could do to point people towards that website.

I think we will come to it, but over the course of this year we will be bringing planning applications at a rate of about one a week. There is no avoiding the fact that there is a huge amount of activity. We have to take local people with us. Our ability to take local people with us is probably the single biggest challenge that we have in delivering the programme, again that is something we will come to. It is fair to say that we, as I recognise, have to do much, much more in order to make sure people are sighted in advance in terms of understanding the scale of development activity that we are undertaking across the capital.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Now we will start to talk about the actual data you have given us, if that is OK. What we were discussing in the previous report that we wrote was the fact that TfL set an original deadline of March 2020 for 10,000 homes to be started on its quite extensive land. As I understand it, that deadline has now been moved back to March 2021, to fit in more with the funding schedule. However, how many starts do you think are going to meet that original deadline?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I guess two things to say, we have been working to the March 2021 [deadline] for, I think, in excess of two years, yes, it was since the end of 2016 that we have been working to 2020/21. As long as we have had a resourced programme, a funded programme, we had an aspiration that we set out in terms of 2020 but for as long as we have had a plan, a real plan, that plan has been pointing us to starting on site to deliver 10,000 homes by March 2021 and therefore we are not measuring against where we are by March 2020. Realistically we will have started on sites that will deliver hundreds of homes, potentially - depending on timescales - maybe reaching 1,000, something

like that. There is no avoiding the fact that this is a back-ended programme. For the vast majority of sites we will start construction on those sites during the year 2020/21.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): What you are saying is essentially, possibly 1,000 by the original deadline of 2020 but then a huge number in the final year to meet, more or less, the deadline you were going to meet of 10,000 homes?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes, reiterating the fact that from the time that we had a programme - a resourced programme, a funded programme - for two and a half years we have been working to a deadline of March 2021. That is what we are focusing in on. Sat here, we have an activity, we have a plan. We are not complacent by any means, but we believe we will hit starting on site to deliver 10,000 homes by March 2021.

I am perfectly happy, of course, to give you updates on how we are doing against the earlier date of March 2020, but our focus is on achieving the target we have agreed with the Homes for Londoners Board of 10,000 starts by March 2021.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): In terms of the stage things are at the moment, how many are actually under construction now? How many have planning permission? How many are with selected partners and you have a deal? Where are you at in terms of those different stages?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We have started construction on 313. In terms of where we have submitted planning, it would be almost 5,000, it is 1,250 over the course of the last 12 months. The macro position is that literally by the end of this week we will have partners identified for all 10,000. That then gives us two years in order to get planning and get onsite across the 51 sites, the 320 acres, which will deliver the starting on site to deliver 10,000 homes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): You said by the end of this week you will have partners for all 10,000 homes?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We are at 7,000 at the moment.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): You are going to sign a deal on 3,000 this week?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We are going to appoint a partner to deliver the build-to-rent portfolio, 3,000, by Friday.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): There are still days left.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We will ask you more questions about that, but you cannot tell us who that is today though?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We are at the end of a live procurement process that has not quite finished. Parts of it will be commercially sensitive, so I can talk about what I can talk about. There are probably three bidders watching this session, for example, so we just need to

be very careful about what we talk about here so as not to prejudice the procurement process and be transparent.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): OK, great. In terms of small sites, what proportion will the small sites contribute towards the target?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Last year we brought to market ten sites, 198 homes. In November last year we brought forward Woolwich, which was 45. We have another series of sites that we have passed over to the Greater London Authority (GLA) and will be issuing a press release possibly as early as next week that those are coming to market. That from memory - it is on my briefing note somewhere - is probably again another 90 or so sites.

Andrew Boff AM: Ninety sites?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Sorry, 90 homes. We have eight more sites, 90 homes. In total, 300 or so, about 3%.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): How many small sites is that in total?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Twenty roughly, 19. Again, we will come to small sites. Small sites are, from our point in view, in some respects, no less, no more straightforward. We can hit the targets but in order to hit the targets we have to make sure that if we bring a site forward it can be developed out. We cannot afford to start on a site and then fail to bring it forward. All of our sites are operationally constrained in some way so we have to be clear - whether we are working with large developers, community land trusts or anyone else - if we are bringing a site forward we are confident that it can be brought forward. We do a lot of work upfront in terms of understanding, quantifying and mitigating operational and planning risk. We absolutely think that bringing small sites is important. It is a fantastic opportunity for us to work with a different range of organisations than we would on the large sites. There is opportunity for innovation and there is opportunity for high-quality design. We do have a discrete team that focuses in on small sites and there is a lot of effort that we put in, in order to bring those forward.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That brings me on to the next question really. All of the information on these charts relates to quite a few sites but definitely not all of your land. What has determined whether something appears on these tables? What has determined the small sites that you give us? There is further potential in your land to bring forward sites, is there not, after these are done?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): There is indeed. When I think about small sites it will tend to be --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Big sites as well I am asking about.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): If we think about small sites first, we will end up bringing to market something between one in five and one in ten of the small sites that we first look at. There are reasons why we are not in a position to bring those forward. Sometimes we are not able to bring it forward just at that point in time, but we continue to keep a watching brief on that site and look to bring it forward at some point in the future. It is by no means the case that when we start feasibility on a site that by any point we are confident that that individual site can be brought forward. There is a lot of work, sometimes months of work, which has to go in upfront.

In total, individual parcels of land, I think we have 10,000 individual parcels of land across London. As you know well, 5,700 acres - 1.5% of land in London - is held by TfL, again reiterating that includes roads, tracks, stations and depots. This is all in some way operationally constrained land but clearly we have been, and continue to be, focused on how we might unlock the maximum amount of that land.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We got the data late, we have not made a total of the amount of hectares of land that is on these tables. Can you tell us how much in area you have brought forward so far?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Three hundred and twenty acres.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Out of potentially?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Five thousand and seven hundred.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Five thousand and seven hundred is your developable land or just your land?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): That is all the land we have including, as I say, the tracks, the stations and the roads.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): What proportion of the potentially developable land have you brought forward in these schemes so far?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Everything that we have identified to date, you will not be surprised to know. We do the work, we identify the opportunity and if we can then bring forward we are keen to bring it to market as fast as we can. We have every incentive in the world - from a financial point of view and from a housing point of view - to bring forward land as fast as we can. There is not some reservoir of land that we are hanging onto. If we can bring it forward then we do so. We have 51 sites, 320 acres, to deliver the first 10,000 homes. I think we are at the point now where we have a plan and it is a credible plan. Not in any way downplaying the risks but I think we are confident we can hit those first 10,000 homes. Our focus is now therefore on where the next 10,000 homes are going to come from, maybe we can talk about that later.

I am also conscious of the fact that we have identified, we believe, sites that could deliver 2.4 million square feet of commercial space and we are keen to work on those, which I know goes beyond the strict remit of this Committee. However, obviously again from a financial point of view it is of interest to TfL. Clearly, there is also the separate team working on small sites and we are keen to continue to progress bringing those forward as fast as we can.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): I had a query about the Earl's Court development. That is obviously a huge chunk - 1,508 I can see on here - of the homes that are due to be built. It seems to be in limbo at the moment. Some of us, like myself, might be welcoming the prospect of a new planning application coming forward with a lot more affordable housing - because, I have to say, it is at a rather pitiful level - and potentially the West Kensington and Gibbs Green estates to be handed back to Hammersmith and Fulham, which is what the Mayor has said he wants. Is this delay going to have an impact on your ability to deliver 10,000 starts by 2021?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We need to find a solution for Earl's Court. The Mayor has made plain he wants to see the two estates handed back. The Mayor has also made plain, and we share, that he wants to see a London Plan compliant scheme brought forward. We are in discussions with the GLA, with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham as well as the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and, of course, Capco [Management Consulting Company]. Ultimately we are talking here about, from an Earl's Court point of view, 26 acres of cleared site. That is 26 acres of cleared site that can be home to thousands of Londoners who need a home.

I am also conscious that we have a depot site, Lillie Bridge Depot, with 16 acres that we own unencumbered. That is currently a heavily used operational depot. We do believe that the facilities undertaken on that site could be moved elsewhere, which potentially gives us a further 16 acres.

That is a total of 42 acres of West London where we would be keen to see thousands of homes and a significant community being built around those three stations. We are keen to see it brought forward. We are in discussions, as I say, with interested parties and hope that in the months ahead we would be in a position to announce a plan that would enable that site to be brought forward.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Do you envisage that plan will be with or without Capco, or is that not a question you can answer in a public meeting?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): At this stage my main focus is that we have a plan that is a London Plan compliant programme. That really is the focus.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Going back to some of those targets and some of the sites that have been identified, you will recall that shortly after the elections there was an announcement from TfL - I think you were quoted in that press release - around Landmark Court, which is my constituency in Southwark, and the ambition to build I think it was at that time 120 homes. When the preferred developers were selected in July 2017 that figure had changed to 80 homes, again still quite high but not as high as we would like to see. This is a site that TfL has owned for over 25 years plus, a site that was part of the original Jubilee line. The ambition from the Mayor and TfL to develop on this site and bring forward homes has essentially been sat on for years. I was quite surprised - a number of people were surprised - when the latest announcement for that site was identifying 35 homes and of that only eight would be for social rent.

How did we get to a situation where - again, everyone is definitely agreeing we need to bring forward new homes on TfL land and there is a great ambition right across TfL and the Mayor - an announcement of 120 is now an announcement of 35 and of that 35 only eight go to local residents in terms of social rent? Where were those changes and how were they agreed in those discussions with the developers?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It is a great example of the challenges we face on an individual site-by-site basis. The 120 homes was based on a fully-residential scheme. When we came to have the first conversations with the London Borough of Southwark they made plain they saw that as being a mixed-use site, which was also the feedback we got from the developers to whom we spoke. The initial fall from 120 homes to 80 was brought about because we were looking not at a fully-residential scheme but a mixed-use scheme. The most recent development is that London Borough of Southwark officers requested we reduce down the scale in height, which resulted in a loss of 2,000 square metres from the site. We absolutely understand where London Borough of Southwark officers are coming from, but we are then faced with how we deal with that in terms of the site we bring forward.

I have a number of targets that I have to hit. Two of the important targets I have to hit is that as a team we must bring forward those 10,000 homes with a start by March 2021 and deliver the 50% affordable housing as an average across the piece. As well as those ambitious housing targets I also have ambitious financial targets because, of course, all the revenue that we raise gets reinvested in the transport network.

In this particular case, the values are much stronger in that part of Southwark for commercial rather than housing. The view we came to was with that loss of 2,000 square metres we would reduce down the residential and maintain the commercial. Obviously, that is something we gave significant thought to. We could have taken a different view but if you look at the financial quantum in relation to the number of homes the impact was £175,000 per home as the differential between reducing down at that particular location given overall reduced density. By reducing down commercial rather than residential £175,000 per home. Given the targets we have across the piece the decision that we came to was that clearly we still need to hit the 10,000 across the piece but we are better off investing in order to deliver housing on other sites across London. This is one where, on balance, we would reduce down the residential to 35 units from a financial point of view, notwithstanding the fact that clearly we still have to hit the 10,000 and we have to hit the 50% affordable as an average across the whole portfolio.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Correct me if I am wrong, Graeme. The initial proposal for the 120 homes would have been worked out with your team and additional TfL planners in housing to say, "This can be achieved on this site"?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): An exercise undertaken, yes, probably three years ago that was looking at a fully-residential scheme. In response to the question of how many homes could we build on that site we came up with a view of 120, but that was pre-discussions with any developers and pre-discussions with the London Borough of Southwark.

Florence Eshalomi AM: It is going back to the question around your targets and how you are going to reach this. TfL and your team are looking at the various sites that TfL own, not Southwark own, so essentially it is up to TfL what is built on those sites in discussion with the planning authorities. If TfL is taking this view on a number of sites that it owns you could be going back and forth, "Actually we will not build the homes, this site is more lucrative in terms of revenue". Is this the case we are going to have on all these other sites going forward, some of them are still in development, when you have those additional discussions? If that is the case you are going to struggle to hit this target that you have, which is very ambitious and that all of us want to see.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): The single biggest risk that we have right now is getting these sites through planning. If you go back two or three years I would have said the closest risk at that stage was identifying the sites to bring forward. Then the risk becomes: how do we get the developers, the partners, in place? Let us not underestimate the challenge of procuring those numbers of sites.

We have got to the point where, literally at the end of this week, we will have partners on board for 51 sites, 320 acres and 10,000 homes. Without question the challenge we have now is getting through planning, as I say, at the rate of one a week. That places a significant strain on the 20 boroughs we need to talk to. It also is a significant strain, from our point of view, in terms of managing all of those communication and engagement activities across London.

I am confident we will get planning but doing so at the pace that is required in order to hit these numbers is extraordinary. Part of what we will have to do in order to achieve that is to work very closely with the boroughs on an individual site-by-site basis.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We will have some more questions on that shortly, sorry. That is useful to know.

Florence Eshalomi AM: That is fine. My plea is that if that is the case - all of us fully appreciate you have to work with a range of developers - maybe TfL should be looking at which developers you are working with and seek to work with developers who are going to bring forward the aspiration of building more homes, not just looking at the profits and revenue. I am on the [Assembly's] Transport Committee and fully appreciate TfL's finances, but we have waiting lists of over 25,000 people in various boroughs, including the two boroughs I represent. If we are going to be looking at sites that TfL own and going back to, "OK, we will take the revenue instead of the homes", it is not helping anyone.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): All I can say is that part of our job is to balance those things. Ultimately, the decisions are made within TfL but in conjunction with City Hall and we have to make the call, which involves seeking to balance our objectives across the portfolio with what we can achieve on an individual site-by-site basis.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Thank you.

Andrew Boff AM: You said your main concentration or task at the moment is to ensure that you have a London Plan compliant programme, is that correct? Tell me I am not right if I have misunderstood what you said, I thought that was what you said.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I said we have targets to deliver 10,000 homes by March 2021 and to deliver an average of 50% affordable housing for all those sites brought forward post May 2016. Whether or not that is what I said, that is what I ought to have said.

Andrew Boff AM: Thank you for that, it makes it clearer. To what extent has that 50% target meant you have had to delay bringing sites to the market?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It has not delayed us. It means we have to work harder. We have to look across the piece and balance which are the sites that we might be bringing forward at 35% to 40% affordable housing versus that we might bring forward at 50%, 75% or 100%.

There are few organisations that have ever sought to do this amount of development across London. We have built up a brilliant team across development, communications, planning and engineering. We have a fantastic team. Make no avoiding, we have to work hard in order to deliver the affordable housing and to balance that with the financial targets. I would say that we have hit our financial targets every year. By the end of this year, as we did last year, we will have brought forward over 3,000 homes to market and we will have hit 50% affordable housing. I am not saying it is straightforward, but we have been able to achieve it last year and this year, and expect to do the same next year.

Andrew Boff AM: From that initial aspiration of bringing 10,000 homes forward you are saying you have delivered 3,000?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): As the first wave of activity, we obviously have to bring sites to market. Last year as well as this year we have the partners in place for 3,000 homes in each of those years.

Andrew Boff AM: We are still stuck with this back-ended programme where we have to be confident you are going to be able to start on site in 2021. Why are you so confident you can do that?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Can I just say there is no avoiding the fact it is a back-ended programme. If you are literally taking operational land, carparks or whatever it is and having to do the work to understand the operational constraints, address those, clean up the site, have clarity on the title [deed], bring it to market, get a partner on board and get planning, there is no avoiding the fact that takes years. Particularly if you are talking about hundreds of acres and literally tens of sites.

The reason I am confident sat here? I am confident sat here because we have a programme, we have a team, we have the partners in place, and we have very good relationships with boroughs across London. I am not for a second saying this is straightforward, not least because it is not within our control. We are dependent upon the boroughs, working with them in order to get planning. It is not whether we get planning, it is getting planning, then all the other things required to enable us to get on site and doing that at a pace across London whatever happens with the vast majority of sites and the vast majority of homes. I am not pretending there will not be particular issues on individual sites.

Andrew Boff AM: Is this where you expected to be in 2016? Have you brought the schemes forward that you thought you would?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I think the scale of opportunity is considerably larger. I have been impressed with the team we have been able to assemble and the work they have done. For me there is no question that London will be a better place as a consequence of the work we have done.

Andrew Boff AM: I do not deny that, and you are working hard to do it. However, is this where you expected to be in 2016 or have you had to scale back your aspirations since 2016?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): The target was that we would bring forward 3,000 homes a year this year and last year, which is what we have done, and we have done so hitting 50% affordable housing. We are on track and getting to the point, with two years to go to March 2021, where we are in a position where we have the partners in place. We then have two years in order to get planning and start on site. That is where I hoped we would be and that is where we are.

Andrew Boff AM: You are not behind schedule in any way?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): No.

Tony Devenish AM: You basically said that the boroughs now are your most important partner in terms of getting it through planning. Can I put to you, Graeme, that the other big issue is the absorption rate with particularly the residential sales market dipping somewhat and perhaps, part of the mix, the retail market again dipping? Are you sure that risk is not as big a risk - that your development partners may come back to you on some of those schemes - as the planning process?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I was talking about the single biggest risk. Again, I am not pretending for a second that that is the only risk we have, whether it is construction costs or access to labour. We will have shortly - within 18 months to two years - 7,000 people employed in construction on these sites, which is what we need. That is part of the reason why - we may yet come to this - we are investing in construction skills training, in order to make sure we have access to the workload we need. We have not talked about access to capital. There is a whole variety of risks that anyone seeking to build thousands of homes across hundreds of acres in London would face, even if those organisations were not undertaking this from a standing start.

In terms of absorption rates, really this comes to build-to-rent, which we will cover in more detail. On the face of it, having mid-market build-to-rent on the transport network is the safest residential investment anywhere in London. Part of the reason why that is attractive to us as a number of long-term revenue is the fact that it is the single deepest market in London, and we are confident about being able to develop out at pace and confident of being able to lease those properties. For us it is not just starting on site, I am conscious again that is what the initial target is, but ultimately it is getting these sites built out as fast as we can and getting people into those homes. We think the focus on build-to-rent is the fastest way of being able to achieve that.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): When we say we will have partners in place by the end of this week that definitely does not mean we are starting from scratch. Typically we will have worked for three to six months with each one of these partners to develop a fairly detailed scheme, something we have evaluated to select them on. Those schemes we have worked quite hard to evaluate can be put into play fairly quickly after that so there is a process to move forward. Our partners are aware of our start on site date. They are fully resourced. We have planning programmes that are submitted as part of these bids.

With the build-to-rent programme we worked for three or four months with the bidders and have set out a clear programme for each one of the sites, very detailed programmes for at least 2,000 of those units. We are ready to go from the end of March [2019] rather than just starting afresh with new partners.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Graeme, can I ask you to predict when the first residents will move into a home built on TfL land?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): In terms of residents, over the course of next three months or so. We have sites that are being completed on the A40. In total 181 of those that will be completed and there will be people in those homes over the course of the next few months, it is the top line of the table. The first of those are, as it happens, the 46 London Affordable Rent homes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That is great. When you say a few months that is three months from now?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Three.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Great. We will come back and hold you to that. Finally on this section, what is the impact going to be of the Crossrail delay? Are there impacts in terms of access to capital? Will the fact the stations are not being finished stop you from developing over-station sites and things like that? Is it going to have a significant effect?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Not a significant effect. We are on track at present. Completely separate from everything we have discussed we have a team within the development team - led by Ben Tate [Head of Property Development, TfL] - doing a great job on

12 over-station developments that we are forecasting to generate £545 million, largely through commercial schemes. Ben is working on those and we are on track for those. Clearly for any construction programme of this scale there is risk attached. Notwithstanding some of the well-publicised issues in terms of over-station development that is on track.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): How many homes are planned for over-station developments on Crossrail stations?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): In central London it is mainly office sites in terms of Crossrail sites for development, the largest of those is Limmo, Canning Town, with 1,500 homes. Woolwich, which is also listed here from memory is 400.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): They are both available already because they are to do with the tunnelling rather than finishing things off, is that right?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes. When we are talking about Crossrail over-station development we usually mean the central London sites and those are for offices. There is one residential site at Tottenham Court Road, which again is one that has planning, and we are in the process of disposal there.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Some other schemes have been delayed so there was a knock-on effect, for example Camden Town has been put off. I believe there was going to be residential planned there as well. Are there many knock-on effects further into the programme due to other things being cancelled?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): TfL's budgetary challenges are well known, and the organisation is working through the implications of that. What I would say is that a robust Commercial Development Strategy that enables us to unlock sites by looking at the opportunity for development is only a good thing. Not only is it generating net revenues to reinvest in the transport network but there are also the opportunities on specific sites in order to understand what scale of development at somewhere like Camden might help to bring forward the much-needed station capacity improvement faster than might otherwise be the case.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): OK, but that has been put off as a result of TfL's review of its schemes. I can't remember what the word is now. It has been delayed.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We are not assuming any sites from Camden Town over-station development within our 10,000 homes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That was not already going to come before 2021?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It was not one of the ones we were focusing on for our 10,000 homes. We continue to work closely with the London Underground teams in order to understand there, and elsewhere, how over-station development might enable homes to be built or, in the future maybe, how over-station development might help to unlock necessary station capacity improvement.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): In your wider thinking, not just to do with housing, have you had any requests for compensation from developers and commercial housing that had the opening of their schemes delayed by the Crossrail delay?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): None that have reached me and none that I am aware of.

Leonie Cooper AM: Relationships and memorandum of understandings (MOUs); in answer to Assembly Member Eshalomi's question you were talking about Landmark House and the business of working with Southwark. Obviously you have been emphasising the number of boroughs across London where you are moving ahead. I wondered if you could tell us how many MOUs have actually now been signed with the different 33 boroughs in the city, all 33?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): No, four or five. We have four or five boroughs with whom we have a MOU. I think those are where we have a particularly large development site or where there are multiple development sites and it is useful for us, and for them, in order to pool together our interests. That is by no means a necessary step in order to have an effective working relationship with the boroughs. What we are focused in on is getting so-called Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs), which establish how we work with the boroughs on each site. Either way formality of structure is what we need, whether that is in practice a MOU, a PPA or some other route. We are hoping to have understanding from the individual borough of what works for them.

Leonie Cooper AM: I was going to ask to ask you what are the benefits of the MOUs you have signed so far, but I am going to broaden that out and say what are the benefits of the four or five you have signed so far and also what are the benefits of the PPAs that you have entered so far with boroughs?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): MOUs are of benefit because they provide structure. Let us pick Merton as an example. The London Borough of Merton had the opportunity to develop Morden. Again, not a site that we are assuming as one of our sites to deliver the first 10,000 homes but there is the opportunity for us and Merton to combine our land interest and in total to potentially bring forward a site that might be 10, 15 or 20 acres. With that type of scale you have the ability not simply to build 2,000-plus homes but to think about what is the future of a London town centre in terms of not just housing but how people are working, how they are enjoying themselves, connectivity, energy and the future of retail. There is a fantastic opportunity for us to work with them.

Leonie Cooper AM: Getting rid of the A24 'racetrack' that goes around the civic centre - I am the Member for Merton and Wandsworth so I do know that site reasonably well - and getting rid of the very large bus stand outside Morden Underground station. At the moment the delight of that particular town centre is if you have crossed the road and did not get killed, generally speaking, because it is pretty gruesome. That sounds good in the wider perspective but is that the only benefit, just having that structure, or are you also saying the benefit includes the ability to pool what you are doing and create more housing?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): In that case we are pooling our land together on that site. More broadly we continue to look to explore opportunities where we, TfL, can sit down and understand with a borough what its objectives are, how we might work together and where there might be opportunity for us to pool land, swap land and marriage value. Ultimately, we want to bring forward the best that we can. We cannot do that in isolation in terms of our land. Although our land is extensive across London individual sites are often smaller than people might imagine. It is only by looking at our land as the gateway to a larger opportunity that in particular brings in other land held in the public sector. It is only really then that we can deliver the proper benefits that we all want to see, not simply in terms of numbers of homes but proper place making that reflects how London needs to evolve in the future, which I think does require us. The relationship we have with the boroughs is absolutely instrumental to that.

Leonie Cooper AM: Will you be entering into more MOUs, do you think, than the four or five you have at the moment? You are talking about the benefits there and I am wondering why you have not entered into more already. You have been going down this track since let us say June 2016, it is probably slightly unfair to say May 2016, so it is almost three years on from the last election. Will there be more that you are going to enter into to enhance that place making and leverage, working together in that way?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I would differentiate between a MOU, as a formal legal document, and a relationship with the boroughs. I have MOUs sitting in front of me now with Merton, Harrow, Barnet and Hounslow. I think we have - unless Clare [Councillor Clare Coghill] tells me otherwise - a positive working relationship with [the London Borough of] Waltham Forest. We do need to have in that particular case a MOU.

Leonie Cooper AM: Clare is nodding, by the way.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): You do not have one with Waltham Forest?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We do not, but I do not think we need one. If we think that will help then we will sign one, but this is much more about having a positive working relationship and the formality or structure around that. We are open, as much as anything, to what the boroughs find to be successful. This will not work if we try to impose one single answer on the boroughs across London. They have their ways of working and what we need to do across 20 different boroughs is understand what works best for them.

Leonie Cooper AM: Let us pull in Clare, if you do not mind, at that moment or Councillor Coghill, depending on which you prefer.

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): Clare is fine, thank you.

Leonie Cooper AM: We are just exploring whether a MOU is needed in each case and Graeme is clearly saying not necessarily and that is the situation with the London borough of Waltham Forest. How is it going in terms of a working relationship with TfL? How are those benefits of place making, improving centres and pooling land - all of the elements we were just exploring - working in Waltham Forest?

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): Extremely well. We do not need a MOU because TfL has, from the start - at every level in the organisation, not just at the senior level but absolutely every level - been open, engaging, straightforward and transparent. They have sought to get to know us as an authority, sought to go and visit sites and come and see community activity that they did not really need to do. They wanted to get under the skin of the area to be, as I could see it, a far more effective partner and also better engaged with the community to be able to get through the type of scheme and scale of scheme that we want to see really delivering across London.

The example I will give - if I may, Chair - will be Blackhorse Road, which is brilliantly confusing because there is a station called Blackhorse Road that sits between Blackhorse Road and Blackhorse Lane. The area ripe for development, a lot of development has already come forward there, is Blackhorse Lane and TfL has a site there. There was obviously an opportunity because we looked at our plans, we were prepared to be more ambitious in terms of height and scale. I think we had been far too timid previously and we wanted to be more ambitious. We have the 24-hour Tube at the weekend coming through. We have Walthamstow Wetlands opening, which is 500 acres of green open space. There is incredible opportunity. We have a programme of saying, "We need to make sure we have the right mix". We have a brand-new secondary school built that the

Council paid for, major investment through Mini Holland for cycling infrastructure, we have hundreds of homes coming forward and we have new community provision. There was this appetite from us to make sure we were maximising those. It is very close by to another housing zone, as it happens, in Haringey. You start to bring all that together and you see the great potential. TfL arrived at the right moment to have a brilliant conversation and said, "How can we help? We have this site. We have this carpark site." The opportunity of that is tremendous. The idea that you have a fantastic public transport network, you are TfL and are going to sit on a carpark did not seem to be something it was keen to do, and is completely contrary to everything we are looking to do in terms of the environment in our borough and so the conversation started. There was real care and attention shown to that relationship, also making sure that when a development partner had been selected by TfL I was invited to come in to have a pre-meet and was then introduced to the people from Barratt that had been selected as the partner.

Leonie Cooper AM: There has been a lot of partnership --

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): Real work, yes.

Leonie Cooper AM: -- working going on but not necessarily felt the need to enshrine it into a formal MOU.

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): Exactly. It will just slow it down, let us crack on.

Leonie Cooper AM: What about the PPA, has that been something you have been looking at in Waltham Forest?

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): Planning performance is something I take personally very, very seriously. I had the regeneration portfolio for three years and there are various things that councils do across this country that are pretty ludicrous. I inherited a situation where we did not have planning committees in August. Why? I do not know any other bit of government - probably there are some centrally, I am sure we can all agree on that - where it would happen. Why are we waiting? Why are pausing at these key strategic moments? There is a desire to see homes built in London in boroughs like mine, why would I hinder that. Therefore, I keep a close eye on the progress, and I think we have a pretty sleek operation, as they go. People understand that my chief executive's door is open, my cabinet members' doors are open, and my door is open if they are hitting unnecessary brick walls.

Leonie Cooper AM: There is also not a joint venture? Assembly Member Boff was just referring to the idea of doing a joint venture, a joint land company or something like that. You have not gone down that road. Basically, in that sort of sense, you are looking at something that might be quite varied across each borough, it is just going to be what is most effective?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Exactly, yes. We have multiple different types, multiple opportunities with multiple partners. There is a huge amount of work that has to go in but there is not one answer and we would never achieve the overall target if we try to impose a single answer across London.

Leonie Cooper AM: I think it is very exciting to hear about the very positive relationship you are having with Waltham Forest. I know also you have your role in London Councils. Is there anyone that needs a bit of a 'chivvyng up' amongst your fellow London Councils?

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): I cannot really comment on that. It is a very, very important point and elegantly put, if I may say. This is really it, there are boroughs where you cannot get stuff done. The leaders of those authorities - with a small "L" - have a deep responsibility to deliver homes, even if there is not the percentage of affordable units that you would like and would always push for but 50% of nothing is nothing. We have to have stuff happening and we have to be able to signal to partners - whether they be private sector or public sector partners - that there is will, you are not a pushover as an authority by any means and you will be resilient if people come forward with 'naff' schemes that will not deliver what you want and what our residents demand. However, ultimately London is a place that needs to grow, and we are doing all that we can.

Leonie Cooper AM: From our perspective, Assembly Members here around the table either have been Councillors - Assembly Member Boff and Assembly Member Eshalomi - and the rest of us all are Councillors. While we understand those weird lines on the map, the edges of boroughs, we also know people place families who are homeless anywhere, not necessarily within the borough boundaries. That is why I asked that question about boroughs other than yourself, because we do see this obviously as a housing need that needs to be met across the whole of London.

We have moved from talking about the positive relationships with the local authorities, and perhaps some need to get more of a wriggle on to - possibly not my favourite people to try to work with because I have always found them incredibly difficult - Network Rail. You might find them an absolute pleasure and a delight and very fast to answer everything. How are you finding Network Rail to work with from a TfL perspective, particularly in terms of land assembly? There are plenty of places where TfL and Network Rail are clearly very closely aligned, let us just say that.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): We have 250 adjoining interests with Network Rail. It owns 50% more land in London than we do. For two of our initial sites there was a Network Rail interface, both at Kidbrooke where we have submitted planning for 619 homes, 50% affordable, and at Landmark Court in Southwark Street. We have in both of those cases managed through the interface and got to the point where we can bring those sites forward. Something I would be keen on moving forward is to be at a point where we can agree a broader relationship with Network Rail. At the moment it works well, but at a transactional site-by-site level. Understanding more broadly how we could bring forward the sites that we have is something we would be keen to see us do more work on, particularly given the number of adjoining sites that we have. At a personal level, we get on well with them and we work with them. I think there is more we can do jointly with them in order to bring forward more sites.

Leonie Cooper AM: You just mentioned two sites but then you started by talking about 250. I am not going to ask you to go through what you are doing on the other 248 sites because that would clearly take too long. I do not know whether there is anything else you can tell us, perhaps by corresponding with us after the meeting, about some of the other sites but it would be good to have a feel for how effectively the relationship is developing. I have certainly experienced difficulties with getting Network Rail onto the page of having a sense of urgency. This is an area where it is obviously not their main function, just as obviously it is not TfL's main function, so getting a sense of urgency there is quite important.

I want to also ask about Government funding - the One Public Estate and Housing Infrastructure Funds - is that something you are going to be making extensive use of or as much use of as possible?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): As much as possible. One Public Estate, we have had success in funding both at Morden and Fenwick. More broadly with the Housing Infrastructure Fund, TfL was successful in an application for the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) that is

providing additional trains and an expanded depot. It ultimately helps to unlock a significant development site that we have above a popular DLR depot.

In the 'to do' category is understanding how we might work better with central Government. We are often successful where we bid for sites but at the moment we are bidding on an individual site-by-site basis against other cities. Given the scale of development opportunity we have in London and given the significant expertise we have developed within the team, we have understanding of what a broader relationship might look like with some of those Government departments and how we might jointly be working on bringing sites forward as a portfolio, rather than on a site-by-site basis, is something we would be keen to explore further.

Leonie Cooper AM: I was going to ask you what more could the Mayor or central Government be doing to improve the collaborative release of public funds for homes, but you have clearly stated that bringing things forward as a portfolio of sites, rather than on a site-by-site basis, would be a step forward. Is there anything else that you would like either the Mayor or central Government to do, if you had your one wish? Just the one, mind.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Just one. If I was picking one thing it would be more transparency on ownership across the city. It is being in a position to understand who owns what, so that as easily as possible we could understand where the opportunities might be in order to partner with others. I have talked about how we go through an extensive exercise seeking to understand how we prioritise our sites. If we were in a position to straightforwardly understand who owns adjoining interests that might help to shape the order in which we bring sites forward.

Leonie Cooper AM: On a different area, public consultation; when sites are coming forward obviously that is not a central role of TfL, but if you are developing sites it is clearly something that has to be done. Do you have more confidence going forward that you are going to be able to manage processes of consultation as effectively as possible? It is important that we take people with us. [Councillor] Clare [Coghill] was just talking about the different developments in Waltham Forest. The Mini Holland was quite controversial when it first went in, but it is about having that confidence and working with people. I think it is the same with housing developments. When something new is being suggested, particularly for TfL, you have to take people with you. Is that something you would manage better?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I touched on it earlier. This is the single biggest challenge that we have. We have held over 23 consultation events in the course of the last six months. We have had 2,000 people into those events and the main wave of activity is yet to start.

At Blackhorse Road we met with 33 stakeholder groups; cycling groups, schools, landowners and businesses. There is no shortcutting this. You have to put an extraordinary amount of effort in to every site and, if you are doing this across literally dozens of sites across London, there is no avoiding the fact that it is a major, major exercise. It is not just about hitting a programme, important though that is, we take very seriously the responsibility of the development pipeline that we are managing. We have to get it right in taking local people with us, getting local people's engagement and making sure we bring the best development that we can.

Much as we were saying about MOUs, there is no one answer to how we work with boroughs. There is certainly not one answer to how we bring forward sites. London is a whole variety of individual villages, towns and cities, and crucial to our success is our ability to understand what the right answer is at a local level. You cannot do that sat in TfL's office as you have to spend an extraordinary amount of time out and about understanding locally what the right answer is.

We have started well but I do not for a moment pretend that it is anything other than a significant undertaking.

Leonie Cooper AM: Could I ask Lianna to comment on consultation processes, with particular reference to the CLT?

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): Yes. Talking to people around the sites we are working on in Lambeth and in Shadwell, there is a real sense of anger about people seeing their neighbourhoods changed around - luxury flats going up and shiny tower blocks - and feeling they have little or no say in those changes. Part of that anger comes from *Alison in Wonderland* definitions of what is affordable, but part of it is that there has not been any meaningful consultation.

One of the people who got involved in our Lambeth steering group did so because his estate has been regenerated. The first thing he knew about it was the football field being cordoned off the building. There had not been any real outreach to residents there. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that lots of developments - even ones that include affordable housing - are being blocked in the planning process. We know that when people are part of the decision-making about the design of buildings and the allocation of buildings they are much more likely to back those developments when they come to planning.

In our first CLT in St Clements in Mile End, there had been proposals to develop that site two or three times before and those had always been blocked at development. When we brought forward our development plans alongside the developer, not only did that go through without a single objection - which was unheard of in that densely populated part of Tower Hamlets - in fact residents were asking could there be an extra storey to provide more affordable housing.

TfL is in a good place to take forward not just consultation but to some extent real and meaningful involvement and co-production. In other sections of TfL I have worked with some of your planning involving disabled passengers. You have an Independent Disability Advisory Group and a youth panel. There is good practice going on involving people in decision making at an early stage. If some of that practice was brought forward to the housing part of it there could be a great deal done to minimise the risk of housing being blocked at planning.

Leonie Cooper AM: Or people having that sense of alienation. It is encouraging to hear how much time and effort I now understand you need to put into this to make something land in an area where people understand it, appreciate it and want it, rather than landing in an area and people feeling like a spaceship has landed from Mars. Those are some interesting points that have just been made.

You also did make the point about *Alice in Wonderland* affordability, and of course that has been such a struggle for us here in London in terms of the percentage of affordable. We just explored that around Landmark Court, eight flats we came to in the end. That is important for people as well because they do go and look online at property move sites and see that all the flats in the development are £600,000, which is not three times most people's salaries in London. Therefore, you are in a uniquely interesting and fantastic position to have a high percentage of properly affordable in terms of many locations, I would hope. Could you give us some examples of where you are definitely hitting that 50% target? You just mentioned Kidbrooke.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes. We are hitting 50% as an average across London. As I say, looking across the portfolio the lowest we have will tend to be 35%, maybe 40%, and the highest 100%. We seek to deliver the 50% average across the portfolio. We also need to

work with the individual boroughs to understand what their aspirations are, both on a site-by-site basis in terms of the proportion of affordable housing but also the mix within that percentage. Again, Harrow-on-the-Hill is an example of where we have a development - Harrow-on-the-Hill town centre with Redrow - which is 35% affordable housing.

We have brought to market - we will announce next week - our partner for Rayners Lane, Stanmore and Canons Park. We are bringing forward those sites at 100% affordable housing. We are achieving the 50%. In the sites we have brought to market this year we will definitely exceed 50% and I am confident we can achieve it. Again, an awful lot of work goes into the modelling that we do but it is only when we sit down and have the conversations with the borough that we can understand what their aspirations are. Ultimately, we need to reach agreement on every one of dozens of sites.

Leonie Cooper AM: We were just exploring that you have stretching financial targets as well. There must be a temptation in the inner London boroughs -- we were just talking about outer London boroughs and obviously that is where Waltham Forest is as well -- places like Southwark and Lambeth, where land values are higher, to go for either shared ownership or outright sale and reduce the percentage, just to create the income to meet your financial targets as well. You say you are balancing it across all of the sites, but I am concerned that there is definitely going to be affordable housing created in inner London and it is not all going to be pushed into the outer London areas.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): I think the least we will ever have is 35% affordable housing. We have a good relationship with the boroughs. We understand what their requirements are. If there is a strong desire from the borough for affordable housing on a particular site then of course we will work with them in order to achieve that. This would not work if we were coming up with a spreadsheet and seeking to dictate to individual boroughs where we think the affordable housing should be in order to help us achieve our financial numbers. That would not work.

Leonie Cooper AM: No, I do not think that would.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It would not work, but it is also the case that we cannot look at affordable housing as being a tariff that we have to hit. We have the best portfolio in London. We want to make the best of it that we can. London has a problem with affordable housing. London has a problem with affordable workspace. London needs cultural space. It needs light industrial space. We have a fantastic portfolio and we honestly want to do the best that we can with it. This is not something that we want to try to game as a system. This is something where we are trying to consciously meet the challenges that London faces. We try to do that as best we can across our portfolio, but we only get the right answer if we are working closely with the boroughs and closely with the local people across the Capital.

Leonie Cooper AM: This conversation that we have been having in this Committee over the last three years with yourself, building up the team within TfL, is now in a very different place from the first time we asked you questions. It is obvious that you have developed your thinking to a huge extent around this whole area. You have also built up expertise in-house as well. Are you going to leverage the use of those staff? Obviously, local authorities have been in a very difficult position and have not been doing as much development over the last ten years. In the past there probably were times when there were public bodies doing as much development as you are talking about now, but that was now some time in the past. Are you going to do any sharing in terms of that expertise with local authorities or potentially others to make sure that public developments do move ahead at a speed, is that something you are going to look to?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It is something that we are doing and increasingly we are doing. Dan [Daniel Lovatt] met the National Health Service (NHS) recently. We have targets, we have ambitious targets. We are not going to threaten our ability to hit those targets by seeking to develop land that is not ours. However, if there are lessons that we can share, if there are existing procurements that other people can take advantage of, if there is anything that we can do to help others - within London or indeed elsewhere - safely assume we have significant expertise. If there are things that we can do help others bring forward, particularly land in London, we are willing to do anything we can in order to make that happen.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Apologies for rushing you through that. We are getting to some very interesting questions now, but we are very short of time. I want to note that, in terms of overall affordable housing numbers, in the table you provided to us there is a very clear distinction between things that were developed pre-2016 and things that were developed afterwards. There are an awful lot of central London prime sites at 0% affordable housing in the previous set of schemes. Like you say, the newer schemes that are coming forward are mainly at 35% affordable and some at 100%. The Blackhorse Road is 50% affordable.

Of those affordable homes we are getting most of them at the London Affordable Rent, which is close to social rent levels as opposed to 'pretend affordable'. Is that something you have fought for or is that something TfL volunteered to do?

Councillor Clare Coghill (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest): We have been very clear that is what our expectation is, and TfL arrived as part of a wider conversation with us already setting that out.

There is a lot we can do politically, as elected members, to signal that this is our aspiration, this is what we want, and this is what our communities need. This is what our communities desperately need, as you were describing. The reality is that the law does not back us. If you were to not have that constructive conversation with any partner - TfL or any other developer - and it were to go to a committee and be turned down, you may very well have that decision overturned at planning appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

There is obviously a massive ambition that we have, as a Council - and that I have personally as a leader - but that needs to be tempered with a degree of rationalism when you are dealing with certain partners, particularly the more hungry and aggressive ones. TfL are great to work with because they share that ambition. It is very clear the direction that Sadiq [Khan, Mayor of London] has given: this ambition is to be shared. This ambition and the responsibility to deliver it should be shared as well, and I think that has gone well.

Would I like more grants from central Government to go further? Yes, absolutely. Would I like more grants for these guys so that they do not have to do what they have to do with their portfolio of land? Absolutely, but unfortunately that is not the position we are in.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Great. Thank you. Graeme, we have asked for the first time in your table of information for the tenure splits to come so that it is not just the percent of affordable, which can be quite a blunt instrument. We have asked for the different types of affordable to be split out.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes, of course.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We have London Living Rent, London Affordable Rent, shared ownership, real social rent, discount market rent, all of those different things are split out. Obviously social rent and London Affordable Rent are the ones that we really need in terms of the London Plan. Do you have an internal target for what proportion of your affordable homes is to be at those social levels of rent?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Not a specific target. My expectation would be it would be probably one-third.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): OK, because we have done our sums on this and we worked out that 32% of what has been coming forward is at those kinds of rates.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): That sounds about right.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Of the affordable that is, not of the homes overall.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Of the homes overall it is only about 8%, which is obviously still way below what we would like.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): My question was in two parts. The first part is which sites are you offering to build-to-rent? The second part is who are your partners going to be? However, I think based on the conversation we were having earlier you will not be able to tell us that just yet. Which sites are you moving forward with build-to-rent?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Do you want to cover that one, Dan?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes. We put forward a squad of ten sites initially as part of our marketing campaign for build-to-rent. Over that period we have selected Southall, Nine Elms, Woolwich, Canning Town, Cockfosters and Montford Place as the sites we will most likely take forward as build-to-rent. There are a couple of sites that were in the initial information that have fallen out for a variety of reasons, some to do with size and some to do with competition in the area where it would not be a sensible decision to develop build-to-rent.

As we stand here, we are about to appoint a partner on Monday, seven of those sites will come forward as build-to-rent. We have worked through detailed plans for delivery of those sites with the three partners from a planning perspective and also from a resource perspective, so we can literally start on Monday or Tuesday working collaboratively with those partners.

It is worth saying we have stressed throughout the process that we will work collaboratively as part of that development management function, so we are not a passive part of this. We are in there offering our skills and abilities to bring sites forward, which is infused with the partners' build-to-rent DNA.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): To clarify something that goes back slightly to the non-build-to-rent stuff, obviously for build-to-rent I have seen the structure in your very impressive glossy brochure, which I think I have somewhere because you gave us one.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Very nice. This land will be held in joint venture. My understanding was TfL was not disposing of any freeholds. Could I just clarify where you are not doing build-to-rent whether the freehold is still being kept and you are selling leaseholds?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): That is the structure?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes, typically that is what we do. As custodians we retain the freehold and sell on --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): In terms of meeting your targets, because Lianna [Etkind] said build-to-rent will be built more quickly than homes for sale?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): How important has that been in terms of hitting your targets?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): It is pretty important. We made a decision in 2018 to diversify our offer and our delivery routes. That makes complete sense to me. It is probably logical. The market for build-to-rent is incredibly strong. The funding for build-to-rent is incredibly strong. The demand for the rental product is incredibly strong, so it is deliverable through all markets.

In terms of our portfolio, it is an incredibly important part now. It allows us to retain long-term ownership around our stations, provide a great rental experience to people using the accommodation and also for us to generate a long-term revenue.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): I know in London we have been seeing house prices coming down, values coming down. Has that been part of your decision because rents are remaining quite high? Well, rents are continuing to rise.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): I see your point. Was it a consideration? It is just logical that you do not want to be reliant on one particular set regardless, so there will be ebbs and flows in the private-for-sale market that may be happening now. However, the reality is that build-to-rent is a useful foil in all markets, so why not use that to derisk the delivery of part of the portfolio?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It is also worth saying that if you were taking a five-year view it is still the case that you would settle. The big change here is taking that long-term view. We could, and should, instead be taking a 30-year view and if you take a 30-year view then you hold on, you create the long-term asset that generates long-term revenue.

Notwithstanding some changes in house prices, if you were just looking at it short term you would just sell but for us that is not the right answer.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): You have answered the second part of my next question which was: are these for the long-term or will you be disposing of them after 15 years or whatever it is that within the London Plan you are allowed to move them on? This is long-term?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): That is an easy one, yes. We are designing specific build-to-rent products, so if you become a customer in one of our build-to-rent developments you have complete security of tenure for the next 30 years because that is what is going to happen. It is going to be a rental development.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): What are the key factors in determining whether you go build-to-rent or for sale?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): The main factor is location, so the transport nodes are fantastic locations for rental demand. We typically look at the area, do the analysis on the social area and the demand, but build-to-rent has to be near transport nodes. That is the main determining factor we went through.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): Given the success of the work that Dan has led, it is fair to say that build-to-rent is now the initial option that we will look at. If we cannot make it work for build-to-rent we will look at other options, but the starting point of default would be: can we make it work for build-to-rent?

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Coming to the issue of affordability, I know in your prospectus you talk about the expectation that 40% will be affordable. That strikes me as odd when the Mayor's own threshold for public land is 50%. I believe that is going to apply to build-to-rent as well as for sale now. I am wondering why there is this discrepancy with what the Mayor is expecting in the London Plan on one side - given, Graeme, what you were saying earlier about being compliant with the draft London Plan - and having this lower expectation.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): There is also a section in the London Plan that public authorities can take a portfolio-wide view, and that is what we are doing here. As I said, generally the lowest we will do is 35% to 40%. In terms of making an assumption, we have made an assumption in build-to-rent that the average across the portfolio will be 40%. Clearly, across the piece we still need to deliver and will deliver the average of 50% affordable housing. That will therefore mean that if we are delivering less than 50% through build-to-rent we will have to deliver more than 50% as an average across the piece.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): What factors have led you to conclude that you need to go with a lower rate for build-to-rent than perhaps with other types of development?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Manager, Transport for London): It was an assumption that we had to make at a point in time. I think 50% is an average. Generally, there are developers and there are sites. There are sites that work well at 35% to 40% affordable housing. There are other sites that work well at 75%, 80% or 100% affordable housing. It is much easier to bring forward at scale a portfolio that delivers an average of 50% than it is to try to bring forward every single site forward at 50%. We will exceed 50% this year.

Where we can deliver more than 50% we will do so. The 40% was an assumption that we made at the point when we said we would bring build-to-rent to market. We have yet to have any meaningful discussions with our partner in individual boroughs, so I would not read too much into what we have said at this point. It was an assumption that we made.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): It just seemed a bit strange. It is slightly incongruous with what the Mayor is expecting elsewhere, notwithstanding what you say about the London Plan saying you can have it as an average across your portfolio. Is it mainly to do with specific sites in question or is it something to do with the build-to-rent model in general that perhaps you think it supports a lower level of affordable housing?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): No, nothing to do with that at all. It was just part of the portfolio strategy that we took, as Graeme said, which you can do under the draft London Plan.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Ok. Drilling down into that percentage of affordable, what sort of expectations do you have in terms of the tenure blend? Do you expect you are you going to be delivering at London Affordable Rent or are we going to be seeing properties delivered that are 80% of market rent, which of course the Mayor has himself says he does not consider to be affordable?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We are definitely not going to be delivering at 80% of market rent. We have been through a tender process and I cannot talk about it in too much detail. However, as part of that we have made it very clear to the partners that the affordable housing needs to be affordable and not at those sorts of levels.

On our larger sites we can deliver a wide range of tenures, including London Affordable Rent. On a site of 300 to 400 units we would be looking to deliver discount market rent, 30% of which would be London Living Rent and 70% would be negotiated and discussed with the individual boroughs. We have not had those conversations yet, but we will look to have those as soon as we have a partner in place. We find that those discussions are very much site by site and have to be taken with the individual boroughs.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): To me, that does suggest that there is a risk of us creeping into this higher percentage of market rents, which the Mayor has said he wants to rule out, and again seems to go against the direction of travel we are having here at the GLA in terms of affordable tenures. I guess what I am asking is: what guarantees do we have that we are not going to be getting up to 70% to 80%? I think London Living Rent is about 60% on average.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Absolutely, yes. Our assumptions have been for the bidding process around about 65% as a blended average. As I say, discussions will go on with the individual boroughs to work out what the tenure mixes are, but we are certainly not in the world of 80% of discount market rent. I can absolutely confirm that. If that is not clear enough, it should be.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Can I interrupt at this point, Tom --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, you can.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): -- and ask about the Apartments for London deal that has been done separately to what has been going forward with the separate procurement service? Obviously the thing you are working on, Daniel, is these nine sites that are in the nice brochure.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): The lovely brochure, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): They are the ones that are being offered up for the future. Separately, there has been a partnership with something called Apartments for London. As I understand it that is doing discount market rate at 20% below market rates, so the dreaded 80% affordable. These are on the table as being schemes that are 100% affordable. We would probably quibble with that definition. We might say 0% affordable. What is going on with that? This is the deal that was done under the previous Mayor or recently? Will we see more of that? Is it really 20% instead of more?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): We have had discussions with Apartments for London. Part of what we try to do is work with innovative companies, sometimes small companies, in order to see what we might do in order to unlock sites that otherwise we might struggle to bring forward. I think there is a potential for a deal with Apartments for London but probably at no more than a very small number of sites, and “small” in this context may be as small as one. We are having conversations with them and they are having conversations with the borough. It is a little too soon I think to say actually what the number of homes is that might come forward and the tenure mix of those homes.

I am not pretending it is straightforward. It is a continual challenge to seek to understand with whom we might work in order to bring forward individual sites that work for that place but also help us to deliver what we need across the piece.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): OK, that is really useful. The business model that we are going to discuss is one where there are a range of different tenures, some of which are full. If we were thinking about what we might want, 100% of not really affordable to anyone is not much use, whereas a little bit of private plus some social would be more of a --

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): I think we will deliver at different levels on that spectrum, not all the way up to that. Absolutely.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): It is because the term “affordable”, as we were discussing earlier, has become so stretched. Every time I hear things like “discount market rent”, or “affordable rent”, or “blended rates” other than “London Affordable Rent” I get very concerned. I get very, very worried, and people start to get very suspicious about exactly what that entails.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): It will of course be easier for us to report on what it is that we have agreed on a site-by-site basis and what that means across the portfolio. It is obviously much harder sat here when we are talking about 25 different partners in place across 51 sites, 320 acres, to try to forecast, often pre-discussions with the boroughs as to where we might end up. I am expecting a series of discussions in the months and years ahead as we have to report back and attend the Committee and explain the mix that we come to.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): The other thing as well is in terms of the locations of where the affordable homes are. Going back to the point Assembly Member Cooper was making earlier about - and this example is in her constituency - the Nine Elms development, where you have 25% affordable but it is all shared ownership. That is already on a scheme that you have next to Battersea Power Station, which is very, very low levels of affordable and no social --

Leonie Cooper AM: No, there is no affordable housing. Nobody can afford £600,000 as a first-time buyer.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): There you go. It comes back to that point about the geography of where we are locating affordable housing. Could not TfL be putting some London Affordable Rent social housing within the Nine Elms development to try to mitigate against some of what has happened there already?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We obviously have an existing consent there which was secured pre-May 2016. I think Nine Elms is one of the sites we will be looking at quite closely for build-to-rent, and it may present us some opportunities to possibly increase density in that location and to improve that formal housing offer, but that is something we are cognisant that we need to

work through with the partner over the next few months. I completely take the point, but that is a planning application we have almost inherited in that sense.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Just moving us on from affordable, the question of what will distinguish a TfL build-to-rent scheme from a housing association in the private sector and thinking of things like distinctiveness in terms of branding and things like that. Are we going to have roundels in the brickwork and - it might not be to everyone's tastes - moquette carpet in the hallways? Is there going to be a specific feel in terms of the quality, in terms of the design and things like that, that is going to distinguish it from other ones?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): I think we can definitely come back and talk about this a little bit more when we have selected the partner, but we are quite excited about this because we really want to leave a lasting legacy on these developments. Design is one thing, and we have come forward with our own design charter, so we have tried to lead that discussion with developers, which I think we might have provided you with previously, and if not we can. That is really, really important to us. We have had lots of meetings on design and the importance of that. You may see the roundel at a station near you. Who knows?

The other side of it is the management piece. Again, we have been quite proactive. We have come forward with how we would like to see these developments managed, so longer tenancies, clarity around rent reviews, security of tenure and a good level of service. With these really important touchpoints we have tried to lead the conversation. Hopefully that is what you will see with the TfL development.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): That point about longer tenancies, again, this comes back to making sure this is not incongruous with what the Mayor is doing elsewhere. I think the Mayor has commissioned Karen Buck [MP for Westminster North] to lead a group to come up with a private rented charter. If TfL's build-to-rent properties were not offering at least what that comes up with, I think there would be an issue there, certainly politically, for the Mayor.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes, quite. Our document that we have provided sets out very clearly on day one some of the management principles that are probably going to come from or be used in that work which are taken from the London Plan. It is really important to us that we give people that security of tenure in our developments.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): My expectation is that we will become the largest landlord for build-to-rent in London. We have high aspirations for what we do, and we would be keen to be involved in the shaping of the product. We of course want to work with it, but to be involved in shaping it and having TfL build-to-rent as a pioneer for what high-quality build-to-rent looks like from a design, security of tenure and sustainability point of view, why wouldn't we want to do the absolute best we can with this fantastic opportunity?

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Absolutely. That is good to hear. Just finally, this is a question about offsite manufacturing. How many TfL build-to-rent homes do you envisage to be built through offsite manufacturing?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): This is my favourite subject by a mile.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): It is a shame Nicky Gavron [AM] is not here.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We would not have time for any more of the session.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We have really driven this debate with our three parties. We came forward on one of our sites with a modular scheme to drive that debate. I expect quite a lot of these developments will come forward as modular, which is great news because we can complete the developments somewhere between 20% to 30% quicker than using traditional construction. There are some logistical constraints about whether you can actually get longer lorries in etc, but beyond that the build-to-rent world can absorb modular construction in a much more effective way because the absorption rates are a lot quicker, so you can build quicker because the stock is taken up quicker. That is definitely something that we will be embracing, and we have driven it into the tender process.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Excellent. Thank you. That is all from me.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): OK. I have one more question about the modular construction. Potentially the sites that you have outlined, is it nine sites?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): That was the original squad, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes. They tend to be around train stations and Tube stations in Zone 3-ish, I think. Now, having lots of lorries going around is a bad thing with sites around Tube and rail stations. Having lots of vans coming in and out of sites is a bad thing in terms of places where you have lots of pedestrian traffic. When you are doing modular construction, this makes construction management and construction safety easier to manage? You have bigger lorries but less of them. Is this the approach you are taking?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Yes, exactly. Well summarised. To be honest with you, that is exactly the approach we will be taking. The reality is that the developments will be finished quicker, so there is less disruption generally to the area. Actually, for those kinds of locations, it is perfectly suited. We have a development around Archway Station that was completed in less than a year, in which traditional construction might have taken double the amount of time. I think it is the perfect solution for these kinds of locations.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): It is part of what we can do with our estate because we can take a long-term view, because of the numbers of sites we have, because of the longevity of development programme that we have. We can underpin an investment in modular construction, and not just modular construction. That means that the effect of the development pipeline that we have expands beyond TfL and into the wider industry. We are uniquely well placed in order to support an investment in modular construction, which is not any cheaper, but it is faster, has reduced impact on air quality, is safer and it has reduced impact on road traffic. There are lots of reasons for doing so, even if it is not still yet any cheaper.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Just finally on this idea of becoming London's largest landlord. You are going to be maintaining a 30-year interest at the very least in these homes. People are going to be very aware of the fact that TfL and effectively also the Mayor are therefore their landlords. Getting it right and being good at this is going to be very important. More seriously - we are getting excited about tiles and roundels and things - design principles that are based on low-maintenance costs, hard-wearingness, like you apply to stations and things --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Mixed communities.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes, mixing people together, mixed tenure, and not having too many carpets - you do not have carpets in railway stations - all of those things lead to benefits of being a landlord as well, do they not, and potentially some branding and excitement from people about living in a TfL home? Are you working on all of those things with your partners, or is their branding the thing that is going to dominate because they are commercial people?

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): Absolutely. No, this will be a true partnership. It is not going to be one particular style of branding which is forced on us. We have to respect the location and the heritage of a particular location, but we also have to respect the bidder and what they are bringing as well. The branding will be something that comes together, along with the management principles, along with the design and along with the general approach. We have really, really scrutinised the bidders from a management and design perspective. It is so important to us, if we are leaving a legacy behind, to make sure that we have done that work. We know that each one of these bidders, whichever one we select, really understands our values and shares those values and wants to see those values delivered across our portfolio. It is very important.

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): Can I come in there as well?

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Go for it. I was just going to say we are going to move straight on to small sites now, I am afraid, Andrew. Would you like to ask the questions on small sites after Lianna speaks?

Andrew Boff AM: What about larger developers?

Sian Berry AM (Chair): I was going to skip over that because it is important that we get to small sites.

Andrew Boff AM: I should have stuck with my question earlier. Assembly Members have spent a long time --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): I agree with you, but we cannot not let Lianna talk to us about her small sites. I wonder if we might write --

Andrew Boff AM: It really could have been a bit quicker. If I can ask --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): No. As Chair, can I just suggest that we write to TfL to ask them questions about their partnership?

Andrew Boff AM: I have a specific question about that partnership that I would like answered in the public session.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): If we push Lianna out, I will be very fed up. We have not asked her question.

Andrew Boff AM: It is one question and we can do the rest.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): How long will it take, Andrew?

Andrew Boff AM: The question is: what processes are you shortcutting by having the framework panel?

Sian Berry AM (Chair): It is a very long answer that Graeme can give to this question.

Andrew Boff AM: No, it should be very quick because he should know what the advantages are of having 13 bid developers.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Can you do it, Graeme? I am being overruled here.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): We have 13 preselected bidders. It cuts down by a number of months the process that one would follow for procuring an individual partner. You and I have discussed in the past the downsides of reducing the procuring process as well as the timesaving.

What I would say is we are now increasingly using multiple routes to market. We work with adjoining partners. We have Build to Rent as a partner. We work with innovative pilots. We use the London Development Panel 2. We have small sites. We have six or seven different routes to market. We are working with 25 partners across the piece. The initial property partnerships framework is only one route that we follow, and we have to be confident that we are getting best value and we have to be confident it is the right answer for that scheme.

Andrew Boff AM: We do not have time to interrogate this, but it is the bit that interests me most of all. Perhaps you could write to us because I specifically want to know which processes are being removed because, as far as I can see, you have to go through the same processes with every single developer whether they are on the framework panel or not. I cannot see the point of the framework panel and of the four contracts you allocated three to one. That concerns me and it will concern the London public as well that we are having such a narrow field of developers partnering with you. You are going to have to write to me.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): I am sorry. Also, because the data came through so late we have not been able to look properly at the distribution of the sites and we want to do a bit more analysis of that.

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): We will happily go through it and I am happy to meet you as well, but I would emphasise the fact that we have 25 different partners across our sites.

Daniel Lovatt (Head of Property Development, Transport for London): We will write to the panel.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Sorry, yes. We will come back to this, Assembly Member Boff.

Thank you, Lianna from the London CLT, for waiting so long. We really wanted to get your take and your opinion on this because you have won the contract to develop two of TfL's small sites that were earmarked for community-led housing. We want to hear about your experience of that and the progress so far and the potential for this to be delivering more on small sites for TfL.

If I can just turn over the floor to you and ask you to tell us what you think about what has happened so far and how your progress is going?

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): Sure. As I was walking here today, I was thinking that it was around a year ago that we were here with the campaign group from around Shadwell and the campaign group from around Lambeth handing in our bids here at City Hall with our banners. That moment had built on around two years of campaigning in both of those areas and many conversations about the need for genuinely affordable housing there, coffee mornings, workshops, community walks around

the areas to identify sites, and campaigning both locally to councillors and to Mayor Biggs in Tower Hamlets and on a London level as well to James Murray [Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development].

We were really clear from the start that what we wanted was for those sites to deliver housing that was genuinely community-led, permanently affordable so that it would not be affordable just for the first people moving in but for generations to come, and genuinely affordable linked to local incomes and what people in the area are actually earning.

We heard in June [2018] that we had been successful in getting both a site on Cable Street next to the DLR and a site between Brixton and Streatham on Christchurch Road. Since then, we have been spending lots of time meeting neighbours around the site. The campaign groups have drawn a great deal from the organising charity London Citizens. They have been doing lots of door-knocking and meeting local residents. There has been a tremendous appetite from people to get involved and excitement about these homes coming.

We ran a community brief workshop in each of those places so that the community would be setting their priorities for selecting an architect and feeding into the tendering for the architect. Most recently, we held two pick-the-architect workshops, where four different architect firms turned up to the church of St George in the east in Shadwell and to a church on Brixton Hill and made their pitches. People voted for the architect they wanted to work with to codesign their homes. It has been a real pleasure to work with people from local mosques, schools, churches and estates and that process of forming community through discussing the homes there.

It has been a really positive experience working with TfL as well. That initial decision to set aside two of those small sites for community-led, affordable housing is something that we really welcome. It is going to be necessary if the Mayor is going to meet his ambition of a pipeline of 1,000 community-led homes by 2021. I hope that inspires other public landowners to do similarly.

The bid process was clear. It was not unduly onerous. It was really welcome that TfL said that it welcomes new entrants because, if the community-led housing sector is to grow in London and meet the levels we see in other European cities, there needs to be that openness to people with less experience than mainstream developers.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Can I ask about that? You are not new entrants. You delivered the first CLT home in London. It is a similar question to Assembly Member Boff's. You are now the only one winning the Mayor's sites so far. Do you think that is a good or a bad sign? Three sites is not a very large sample size, but is it a good sign that you won? You are pleased you won, but were you expecting to win both? Did you expect there to be more variety?

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): We were really pleased to win both because that was built on two years of campaigning around each site. The fact that we had an idea of which sites were going to come up when the small sites bid was opened because we had been involved in so many conversations and campaigning was helpful.

Something that we would like to see to broaden the community-led housing sector in London is more openness about which sites might be coming up in future. Ideally, it would be great if key actors in the community-led housing sector and key actors in TfL and the GLA were to sit down and overlay two maps, one map of where the community-led housing groups are and one map of possible TfL sites, to see which sites and to identify new ones that could come up in possible rounds.

The biggest thing is to make the pie bigger so that other community-led housing groups can successfully get their first start in the sector as well, and potentially too to have a mirror for the London developers' panel. The bid process focused on design plans and finance plans for the site and also community-led housing groups' capacity to take them on, including experience. As you say, we had had experience with previous sites, but most other community-led housing groups are run on volunteer time and are run on people spending their evenings going through the paperwork. That can be difficult.

Perhaps it could be split out so that there was a prequalification stage that laid out a really clear set of goals for how a community-led housing group can qualify to bid and then a second stage once you are in that panel to go for a particular site. That would cut down on a lot of the waste that happens through a competitive process, waste for both the community-led housing groups to work up a full bid in six weeks and also waste for the GLA and TfL, which have to go through those applications.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you. That is really useful to see. One of the questions earlier on asked whether TfL can be more transparent about what land it has. That might have been me. That does chime with that, does it not? If the potential land that has not yet been brought ready could be looked at alongside where the potential for community-led housing groups is, it would be really useful.

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): Yes, and that should include small sites and also look potentially at bigger sites. Our first site, St Clements, came about because in the tender documents there was an insistence that when mainstream developers bid for that land, some of those homes would have to be put aside for community-led housing. Therefore, on larger TfL sites, a developer could factor into the bid a requirement that community-led housing would be on that site, say one acre out of 10 acres or 50 homes out of 300 homes. That would be another way of growing the community-led housing sector in London and getting more affordable homes built.

There is good political support beginning to come through with the Mayor's £38 million. There is the funding available. There is so much demand and appetite and enthusiasm from communities to do this, but sites coming through is the biggest thing that can unlock more housing in London.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes. They all need land, do they not?

Andrew Boff AM: Good luck with that. It has been a suggestion that the Assembly has had for years that perhaps 5% or perhaps 10% of sites should be laid over to small developers, but neither Mayor in my time, the past two Mayors, has acceded to that demand. It is good to hear that you have stated that. I must say that that would help you.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes, that was very useful. Of the people we have here, can anyone tell me what is happening to support the unsuccessful bidders? They will have got to the point when they were ready to bid for some land, but their proposals could be used for other land if that came forward. Is anyone keeping an eye on them and helping them to keep an eye out for other land?

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): The community-led housing hub does a great deal of work offering support and expertise and helping groups scale up and prepare to bid.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Have you passed on their details to anyone who can help?

Graeme Craig (Commercial Development Director, Transport for London): I would be happy to meet any interested parties. We have good discussions with a number of different sectors. Anyone who wants to talk to me, I would be happy to meet.

Lianna Etkind (Campaigns Manager, London Community Land Trust): Can I add one thing? Since the bids have been agreed, we have really appreciated the flexibility from TfL in agreeing to sign off the land with a 0% deposit and flexibility in principle from the GLA in releasing the grant for the land earlier in the process than normal, which is so vital given that, unlike standard developers, community-led developers do not always have huge amounts of cash up front. That has not translated to flexibility in practice and we had hoped to have this signed off by now. We are frustrated by the delay.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): I really want to thank our guests for your patience and for telling us so much today. It has been really useful. We will be following up questions about some of the tenures and will have more questions about this table, which we will follow up with you in writing. Hopefully, we will have community housing developers back in the future as well. Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES

Meeting: Housing Committee
Date: Tuesday 2 April 2019
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Committee Room 5, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/housing

Present:

Sian Berry AM (Chair)
Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair)
Tony Devenish AM
Nicky Gavron AM
David Kurten AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Andrew Boff AM and Leonie Cooper AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

2.2 Resolved:

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 Summary List of Actions (Item 3)

3.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

3.2 **Resolved:**

That the outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted.

4 Housing First in London (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on Housing First in London to the following invited guests:

- Mark Taylor, Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project;
- Stuart Nevill, Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond;
- Hannah Gousy, Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis; and
- David Eastwood, Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority (GLA).

4.2 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 1**.

4.3 During the course of the discussion, Members requested that David Eastwood, GLA, provide a summary of the breakdown of funding provided to homeless services across London.

4.4 During the course of the discussion, Members requested that Hannah Gousy, Crisis, provide a breakdown of the number of people who are sleeping rough compared to the number of people in the hostel system.

4.5 The Committee agreed to write to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) regarding why the GLA were not selected to receive funding for a Housing First pilot; and the Mayor regarding whether the feedback and suggestions from the Housing First pilots have been sent to the MHCLG.

4.6 **Resolved:**

(a) That the report and discussion be noted.

(b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.

5 Housing Committee Work Programme (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

5.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the summary of work completed during the 2018/19 Assembly year be noted.**
- (b) That the provisional schedule of meetings for the 2019/20 Assembly year, which is subject to agreement at the Annual Meeting of the London Assembly on 2 May 2019.**
- (c) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with Party Group Lead Members to agree;**
 - (i) Any further outputs relating to the Committee's investigations in the 2018/19 Assembly year; and**
 - (ii) Arrangements for any site visits, informal meetings or engagement activities before the Committee's next formal meeting.**

6 Date of Next Meeting (Item 6)

6.1 Subject to confirmation at the Annual Meeting of the London Assembly on 2 May 2019, the next meeting of the Housing Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, 8 May 2019 at 2pm in the Committee Room 5, City Hall.

7 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 7)

7.1 There were no items of business that the Chair considered to be urgent.

8 Close of Meeting

8.1 The meeting ended at 12.03 pm.

**Greater London Authority
Housing Committee
Tuesday 2 April 2019**

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer; telephone: 020 7084 2825;
Email: jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk; minicom: 020 7983 4458

London Assembly Housing Committee – Tuesday, 2 April 2019**Transcript of Item 4 – Housing First in London**

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That takes us straight on to today's main item, which is about the current delivery of Housing First homelessness services in London.

Can I welcome our four guests? We have Mark Taylor, Assistant Director of Services at the Single Homeless Project, which delivers Housing First services to a number of boroughs; Stuart Nevill, Chief Executive Officer of Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond (SPEAR), which also does a form of Housing First homelessness services in London; Hannah Gousy, Policy and Public Affairs Manager for Crisis; and David Eastwood, Rough Sleeping Lead Manager for Housing and Land in the Greater London Authority (GLA). Thank you all for coming.

Before we start I wanted to just briefly ask Mark Taylor to give us the definition of Housing First. What we are talking about today in terms of how it differs from other approaches to chronic homelessness services?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): Thanks. I will try to give a reasonable definition as I understand it. I guess Housing First turns housing-related support on its head a bit. Rather than the traditional approach, which is to warehouse vulnerable rough sleepers in large hostels and then expect them to engage with support and overcome a number of hurdles to maintain their residency, Housing First begins with the very simple principle that everyone has a right to a home and, essentially, they have a right to their own front door. Rather than housing people within warehouses or large hostels, Housing First clients get their own home, which may be provided through the private rented sector (PRS), through social housing or through registered social landlords, and then underpinning that and supporting that is the support, really. Fundamentally, the home is the basis on which people can begin their journey of recovery.

Traditionally, Housing First is aimed at the most entrenched rough sleeping group. This is the group that it is seen to work most fundamentally for and where it is the most cost-effective. Alongside the home, we offer flexible and open-ended support, which again is unusual because most support - floating support, as we would call it - tends to be time limited. The recovery journey is basically determined by the client, the length of the support and how much support they engage in. It is very much a client-centred approach.

Effectively, we are separating housing and support. The housing is delivered and the support, whether or not the client engages with the support, the amount of support they get and the amount of engagement is very much determined by the client. It is a client-led approach, really, and that works much better with a client group that has found themselves outside of the mainstream of supported housing.

We tend to use a strengths-based model. Is that enough?

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That is quite a lot. We will come back to you to ask for more details. Essentially, you are saying that housing is given unconditionally to people who have chronic homelessness and possibly multiple problems, and support for other problems is provided on top of that?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): Yes, and when they are engaged with our services, we would support the client to link in with drug or substance misuse services, mental health --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes. Rather than housing being conditional on engaging in support first, the housing is provided first?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): That is right.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Also, to David Eastwood, you are the Rough Sleeping Lead Manager at the GLA. What responsibilities does the Mayor have for rough sleeping? Rather than going into detail about your work, what are his statutory responsibilities here? What does he have to do?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): He does not have any statutory duty, but in terms of duties the Mayor has two functions. One is providing the strategic direction, which he does through the No Nights Sleeping Rough Taskforce, and the other one is through commissioning services. We commission pan-London services where it makes sense to commission pan-London services, such as No Second Night Out or the Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN). We also provide services to fill the gaps where boroughs do not commission their own services, such as London Street Rescue where we provide outreach in the 13 boroughs that do not commission their own outreach services. Therefore, he has, yes, two main functions, one strategic and one the operational services.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you very much. We will move on to our questions now. I will start by asking about the need for this and the demand for this. This is a question to Hannah first of all. We know there are issues with counting rough sleepers and with knowing the scale of the problem. Do we know how many Londoners there are in need of help with chronic homelessness?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. Just to set the scene in terms of the numbers of people in London who are experiencing the very worst forms of homelessness, we recently commissioned Heriot-Watt University to undertake a piece that looks at people who are sleeping rough, who are sleeping in cars, tents and on public transport, people who are living in unsuitable forms of temporary accommodation (TA) such as hostels and also people who are sofa-surfing, people who are staying with strangers from night to night and do not have any certainty about where they will be going from there. We found that in 2016 there were around 60,000 people living in London who were experiencing these worst forms of homelessness. We found that if we project forward into the future, by 2026 that number is projected to rise to 90,000 people if there is no significant change to Government policy.

Last year [2018] we published a plan [Everybody In: How to end homelessness in Great Britain] to end homelessness and, as part of that plan, we commissioned Imogen Blood Associates to look at the demand for Housing First across the United Kingdom (UK) or in Great Britain. We found that there is a huge mismatch between demand and the provision of Housing First services. There are around 2,300 people, we have estimated, in London who would be eligible for a Housing First place and that is based on their current experience of homelessness, so how long they have experienced homelessness for, and also based on the fact that they have multiple support needs. We know from that research that there are currently only around 84 people in London who are being supported by projects and so there is a huge gap in terms of provision at the moment for people.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That seems absolutely huge. You are saying that of the 60,000 people who are experiencing the worst kinds of homelessness, there are 2,300 people with long-term experience of this kind of homelessness plus other support needs?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): What are those other support needs?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of support needs we are looking at people who have a history of offending behaviour, who have mental or physical health problems, and also addiction issues in terms of alcohol and drugs.

It is worth saying that that 2,300 number is a fairly conservative estimate and so it only estimates the number of people who are in need of Housing First right now. It does not calculate future needs. It may be that we have people leaving the care system or the prison system who would also be eligible for a Housing First offer, but that number just calculates the current need provision for Housing First.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): In terms of London, David, how are you looking at this problem? Are you taking note of Crisis's figures and making plans? Are you commissioning any further research at a London level? It is great that Crisis did this, but if it is the Mayor's responsibility should we in the GLA be looking at this more closely?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): We are. As Hannah said, there are different ways of cutting numbers and looking at numbers. You can look at the numbers and work out about 3,000. You could look at CHAIN. We commission CHAIN. We know there were about 7,500 rough sleepers last year [2018]. Of that group, if you take the flow out, which is around 4,000, you end up with about 3,000 individuals who are your stock and returner numbers, whom you could say could benefit from a Housing First or housing-led approach.

At the moment we have some very good hostels that work that are commissioned by local authorities and the Mayor does not get involved in relation to the commissioning of hostels. That is very much from the borough level.

If you are looking at Housing First and you are looking at that step change in relation to an approach, it is very much a different approach to what is currently offered across the board. You need to look at it at scale. You need to look at the feasibility about putting money all in one pot and then working out how to divide it best, which is very difficult when the Mayor has only limited powers in this area and limited funding in this area.

We are in conversations with Crisis and with the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) about looking at a London-only feasibility study in relation to Housing First, and in relation to what scale we will need to step up to, to be able to do those changes, to make the changes at the scale that is needed to mean that Housing First is a step change approach.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We will get more on to what the Mayor is doing much later on in the meeting. Have you been looking at Manchester? We have seen reports that Manchester has set up a Housing First service.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): We have indeed, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): The count of rough sleepers in Manchester was estimated at 278 and that was everybody, not just the long-term ones but the short-term ones as well. They had over 500 referrals in their first year. Are you concerned that estimates of need might be too low and that once this is set up, the demand might outstrip what is being provided?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Not necessarily. We are very lucky in London to have CHAIN and we know more detailed information than Manchester does.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): This is calculated differently than the census?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): It is different to a count. A count is a one-off snapshot when people go out. In London we have CHAIN where all outreach workers record everyone who is seen rough sleeping and provide an intervention in terms of that and so we know, across the entire year, everyone who is seen rough sleeping by an outreach worker in London. Manchester does not have that same level of information. We know more in terms of what client groups are there. We know, like I say, that 4,000 people are only seen rough sleeping once and interventions are provided and those people do not return to rough sleeping. They do not have that level of information in Manchester. We have more information and so we have better data. We know more of what the needs are for that group. We know the support needs of everyone who is on the streets. We know more information than Manchester does.

In terms of whether demand will outstrip supply, that depends on what model you use for Housing First. It depends on the cohort that you choose. We can choose the cohort in London, which we did before in relation to the pilot we did back in 2011, which we did in relation to Housing First. We piloted the approach from the GLA and piloted a pan-London approach to try to test the water and see if it could work in the hope that boroughs would then end up implementing the model. A number of boroughs did, such as Camden, in terms of taking that forward. We had an approach to try to test the market back in 2011. Now we are looking at what more we can do.

Yes, it is an approach that has some evidence of scale. Manchester was very lucky to get funding from central Government. That was not an open bidding process in relation to how Manchester, Liverpool and the other areas got the money. The Government just went to those areas and suggested it would do Housing First. We were rather disappointed that it was not an open bidding process and that we were not allowed to bid because we would have been putting forward that. We did publish the Mayor's Rough Sleeping Plan of Action in June last year [2018], which had Housing First as one of the areas that we would like to develop. The Mayor is very much interested in taking it forward, but we need to do this at scale for it to work.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Hannah, did you have any further comment on that?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of the cohort in Manchester and why there is a bit of a mismatch between the numbers of people who are sleeping rough and the numbers of people who have been going into Housing First, it is worth saying that this is not just an intervention for people who are rough sleeping. This is also an intervention for people who are using the current hostel system. We have found that there is a number of people who cycle around that hostel system and that current homelessness services are not working effectively in terms of ending their homelessness.

The other thing I wanted to say in terms of meeting demand and the fact that Housing First could potentially be a service that could become flooded in terms of demand is that it needs to be situated within a broader homelessness strategy that also focuses on prevention so that we are turning the taps off in terms of the people who do go on to experience chronic homelessness.

Also, we need a wider housing-led approach. If we have a system in London where we have Housing First that prioritises rapid rehousing for people with the most complex needs, at the same time we need another system in place that prioritises rapid rehousing for people with lower support needs. The main difference would be in terms of the intensity of support. As David [Eastwood] mentioned, we have done a feasibility study in the

Liverpool City Region looking at Housing First and we did that ahead of the funding it was then allocated by central Government. We found that without that wider housing-led approach it was almost impossible to implement Housing First at scale successfully because it would become flooded as a model.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you very much.

Tony Devenish AM: Could I ask for some context first? We all know you do a great job, but this paper we have been given by our officers does not actually say who does what. There is no mention at all of the Government's recent paper in here. There is hardly any mention in terms of what the boroughs and then the partners do. What would be really helpful, David, maybe post-meeting, is a basic chart that shows what the Government does, where the money flows down, where it goes to the GLA, what the boroughs do and what the partners do. I broadly know because I have been a councillor forever, but anybody watching this will be confused when we go straight into a name, Housing First, which does not mean anything to anybody who is not within your specialities.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Assembly Member Devenish, we are exploring Housing First specifically today.

Tony Devenish AM: Yes, but we have to have some context --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): If you have questions about the Government funding, the question we are proposing to ask Hannah about what is going on around the UK would be a good way to get more information about that.

Tony Devenish AM: The point is that there is not even any mention of the Government trying to end rough sleeping by 2028, was it?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): 2027.

Tony Devenish AM: Just the context would be quite useful. My question - within context would have been helpful - is: how popular is the Housing First model in the UK, please?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of popularity, we know that it has gained significant political interest in this issue. At the beginning of last summer [2018] the Government allocated £28 million to Greater Manchester, the Liverpool City Region and the West Midlands to pilot the Housing First approach. In the last couple of years, we have seen a fairly significant increase in the number of Housing First projects that are run in England. There are around 32 projects that provide Housing First assistance to between 300 and 400 people. As I mentioned earlier, we have done some research that looks specifically at the number of people in London but also across the whole of Great Britain that would be and should be eligible for Housing First. That stands at around 18,500. Even though we have seen an increase in the number of projects, there is certainly still a huge demand for provision nationally.

The other issue in terms of popularity is that whilst we have seen a fairly significant growth in the number of Housing First projects operating across England, there have been concerns or interest around the fidelity of those projects in terms of the model. There was a piece of research that was conducted by Homeless Link in 2015 looking at the extent to which projects that claim to be Housing First are really delivering Housing First in terms of particularly the intensity of the support that they provided. Actually, quite a lot of those projects could probably be more accurately described as housing-led approaches to ending homelessness. As Mark [Taylor] described, the real difference with Housing First is that that support is unconditional and is

open-ended. Even if somebody does not access support for two or three years, say, after a five-year period of accessing support, they can go back to that project and access support later on. That kind of support was not necessarily being operated by all of the projects.

In terms of popularity, there is definitely significant interest in growing more projects and significant interest from the Government, but Labour has also committed to this as a policy if they were in power as well.

Tony Devenish AM: In terms of ending rough sleeping by 2027, how much of a component of the complex process to do that is the Housing First model?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of the Government's current commitment, it has dedicated funding to piloting Housing First. In terms of ending rough sleeping, Housing First would not necessarily work for that entire cohort. We have estimated that around 18,500 people across Great Britain would be eligible, which probably makes up around - gosh, off the top of my head - a fifth of people who are sleeping rough.

Nicky Gavron AM: Sorry. What proportion of people sleeping rough is the 18,500?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Sorry, I should have been clearer. The 18,500 figure is for England, Scotland and Wales. Of that figure, a proportion will be people who are sleeping rough, but a much higher proportion will be people in the hostel system because there are many more people who are cycling around in the hostel system than there are sleeping rough. I can definitely provide a breakdown for the Committee in terms of the number of people who are sleeping rough versus the number of people in the hostel system.

Tony Devenish AM: Yes, and that is my final point, really, but maybe David and Hannah together can come up with a nice simple diagram chart for those who do not do this for a living 24/7 so that it is nice and clear who does what and what you are trying to achieve. A lot of people have expressed some surprise that my Government has said, "We are going to end this by 2027". I just want to know how we are going to do it.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): It is worth saying in terms of the MHCLG and the Government's commitment in terms of piloting of Housing First, they have been very clear because we have had conversations with them that they will not commit any further central [government] money until these pilots have taken place and have been fully evaluated, which in the sector has caused some potential ripples because Housing First has been extensively evaluated in other areas. As Hannah said, Crisis has carried out extensive evaluations. There have been extensive evaluations from the work in Finland. There is a little bit of concern that they are going to wait three years until this has been properly done in those areas before they are going to do an evaluation and then come back and, we would imagine, say, "Yes, this works", in which case we have already lost three years when they could potentially have been funding it in other areas. There is a concern around that.

In terms of the Government's commitment, how they are going to be measuring their success is based on the count and so is based on that one-off snapshot across the country because that is all the information that they have available. Yes, that is how they are planning on measuring it. Their target is to halve it within this Parliament and then end it at the end of the following Parliament. They might be more ending the need for rough sleeping rather than necessarily ending rough sleeping, but that would be my personal view around that target.

Tony Devenish AM: That was very helpful. Thank you.

David Kurten AM: From the 18,500 people who need your services, do you have any information on the nationality of those people? How many are UK citizens and how many are Polish, Romanian and other nationalities, where we know there is a big problem with homelessness within the UK?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): We do not have a nationality breakdown in terms of that 18,500 figure. That number is largely drawn from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation work on destitution, and I know that a significant proportion of people within that study were non-UK nationals and had become destitute as a result of that. The number also draws upon the Lankelly Chase *Hard Edges* research, which looks at multiple disadvantage and exclusion. We do not have a nationality breakdown.

That is one of the things that I would recommend if London was looking at Housing First and was looking at a feasibility study in terms of scaling up. It would be something to take into account, looking particularly at multiple needs amongst non-UK nationals because, as I am sure you will be aware, there will be additional barriers for that group of people in terms of accessing housing support and that will impact in terms of the success that Housing First can have amongst that group of people. We do not currently have a breakdown in terms of that 18,500 figure.

What you probably could do on CHAIN - and I do not think this is publicly available but I am sure the cross-references are possible - is to look at the number of people who have more than one support need, which has been rising as a proportion in the last couple of years, and cross-reference that with people's nationality because that is available on CHAIN.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Yes, you could carry out that analysis on CHAIN. The difficulty very much is that part of the funding in relation to Housing First is in relation to Housing Benefit. If a group is not eligible for Housing Benefit - and the likelihood is that those individuals who are non-UK nationals especially are without access to that - the funding that is required becomes even higher because you do not have the money from welfare to cover those other costs. It is very difficult and none of the pilots that the Government is funding will be working with non-UK nationals.

The issue in other areas of the country is not quite so high. In London at the last count in terms of CHAIN, 52% of those people on the streets were non-UK nationals. It is very difficult in terms of the service offer that we have for that group if they are not eligible for welfare. One of the things that the Mayor has been calling for is the opening up of welfare, time-limited, for that group so that we can help provide more interventions for that group.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): The Committee has looked at rough sleeping in general not that long ago and we explored this issue as well.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): To Hannah first of all, in your experience, is Housing First successful in sustainably housing chronically homeless people with complex needs?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): There is overwhelming international evidence as well as evidence from the UK to show that for people who have high and complex needs, Housing First is incredibly successful in terms of tenancy sustainment. It tends to work for around 80% of people who have high and complex needs.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Are you measuring success in terms of tenancy sustainment or do you have other measures as well?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes, Housing First is principally measured in terms of tenancy sustainment, but there is evidence that it is also very successful in terms of improving other health and wellbeing outcomes. One of the pieces of evidence that I would strongly recommend having a look at is the piece that was done by the University of York in 2015. They looked at nine Housing First projects around England and were looking specifically not only at tenancy sustainment but at improvements in terms of physical and mental health outcomes and also in terms of addiction to drugs and alcohol as well. For all of those categories, there were improvements shown.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Even though there is no compulsion on people to access services, it is actually more likely that people will end up accessing the services?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. What is really important to note around Housing First is that it is aimed at a cohort of people who have been repeatedly excluded from services. They are a group of people that often have things done to them rather than having control and choice over the support they receive and the way they receive it. Having lack of conditionality between support and housing is really important in terms of helping them to access support. It really is about enabling people to make their own choice about how they access it and the way they access support services, if that makes sense. That can mean on a shorter-term basis that people do not necessarily engage in support in the immediate stages, but in the long term they have a more sustainable relationship with the way they access support and it is much more successful.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Would you say based on the evidence that Housing First is more successful at housing chronically homeless people with complex needs than traditional ways of doing things?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. We commissioned a 'what works' review looking specifically at rough sleeping services and services for people with complex needs last year [2018] as part of our plan to end homelessness. We found that there is a significant lack of evidence around hostels and supported accommodation in terms of their ability to move people on from homelessness. It is not so much that there is an overwhelming amount of evidence to show that they are less successful.

We do have more experiential evidence from people who are using supported housing in the hostel system to show that it does not necessarily work particularly well for people with high and complex needs. When we carried out the feasibility study in the Liverpool City Region, the researchers undertook a number of qualitative interviews with frontline workers and also with people who had experience of using the homelessness system there. They found that it was not working for a number of groups --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Traditional services, sorry, for Housing First, was not working for people with high and complex needs?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. In terms of traditional services, I am referring to hostels --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Is it the staircase approach?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes, essentially a system that requires people to move through a number of transitional stages before they are able to access permanent accommodation. What we found was, for people who have high and complex needs, living alongside other people - on a congregate site in a hostel, for example - who also are facing similar challenges, other people who have

addictions or who have very severe mental health problems, can prove a very chaotic environment. It can be very challenging for people if they are trying to get off drink and drugs.

One other thing that people found particularly challenging was around that assessment process to move into permanent accommodation. That caused people a lot of anxiety and a lot of stress around that entire process.

There is also quite a lot of evidence from Homeless Link, which does an annual survey every year of support that is provided to single people. It found is that a significant proportion of hostels and supported accommodation providers are reporting that they are having to turn people away who have high and complex needs because they simply do not have the resources or the capacity to deal with people in that situation. It is a problem for people when they are in them, but it is also a problem in the sense that people are being turned away.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Are there any groups of entrenched rough sleepers that Housing First does not work for so well or does it work across the board for people with complex needs?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): We do tend to find that for about 10% of people who have high and complex needs, Housing First does not necessarily work for that group. It might be that they need another form of supported accommodation. That might be long-term ongoing supported accommodation that is able to provide the healthcare support needs that they need in that situation.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Mark, can I put the same questions to you? Do you agree with what you have heard? Is there anything you would like to add or do you disagree with anything you have heard?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): I generally agree with it. For us, one of our key pieces of work is Housing First for women who are experiencing complex needs. Of the women within our Fulfilling Lives project, which is funded by the Big Lottery, over 90% had experienced domestic violence. Housing that particular group in a hostel is often counterproductive and just reinforces a lot of the experiences they had before. Housing First has proved to be very effective for that particular group.

The other thing in terms of it not being effective is - yes, I agree very much - that there are a lot of guys who have been on the streets for a long time and have very prominent physical health conditions and may need some form of registered care type of provision. Clearly, that is not going to work for them. Also, ultimately, the guys have to pay the rent. If they are not going to pay the rent, it is not going to be sustainable, really. I guess that is where the support comes in, but it is not always there.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): There is an issue there with welfare. I presume there would be direct payments to landlords in the case of people going through Housing First?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): Yes, that is certainly a mechanism by which we can achieve that. I do not know if we are going to get on to the barriers and where it is problematic in terms of accessing PRS accommodation.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, we will come on to that further down the agenda. That is a very important point.

David, could I ask you to comment on what we have heard? What are your views in terms of the success or otherwise of a Housing First approach?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Sure. Finland is normally held up as being the mecca in relation to Housing First and what is achieved over there is extremely inspiring in terms of the changes they made to their hostel system and the changes they made to their supported housing. Very much over there when it started out, there was more dormitory accommodation and mass areas where people were sleeping and being warehoused in large rooms. They changed that approach to more single rooms and also had Housing First coming alongside that at the same time.

We are in a different position in London. We have learned a lot from psychologically informed environments in hostels. In the majority, people have their own rooms and people have their own bathrooms. It is a very different setup to what there was in Finland.

It is also worth saying in relation to Finland - and I have been lucky enough to have quite a lot of conversation with Peter Frederickson, who was a special adviser to the Finnish Government at that time when it was looking at Housing First - the approach was to look at it systematically and it was a huge investment that was made in relation to this change from what they had previously. They were looking at investing around €240 million in terms of capital funding. There was €100 million in terms of support funding. These are large sums of money and it was a large change across the entire way they worked.

One of the key changes and one of the key costs in relation to that was the support. Support was offered initially on a one-to-two basis and so they had a caseworker working with two clients only, which is a very costly approach. It is a very effective approach, but it is not an approach that you should be doing across the board for everyone. That is something that I think we would all agree with in terms of the panel: Housing First works and can work for a specific cohort and you have to make sure you are getting that cohort right. It is people with very entrenched needs whom the current system is not working for.

The hostel system does work and we know in terms of our Clearing House properties that they work. We have a 97% tenancy sustainment rate in Clearing House, which provides floating support. We learned from our Housing First pilots that we did back in 2011 in terms of looking at more of a housing-led approach in relation to Clearing House properties so we do take some people that have high support needs straight from the streets into that accommodation. However, that is not Housing First because, if someone is in a Clearing House property, they have to engage with support. The agreement we have with the registered social landlords that provide that stock is that support will be provided and so that support is mandatory coming in. Therefore, it is not pure Housing First.

That is where things can get quite difficult. I know you asked at the beginning for a definition of what Housing First is and it is difficult. There has been much debate within the sector about the purity of the Housing First model, which, like I say, came from Finland and from Canada. It was very much that everyone is given a tenancy for life and is given support when they need it throughout the course of their life. That is very difficult to achieve in England where we are commissioning services on a two- to five-year cycle. To say that that person is going to have support forever and is going to have a tenancy forever is very difficult to do and should only be for those people who really need that support.

The other thing I would say is that even within Finland, even within Helsinki, the numbers of rough sleepers that are now on the streets and in long-term homelessness is still relatively high. Although they have provided a solution for many people, their last count was back in 2017 and there were just over 1,000 rough sleepers in Helsinki, which is a comparatively higher number than we have in London. Although Finland is held up as being the model in relation to Housing First and how successful Housing First can be, there are still some challenges and limitations with that model. Yes, it should be part of the solution and it should be part of the toolkit that we use in relation to tackling rough sleeping, but, as Hannah has mentioned, Housing First is not

just about rough sleeping. In its purest model, you are looking at helping people who are struggling in tenancies currently. You are looking at helping people who are in TA and getting people straight from TA into housing. It is very much across the board rather than just tackling rough sleeping.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Just quickly – and this relates to Assembly Member Kurten’s question earlier – are there any restrictions in terms of who is eligible to access Housing First in terms of immigration status? Is it open to European Union (EU) nationals and non-EU nationals? What will happen after Brexit?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): That varies depending on the individual project and depending on how the individual project is funded. In the majority of cases, individuals have to be eligible for benefits to move into it because that is how in the main the rent is going to be paid. Therefore, an EU national who is eligible for benefits – and there will be some who have previously worked – will be eligible for Housing First. If you are not eligible for welfare, in the main there are very few Housing First projects that you could access.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Could I move on to you now, Stuart, and SPEAR’s approach? Can you outline for us SPEAR’s homelessness service, which follows the Housing First principles?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person’s Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Sure. I do not really recognise the difference between the traditional approach and the Housing First approach. There are principles of Housing First that are quite common in the sector, not universal. The way that we work in SPEAR we would not call ‘Housing First’ necessarily but many of the principles we adhere to.

We focus on the Borough of Richmond upon Thames. We provide a pathway. We work with people on the streets. We have short-term emergency accommodation. We have a hostel that is a psychologically informed environment and so it is a recovery hostel with a high level of staffing, partnerships with other agencies, etc. We have second-stage shared supported accommodation. Then we have independent accommodation that is time-limited and there is an exit into both social housing and PRS accommodation, which we broker. There is tenancy support in that independent accommodation. Therefore, it staircases but it is not delivered in a fashion that has been described in the traditional model, which is that if you do not engage with an addiction service, you cannot move on and otherwise you will be evicted. We would not work in that way.

It is strength-based, it is person-centred and it works extremely well. We have tenancy sustainment rates in the region of 90% once people are in independent accommodation. Across the board, even in the direct-access hostels, we have an 84% tenancy sustainment rate. It works very well.

The principles of Housing First that we recognise are very much that to engage people with complex needs you need to build trust because, if you have had trauma and if you have complex needs, you accept support from people you trust and you trust people whom you believe have your best interests at heart. The approach that is described in Housing First of saying, “How can I help you? What support can we provide? Where do you want to go in your life?” is much more effective than saying, “If you do A and B, you will move on. If you do not, we will evict you”. That is not an approach that we would ever advocate at SPEAR.

That is not, in my experience, very common in the homelessness sector, generally speaking. It is common, however, in the provision of statutory services. If you go to engage in mental health provision or addiction services, there are often thresholds in that way. If you do not meet certain criteria then you will not be able to stay in the service, essentially.

We did have some Housing First funding from the GLA and the service was not delivered in isolation. It was integrated into the rest of the services we provided in Richmond and Wandsworth. Essentially, it enabled us to have additional staff so that the staff-to-client ratio was lower and a smaller number of people had more support. Undoubtedly, that helps. It helps a lot. If you have staff who are paid reasonably well and you have a staff-to-client ratio that is more generous, then people get more support and they do better.

In our case, we provide our own accommodation or we manage it. Some of it is supported shared housing. Some of it is independent accommodation. If we are effectively the landlord, then we can be much more tolerant and we can take an approach we describe in the sector of taking positive risks. We know if we move someone into independent accommodation or a small shared supported housing scheme where there is no staff onsite - there might be four people living together and somebody visiting every so often - we are taking a positive risk. If you have more staff support you can take more positive risks and if you are the landlord, even more so.

When you are working with housing associations as partners or with PRS landlords, you are somewhat limited because the tenancies have conditions. Even if we are supporting someone in a social housing unit, if somebody does not pay their arrears or behaves in a certain way, they will breach their tenancy agreement. From a pure perspective, you have limited control over the tenancy management if you are not the landlord. If you are, it is easier.

However, even if you increase the staffing, you have skilled staff and you have a higher staff-to-client ratio, you are still limited in the wraparound support you can provide for this cohort if you do not have robust partnerships with mental health, addiction and physical health partners. An issue that we often face is, for example, when we have somebody with very serious mental health issues. For their tenancy sustainment long-term, they need to engage in mental health treatment. Their local mental health services do not have a bespoke way of either promoting access to or engagement in health treatment. They do not have a bespoke way of multiagency case management with voluntary sector partners. You might spend a year lobbying the local mental health service to take on one of your clients; you may or may not be successful in that; and if the mental health issues are not addressed, the client's recovery is inhibited by that. Therefore, we do not look at the housing issue on its own. We look at the support we provide, the partnerships and what we need from Mark [Taylor] and our health partners, and also the co-operation that we need from our landlords.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Does that differ from traditional Housing First or mainstream Housing First?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Coming back to what Mark said at the beginning, if you define Housing First as a set of principles, we deliver them and have done for some time, whether we call it 'Housing First' or not, but there are limitations to the application not of the principles necessarily because the principles are quite generic but in terms of the purity. To provide the housing regardless of whether somebody engages in support or not, you are limited by the nature of the tenancies depending on whom you are working with, whether you are providing yourself or you are supporting people to move into social housing, for example.

My view is that to take this forward and what we are doing in our area independently with partners is to develop the partnership working with both the registered provider partners - so that they are on board if you are taking positive risks with people who are going to move into tenancies and you recognise the risk of there being problems as higher - and also with the local health, particularly mental health, and addiction treatment providers and commissioners with us, the charity providing the services, and council colleagues. When you

bring those together, you have a much greater chance of success in people being ready and wanting to move into independent accommodation sooner.

The other thing just to add is that, not everyone said this but the assumption is that, hostels or supported shared supported housing projects are not effective. They can be. For some of our clients, if we would say to them, "We have developed a relationship with you. Would you like to move into a hostel where you are currently residing on the streets and you know us and you know if you move into the hostel you will get this type of support, or would you like to go into independent accommodation but out-of-borough in another part of London?", the majority of our clients would say, "I will move into the hostel". Some of our residents would say, "I would rather be in the hostel for a period and stabilise and then I will move on to independent accommodation later". That is the client's choice and our view is that it is in their interests to give people the option.

I would not advocate the provision of independent accommodation in lieu of supported housing or hostel provision, but I would say that hostel provision needs to be resourced in a way that enables more intensive support so that the staircasing is client-led as opposed to punitive.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): We have actually moved on slightly as well to question 8 in terms of the funding that the Mayor has given to the to the project. I just wanted to finish off with a question about whether you think Housing First is always the appropriate service for chronically homeless people with complex needs. It sounds like you are saying not necessarily?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): It depends how you define it. If you said that there is a provision of independent accommodation with a high level of support that is delivered on a multiagency basis for people as early as they want to move into independent accommodation, then I would say that undoubtedly it would be hard to justify any other position, but that does not necessarily mean that recovery-focused hostels or single shared supported housing do not also have their place in a somewhat staircased approach because many people benefit.

Picking up on what Mark [Taylor] said earlier about women's provision, we have been having bespoke services for women who have been street homeless with domestic violence, etc, and we do women-only supported housing projects on quite a small scale with four or five women living together. The women love that. They would rather live in a house with three or four other women. Men are not allowed into the service. It is safe. The location is anonymous. There is a peer-support element to it. There is a bit of a community. People make friends. That is a precursor to people moving into independent accommodation.

The model we have developed at SPEAR is a pathway model where we have supported accommodation that precedes independent accommodation, but not always and not for everybody. Certainly, if people who are street homeless or were street homeless and are now in supported housing have the opportunity to get into independent accommodation as soon as possible, as soon as they want to - to an extent as soon as they are ready, but that is often their own assessment more so than anyone else's - and if with that there is the support, then great. However, I would say that to facilitate people moving into an independent accommodation as soon as possible and to sustain it effectively, there is so much we can do ourselves in the voluntary sector but it is the partnership with the statutory agencies and the mental health and addiction providers that needs to be improved. If we are talking about social housing as one of the exits into long-term accommodation, then we need to work with registered providers in a more structured way.

Together we can do this, but otherwise people do come up against limitations of other agencies' criteria. If you breach certain rules, you cannot get the mental health support. If you breach certain rules, you cannot stay in a social housing provision.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Mark, do you want to comment on what you have heard about the SPEAR approach?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): I suppose I would need to understand a few more details, but I suppose in a sense we can talk about the fidelity of the model and purity and suchlike, but we do not want to get too hung up on those issues. Really, it is about what works. For SPEAR and for that locality, if the approach they are taking is what is working, whether it is a variation on Housing First or not, then that is primarily the issue, really. There are local variations that would mean that one approach is much more appropriate than another, perhaps, and also about the access to the various types of housing. In Islington, for example, where we have a Housing First approach, they are providing social housing to support that. That is highly unusual but incredibly positive. That is a pilot but they are going to scale it up. It is five units at the moment and they are hoping to move that up.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Is that the only borough to provide that? Are they providing their own council housing?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): Council housing, yes.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Southwark also has a Housing First pilot doing the same thing. The question is how to increase that stock. As Mark mentioned, if there are five units, if you are doing Housing First properly, those individuals will remain in those five units for the rest of their life unless they would like to move. Therefore, you have to make sure you are going to be increasing the stock to make it work. Otherwise, all you are doing is providing support for those five individuals and that is going to be it. It is how you scale up and increase that stock, but not to the detriment of other groups who are coming in and who equally would like that housing stock. That is a conversation that we have with our colleagues in relation to statutory housing. The council waiting lists are very long and so are you jumping the queue if you are potentially going through this model? Are rough sleepers jumping the queue in terms of those individuals who are waiting for council housing stock? It is very difficult for a local authority to juggle that and to balance that, as you can imagine.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): In Richmond we have 32 flats provided by two housing associations. Access is given to the local authority, which delegates that to us. Then we have a quota of 20 housing association flats per year every year as part of that pathway. It works extremely effectively, but nevertheless the housing association that is signing the person up for the tenancy, both in the interim period and in the long stage, still needs to assess that person as being suitable and is still the landlord and still puts certain conditions on the tenancy agreement. Our support for that person is ongoing whilst they are in that tenancy, as long as they need it, but also in those earlier stages in their journey into that independent accommodation. Some people will go there quite quickly; some people will be in the supported accommodation first. Yes, it is relatively unique, what Richmond has done there.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): I have a couple more questions about the types of people different models may be suitable for. I wanted to ask Stuart about the kinds of people who get referred to you and whether or not you assess people for whether or not it might work for them. One of the things that attracted me to talking about

Housing First is that it is rights-based and person-centred and it is people's choices what things they take up, whereas the traditional supported housing and hostel model is more institutional and less individual. Mark [Taylor] has described, for example, women who have been victims of domestic violence and who might have trauma in their lives needing to be alone and not in a place that might be more chaotic and have more people coming in. Some people with long-term rough sleeping may be very individual-type people. They may not respond well at all to being in an institution. Others may be more institutionalised if they have come out of prison, for example. Therefore, I can see that different models might work better for different kinds of people.

To go back to my question, Stuart, do you select people who might be more amenable to your more highly regimented [accommodation] and who want to be in those stages before being in individual accommodation? Do you select people for suitability or are you just handed people and it works for some and not others?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

We do, but it is very case-by-case. There are certain lessons you learn about what works and what does not and that informs your practice, but it is pretty person-centred, I agree. There are certain general rules. For example, for women who have had trauma, have experienced domestic violence or have been on the streets, in our experience - and this is generally held up - women-only provision is safer for that cohort. If you have women in a large mix-gender hostel, I have seen evidence in the past that women do not do as well in that setting. To say that women would necessarily, *en masse*, in that situation want to be in independent accommodation as opposed to a small house with four people sharing, my experience does not bear that out. It might very well be the case for an individual person that they do not want to be in that shared supported housing scheme and wants to be independent and that might be what works out best for them, but there are other people who go into independent accommodation and it does not work out for them. They needed the shared supported housing with somebody holding some boundaries.

I would not say it is regimented. Certainly, the hostel provision we provide is much more about creating a culture of recovery. It is psychologically informed. If you look at the recent reports from the South London and Maudsley National Health Service (NHS) Trust, in partnership with Graham House and Thames Reach, hostels can provide opportunities for recovery and personal development. The communal living aspect of it is really important and you would not get that necessarily if someone was living alone. It is very person-centred.

To a certain extent, it is also compromised by availability. There is a reality check to this. If you have a vacancy in a hostel but a waiting time for somebody to go independent and both are open for somebody, there is something about availability.

Most of our most complex-needs clients would tend to go into the supported housing environment, but if it does not work for them or they do not like it and we can provide more intensive wraparound support, then for sure independent accommodation is on the menu for them as well.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): What you said earlier was when people are ready to move on is their own assessment, essentially. Is that the case?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): To a certain extent, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): There is no testing to say if you are ready next month or something?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): The client group does not fit into the boxes that we might want to define them into. Just as an example, we

had a lady who had been rough sleeping for 30 years. She had an addiction. She had mental health issues. She had learning difficulties. She had been street-working for many years. She was in a mixed-gender hostel. She was violent to another resident. She was evicted. She was back on the streets. We were still working with her because we have a rough sleeper outreach service. We were still working with her. We did not say, "That is it. You have blown your chances. We are not going to help you anymore". We carried on supporting her, but she could not stay in the accommodation. We then moved her into a smaller shared supported housing scheme. Things did not work out there. She was bringing men in, which was against the rules. She could not stay there. We then moved her into an independent training flat and provided her more support there. That failed due to people taking advantage of her vulnerability and using it as a base for dealing drugs and other activities. She could not manage that independently. She moved back into the supported housing scheme. Then, through her choice, she was from Scotland and she wanted to go back to Scotland. We helped her resettle into independent accommodation in Scotland.

She has successfully sustained that. She contacts us from time to time and asks for a little bit of advice. She is happy and her life has stabilised. During that period of - whatever it was - five or six years of her being in different services, the principles that we are talking about here were very much at the heart of the approach we took. We never rejected her. We never said, "We are not going to help you anymore. We are not going to support you". We were always open to different options for her, but the chaos of her life and the difficulty in changing her habits was such that it took that sustained service through different types of models - whether the accommodation was independent or shared or supported or single gender or mixed gender - and she went through a process of growth.

For most of us on the ground who do the work, we are person-centred. We are looking at people's strengths. We are looking at their aspirations. We also a stakeholder in terms of the support we provide and managing boundaries. We kind of work on it together.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you. Mark, just finally, do you have a comment on the question of this more medical, mental health type of support? Your model provides a keyworker who provides outreach and links. Do you experience the same problems in getting people access to mental health support and medical treatment for things like addiction?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): We do depending on the location. The reality is that - and maybe this is where we do differ somewhat from Stuart's service - a lot of the guys we are supporting into Housing First are on the streets when we engage with them and so they are not engaged in any services at all. The challenge is to get them engaged in services, but the principal issue is to get them engaged in our service and then get them into some form of housing. From there, the conversations can start about accessing the wraparound support. That tends to be a journey and it tends to be much later on down the line. Yes, those challenges exist. They exist for all the clients more generally within the population, but ultimately the challenges we face are about engaging with the guys when they are on the streets because they are basically locked out the system entirely or have opted out of the system entirely.

Tony Devenish AM: I just wanted to go back to my famous point about context. Stuart, you mentioned the figure of 84% achievement, I think you said. How many people are we talking about? I know it is not that simple. How many years have you have been doing this? That is not in the papers. Perhaps Mark [Taylor] can give us an idea of how many customers he has in his work as well.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): SPEAR has been working in southwest London for 33 years. We started off in the Borough of Richmond upon Thames. We now work in Richmond, Sutton, Kingston, Wandsworth and Merton. The service is principally

directed towards people who are street homeless. We have a separate division that works with young homeless people. The street homeless services are outreach and accommodation and we differentiate women-only provision as well.

Last year we worked with 620 people, most of whom were street homeless, and we provided 157 tenancies, most of which were in different supported housing settings or shared housing. Probably 50-plus were in independent accommodation units. Does that answer the question?

Tony Devenish AM: That is perfect. I just wanted to get a feel for it.

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): We have four Housing First projects at the moment, one in Newham, where we currently have 15 people housed. It is funded to that level and they are going to look to double that for the next year if the funding is available. We also have around 15 in Redbridge. Again, we could ramp that up if the funding was available for the additional workers. Then we have two projects operating across Camden and Islington. We have the Fulfilling Lives project with about 15 people. Then we have the pilot in Islington, which has five in it at the moment.

Tony Devenish AM: Thank you.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you, Assembly Member Devenish. Hannah, you wanted to come back with something?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes, just on that point of context and what we find overwhelming from our services. We provide frontline services in England, Scotland and Wales, and we do have three delivery centres in London: in Shoreditch, Croydon and up in Brent. We deliver services to around 11,000 people and around 4,000 people in London.

What we overwhelmingly hear from people when we ask them what is needed to end their homelessness is, "A home". Often when people tell us that they do not necessarily want that, it is because their experience of living independently has not been matched with the appropriate type of support that they need. Whether or not we are working with people with low support needs or high support needs, we almost all of the time find that scattered housing within communities is the answer to their homelessness.

We worked with Hammersmith and Fulham Council about 18 months ago on a commission that they had around what was needed to end rough sleeping within that borough. As part of that piece of work we commissioned Groundswell, a homelessness charity that operates there, to interview 108 people who had experience of sleeping rough in the borough. Of those 108 people, only two people told us that they wanted to move into a hostel. There was a lot of concern amongst people with high and low support needs about moving through transitional TA before they move into housing.

Therefore, even if people say, "I do want something else", it tends to be because their experience of living independently has not been matched with that support. Overwhelmingly, housing and homes are what are needed in order to end people's homelessness.

Nicky Gavron AM: I just wanted to ask one thing of Stuart. When you talked about women sharing, is that for life? You talked about women wanting to be together and sharing.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

No. It might sound a bit old-fashioned but we deliver a pathway. The pathway typically is that somebody could move from the streets into independent accommodation --

Nicky Gavron AM: And that would be for life, would it?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): --

not necessarily, but normally they would move into shared housing, which is either a slightly larger-scale hostel or a smaller-scale shared supported housing project. The women's projects that we have - and we have a number of them - are small with three to four people living in a house together.

It is time-limited because there is a continual flow of people every year. Women would normally be there for period of time and then move on into independent accommodation. Some of the independent accommodation we provide is time-limited to two years and we provide more intensive support.

Often that is a precursor to social housing when we are in Richmond because Richmond makes social housing available to us at 20 units a year. Other boroughs do not do that. If it happens to be in Richmond, then there is a step-on. If it is outside of Richmond, we typically broker somebody's access to PRS accommodation. The issue with that is that the tenure is much less secure. A private landlord can at any time say, "I want to sell the property. You cannot stay there any longer", or they might want to put the rent up or what-have-you. Private rented sector accommodation as an exit is less satisfactory than social housing, which is typically a home for life.

Just to go back on what I said earlier, if you were in a situation where there was much greater availability of social housing or secure tenure and assured tenancy for life, more people in supported housing would take it if there was the right support for them.

Nicky Gavron AM: Yes. I suppose the point is that we are talking about people who have come off the streets with entrenched homelessness and very complex needs and it is in the nature of it that they are going to need some support for their lives, are they not? Is that not the point of Housing First?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

Not necessarily. We have many people who were entrenched rough sleepers with complex needs who a few years down the line live independently with little or no support.

Nicky Gavron AM: These are people with complex needs?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

Absolutely, yes. There are people who work for us. Over 10% of our workforce has experienced street homelessness. People do recover. Not to sound like a broken record, but often the recovery is underpinned by both the stability of that housing and also the effective joint working between us and what we provide and also our partners in mental health provision, addiction services and physical health provision as well, with a co-operative landlord, typically a housing association. When that comes together, people do recover much more effectively.

Nicky Gavron AM: I do not know how comfortable I feel with this question, but anyway. It is about comparative costs, in a way. The research seems to be inconclusive about the cost savings with Housing First to Government services, to local authority services and to homeless charity services. That is in the longer term

that the research is inconclusive on these cost savings. I do not know what experience people have of this and so I would like to leave it open as to who answers first, but if that is the case, what research is needed?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

We have done some research into this and I brought a copy today of a report produced by the Young Foundation. Comparable to Mark's [Taylor] organisation, we were funded by the Big Lottery to deliver our health and homelessness service. This was particularly to build bridges between our client group and health providers. We find that street homeless people or ex-street homeless people with complex needs often do not really want to engage in mainstream provision and also that mainstream provision does not easily engage with this cohort. This is mental health, physical health, primary care and addiction. When we deliver a service to bridge the gap, the access to health provision goes up significantly. Most people do want to engage in health treatment if they have the support from us and have built the relationship and the rapport. They tend to stay engaged longer and their health improves.

The Young Foundation did some evaluation. It is extremely hard to find the metrics to measure cost savings but they have done it nevertheless, but in quite a limited fashion. They have looked at reduced accident and emergency department (A&E) attendances and people going to primary care instead of an A&E, reduced ambulance call-outs and reduced inpatient stays in wards as opposed to health treatment in the community. There is evidence from our work in that field.

We are not alone. From the Department of Health, St Mungo's, Homeless Link and other organisations there is emerging research around the costs to the health sector from a voluntary sector partnership with health agencies. Other reports have been carried out into cost savings to the public purse. We all intuitively and anecdotally understand that there are savings through prevention and through upstream work in the community, but there is not definitive evidence so much so that there would be a business case to persuade, for example, Clinical Commissioning Groups or NHS trusts or the NHS to put some of its funding more upstream.

One of the reasons for that is that the evidence that has been collated so far, as far as I can understand, comes from the voluntary sector databases, not from the NHS database. One of the recommendations of the Young Foundation as this service carries on is for us to try to work with the NHS so that we can use their data for the shared client group so that the business case about the cost savings comes from within the NHS where it is more likely to drive spending at their end around prevention and saving money elsewhere.

Nicky Gavron AM: Is that comparative to what would have happened if the person being helped was not in Housing First but was on the street or in a hostel?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

For us, we cannot say it with 100% certainty and, just to clarify, it is not necessarily just the Housing First service. It is SPEAR's services more generally.

In our case we looked at the cohort of people and the number of A&E attendances and ambulance call-outs before and after and it had definitely reduced. I would say that the evidence is relatively robust. You cannot say 100% that the A&E attendances and ambulance call-outs would not have gone down anyway, but probably not without the support.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): This was one of the things that we focused on when we did the feasibility study in the Liverpool City Region. One of the key factors of that study was looking at cashable savings for all the boroughs in the Liverpool City Region. We model two different

scenarios of implementing Housing First. The first was quite a conservative implementation just for the people who needed Housing First alongside existing provision. The second scenario looked at introducing Housing First for the cohort of people who were identified alongside homelessness prevention interventions and also a wider housing-led model as well. In that first scenario, we found that after around five years of implementation there were cashable savings for the entire Liverpool City Region of just over £1 million, but if you implemented Housing First as part of a broader strategy that also focused on prevention and housing-led solutions, there were cashable savings of over £4 million for the Liverpool City Region. That was in terms of cashable savings. Quite often we talk about savings for health and things in terms of admissions, which is very useful, but it does not necessarily mean that you are going to close an entire A&E and that you are actually going to see cashable savings. We looked at what we could save in terms of cash across health and justice budgets but also across housing and homelessness budgets.

Nicky Gavron AM: One of the crucial things you said was that after about five years and the question also is in the longer term because this is housing for life and you have to look at the long term.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes, exactly. It is really important to say that if you do Housing First properly and in line with the principles - and it is a high-fidelity model - then it is not necessarily cheaper as a solution compared to other homelessness services and current provision, but we do know that it is more effective and so it is better value for money.

What we also found in the Liverpool City Region in terms of scaling Housing First up appropriately and responsibly is that you would have to double-fund existing services alongside Housing First for about one to two years. During that period there would potentially be additional spend and it would not necessarily be cheaper, but in the long run you would see cashable savings, particularly if it is done as part of that broader homelessness prevention and housing-led strategy.

Nicky Gavron AM: Do you have a view on this, David?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): In terms of around the money, yes, it depends on the fidelity of the model and it depends on where you go with it.

Our view is that Housing First should be part of the toolkit. If you are working with the most entrenched on the streets, a personalised solution is what you should be working with. It is what we do with the Social Impact Bond, which works with 350 of the most entrenched individuals on the streets in London. We operate with very much a personalised approach. We work with the providers St Mungo's and Thames Reach and we pay them based on outcomes rather than the model they have to go through. We are pay on accommodation outcomes for the individual to get into accommodation and then to sustain that accommodation. We do not say what that kind of accommodation is. We do not say that it has to go through a pathway.

We know personalised solutions work for the most entrenched. Making people jump through hoops in terms of that old-style, standard, classic, "This is the pathway off the streets that you have to go through", does not work for the most entrenched, but it will work for quite a number of people. Trying to have that personalised approach is what is going to work.

Is Housing First cheaper? No, it is not going to be a cheaper approach. As Hannah said, it is more likely to be really successful for a group of people. What we found from the small pilot we did previously was that it is very difficult to predict the individuals it is going to work for and is not going to work for. I was in Westminster at that time and we put forward people to be part of this pilot. We put forward five people. I thought three of

them would do really well. With two of them, I was like, “Blimey, they have been around every single hostel. It is never going to work for those two at all”. Three of them worked; two of them did not. It was not the two people I predicted would fall out. They fell out of it within six months. It did not work for them at all. They could not cope in terms of living on their own. They were not quite ready for that.

It is very difficult to predict. It should be part of the toolkit. We should be looking at taking people straight from the streets into accommodation if that is what they wish and is what we think is going to work for them, but it needs to be a balanced approach. No, you cannot say that you should disinvest in every single hostel and turn everything into Housing First. That is not going to be the best approach and that is not what they have done in Finland. Like I said, everyone harks to Finland and says that they have done everything and everyone gets their own flat. They do not. Lots of people get supported housing based in blocks, which is very similar to what we do in terms of hostels. There has to be that mixed approach.

Nicky Gavron AM: Does anyone else want to comment on what has been said by David?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of the Finland stuff, what is really important and the biggest distinction between that model and what we have here is that they have more dormitory-style accommodation compared to here. We have a more advanced supported accommodation system. However, everybody, even if they are living in congregate sites in Finland, does have their own tenancy. That has to be the biggest difference between what goes on there and what goes in here in terms of security of tenancy. Even if people are living together in congregate blocks and have their own flats, they should have security of tenancy. There is no need for not providing that within supported accommodation.

Nicky Gavron AM: Is it a life tenure?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): It depends on the tenure. Housing First can certainly work in the PRS and it is working in London in the PRS. If it is in the social rented sector that tenancy is more likely to be for life, but we would not necessarily see a barrier in terms of people moving into the PRS. The most important thing about Housing First in terms of housing and the choices people have is that it should reflect generally what other people are experiencing in the market. There are lots of people here living in the PRS and so we do not necessarily see that as a barrier to people moving into Housing First.

Nicky Gavron AM: In terms of the research and the evidence for this question about costs, I tend to see this as a moral and a humane issue and not as a cost-saving issue. On the other hand, it is back to what you said. It is about what is effective and what works. Do you think there are some gaps in the evidence and what it is we really want?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): There is certainly a gap in London. That is why, if you were undertaking a feasibility study here, that analysis of the cost-effectiveness of Housing First would have to be essential. We could look at what we have learned in Liverpool, but the provision in terms of accommodation between Liverpool and London is very different. For example, in Liverpool there was a lot of expensive supported accommodation and that is why we saw some of the savings we did. In London we have a lot more large-scale hostels and so that would affect the extent to which we saw cashable savings. Undoubtedly there would be cashable savings in London, but we would have to model that looking specifically at the context here and the provision of services.

Nicky Gavron AM: Does anyone else want to comment?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): I agree with David's [Eastwood] point that it is part of a toolkit and not to, as I said earlier, disregard the place of supported housing. I am slightly repeating myself, but if it is about the provision of more independent accommodation that is more secure earlier on, if there was more of that, undoubtedly that would be a positive thing.

The funding for the charities principally that are providing the support needs to go up. There needs to be more support at our end.

However, what Mark said earlier is right. There is a piece of work to engage people in the support you are providing if they are entrenched and not engaged in any support whatsoever. That is the first step. Then do not disregard the challenge of the next step, which is that people need support from mental health, physical health and addiction services as well as the support from you as a charity, and that is not an easy thing to do. From a commissioning perspective, I would really like to see on a local basis or sub-regional basis a smaller number of boroughs working together with the local council, the local charity, the local health treatment partners and the registered providers working together on this to find a solution for that locality. If you have all the partners together, you are much more likely to succeed in this aim than if what the health treatment providers in particular are bringing is mainstream provision as opposed to bespoke provision.

Nicky Gavron AM: That is one of the bits of research that needs to be done because partnership working in the way you are suggesting would be more cost-effective as well as effective for the individuals?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): It would be both, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Thank you. We were talking about saving money, but one of the things that that rough sleepers and people with multiple problems experience is really high levels of mortality and low life expectancy. That is a long-term outcome. Has anyone looked at that? Do we know if there is any evidence of improved health outcomes in that respect? Stuart, you talked about ambulance call-outs, but one would expect people living in secure accommodation with support needs to have much lower rates of mortality than people living on the streets. Has that been looked at all yet?

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): It is definitely worth looking at some of the research that has been conducted by the University of York on this. That looked at tenancy sustainment and looked at improvements in mental and physical health. It also considered things like use of A&E because we know that that is one of the biggest differences between people who are living on the streets and facing high and complex needs. They end up having to use A&E as if it is a general practice service because they face such extreme barriers in terms of access. Things like that were considered as well. Because that research is specifically looking within the context here in this country, it would be a useful one to consider.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes. Like Assembly Member Gavron, I am not particularly comfortable putting cash values on things like that, but you can put a value on a year lost.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. They have also done quite a lot of evaluation of a Housing First project that I would really recommend that the Committee looks at up in Manchester called Threshold. They work specifically with women who are experiencing multiple and complex needs. As Stuart has described, this is a group of people for whom Housing First works particularly well. They have also looked at a lot of those other elements in terms of health outcomes as well as the tenancy sustainment model.

David Kurten AM: Mainly, I will be thinking about how Housing First is delivered in London. If I could ask you, Mark, first of all, you are piloting lots of services in London boroughs. What are the main difficulties that you are finding with doing the services in the London boroughs that you work with?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): It varies from one to another, but the primary challenge is accessing accommodation, really. The private rented market is challenging. The Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rates are set at such a rate that it is difficult to access housing, particularly local housing in the boroughs where we are operating. Ideally, the guys we work with would want to live or remain living where they are, but that brings a challenge because we cannot afford the accommodation.

Also, there is an incredible amount of competition for private rented accommodation, particularly now with guys who claim benefits and they are not willing to take those guys because the councils are all competing for this accommodation for their own homeless population. That is that is one of the main challenges, really.

The other one is staff and getting the right quality and experienced staff. Recently we have seen quite a bit of money come into the sector from the Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) and so forth and so a lot of these projects have started up. We are struggling to recruit the people with the sorts of credentials we need to deliver this sort of service.

David Kurten AM: Thanks. You mentioned that you have five units from Islington Council and so something is happening in some of the boroughs, but what other social housing providers have helped you with accommodation or is that something that is particularly difficult?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): Yes, that is very particular to that borough. They took the decision to go down that route and it is something we welcomed. In other boroughs where the services are commissioned, we are largely reliant on private rented accommodation. I know that Hackney is going out to the market for a new service and is looking for the provider to bring with them a registered provider to offer the units. That is another option but is not something that we are familiar with so much.

David Kurten AM: What about other social housing providers apart from councils? Do you work with them at all or do you have any sort of help from them?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): No, we have not had any help from them, no. I know that Stuart [Nevill] has described his very different scenario, but for us it is definitely the private rented market.

David Kurten AM: Yes. For you and also for Stuart as well, how do you think the Mayor could help you source accommodation for what you do? Is there anything he could do that you have thought of that could add to your strategy?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): I guess there is an amount of influence that he has on the central Government, ultimately. We have not seen any increase in the LHA rates at all and so we are competing with a lot of other purchasers. We are competing with the boroughs. We offer incentives to landlords, but then the local authorities are offering incentives as well to meet their Homelessness Reduction Act [2017] priorities. Something that is happening is that boroughs are now beginning to work more closely together so that there is more of an economy of scale really, but we would

want ideally to be part of that so that we could have a share of the private rented market being sourced by the local authorities and are not trying to compete with them all the time.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): In terms of what the Mayor could do in this situation, the housing supply problem is particularly acute in London but it is also faced by other Housing First projects throughout the UK. I could not agree more with Mark on the issue around the LHA. Anything the Mayor can do in terms of influencing the future spending review on that and ensuring that LHA rates are returned at least back to the 30th percentile would go a long way in terms of helping to access accommodation.

The other thing that we think would be incredibly useful in terms of sourcing accommodation and something that we recommended in the Liverpool City Region - of course they are not facing quite the housing supply problems that we are here - would be the establishment of a pan-London local lettings agency. It would be a lettings agency that specialised and recruited staff who are specialists in managing property and acquiring property. That property could be sourced from the PRS or the social rented sector.

The advantage of having a pan-London local lettings agency rather than people doing it in individual areas is, first of all, it helps to overcome some of those problems that we see in terms of competition between boroughs. Also, in terms of economy of scale, if you are managing housing like that across the whole of London, it does make housing management cheaper.

It also means that you could deliver lettings via an agency like that both for Housing First and also for people with lower support needs. That overcomes some of the obstacles that we see in terms of both private landlords and social landlords who do not want to let to people who have high and complex needs because they are worried about that tenancy. If you have a local lettings agency, you can take those properties off people's hands and redistribute them on a pan-London basis and that would go a long way. It also helps to overcome some of the barriers that people face in terms of local connection.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): I agree with both of my colleagues. I wonder whether there is a win to be had with local authorities if there was the expectation or just a request for local authorities to pick this up themselves and think, "How can we implement this ourselves in the council's housing department?" They have close relationships already with the registered providers. As Mark [Taylor] says, they already have teams that go out and source PRS accommodation. They commission locally organisations like ours to deliver services. They are also working very closely with colleagues at the GLA and the MHCLG to come up with local strategies to end rough sleeping.

If the local authority itself was engaged in this, then we could look at the scope for tackling the issue together as opposed to competing with each other. There is a question about whether somebody who has had an experience of rough sleeping gets priority access to social housing or not, as well as whether the council's resources for accessing PRS accommodation could work with us so that that cohort are built into those mainstream services. Without sounding like a broken record too much, it has to be, "Let us work together with the local stakeholders to try to implement the principles, if not the purity of the model, locally". If that was an outcome it would be hugely beneficial. I would say it should not be just the housing department of the council, it should also bring in the Health and Wellbeing Board so we can look at homelessness with health, housing and social care interventions collectively.

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): One other issue is maybe around the security of tenure. The ability of landlords just to give two months' notice puts people in an incredibly precarious position. That is not just Housing First tenants but anyone within PRS generally.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): One difficulty that I would mention - I am surprised nobody else has, but probably because of a Commissioner [of Services, the GLA, being] here - is in relation to the funding of the support. One of the difficulties in relation to implementing Housing First, even at a local level, has been that the support funding has been on quite a short basis. The idea of piloting Housing First, when it is supposed to be potentially a tenancy for life when you need it, is a confusing concept. That would be one thing that I would mention as one of the potential difficulties for the moment. If you are looking at doing Housing First to scale and you are looking at doing Housing First properly, you need to be looking at longer contracts for the support providers. They need to be in place for a longer length of time to say that this support is going to be there.

Therefore, you need to fund it for longer than just saying, "We are going to do a pilot for one year of Housing First". Great. By the time you are working with the client and you have gained your client's trust, you are looking at winding down some of the projects. We have seen that with some of the projects that have been implemented in London and nationally, whereby you look at it too early, you say, "We are going to do a short Housing First pilot and get people in", and you manage to get people into a tenancy but by the time they are accessing support the support contract itself is disappearing. Therefore, you are setting up the individual potentially to fail in that housing because the support is no longer there. That is something that needs to be looked at as well.

Nicky Gavron AM: I do not know who would know the answer to this, but those boroughs who have social lettings agencies, are they not in a much better position to be able to secure long-term tenancies?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): Potentially, and there is some work, I would say, around that Londonwide local lettings agency. There is work going on with London Councils and with the GLA in terms of the Capital Letters project, which is looking at how to pool across TA. At the moment, as was mentioned, this is not just rough sleeping services trying to access the PRS, this is local authorities trying to access the PRS for individuals coming through TA.

There is work going on in relation to how to do this across TA. We have been involved in those conversations in relation to rough sleeping, I have been a little bit, and been told, "At the moment, let us try to get TA and try to get the Capital Letters working in terms of TA, getting that agreement from local authorities, and then let us look at rough sleeping". I am constantly trying to muscle rough sleeping in there in relation to how that works. I think you are right, at the moment our services are fighting among themselves for PRS units because, like you say, there are very few that meet the LHA rate and there are very few that meet the standard in terms of a decent enough place for someone to move into. Therefore, you end up potentially driving up the market and driving up the price of those areas.

Yes, looking at it on a pan-London basis or a sub-regional basis makes sense and I think --

Nicky Gavron AM: You are doing it already and this is called a capital letting agency?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): It is called Capital Letters. They are trying to develop Capital Letters and London's councils are leading on that piece of work, trying to pool across all local authorities how to make sure you have one point of access in

relation to PRS because, as I am acknowledging, at the moment local authorities are fighting among themselves for those units and, like you say, playing landlord potentially --

Nicky Gavron AM: It is not a Londonwide social letting agency, it is something rather different?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): Capital Letters is Londonwide. It is looking at that and looking at pooling all of that together. I am not that close to it.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): We looked at TA and part of the team from Capital Letters came in to talk to us about that.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): Perfect. I thought you did already, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Not that long ago. We have not published what they said yet but there may be a transcript we can look at already. It is a very interesting project. This was in the context of TA but, like you say, it could be used equally well for this.

I had one final question, which is about the insecurity of PRS tenancies. Obviously, the [London] Assembly as a whole, as a majority, voted against Section 21 and voted to support the campaign to end Section 21, which can lead to those evictions. I am just wondering what happens if that happens to someone who has been placed in private rented accommodation by Housing First. If they get a Section 21, do you kick back in and find them another one quickly? Do you take the stress out of that process?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): In the rare event that that has happened, we would always support them into another form of accommodation. Generally, the relationship we have with the landlords is such that they do not randomly issue Section 21s - it will be in response to perhaps serious antisocial behaviour or what-have-you - but the sustainment rates are so high that it is not something we experience very often. More often it is an abandonment rather than someone being evicted, but in the event that they were then we would always support someone into another form of accommodation if it is felt that it is sustainable.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Stuart, we already moved on to this a little bit in our conversation earlier because you received, I think, the only mayoral funding for a Housing First project, which was £18,500. Do you want to say anything more about specifically how the money was used in the programme?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Yes, for sure. As I understand it, the amount was double that. It might have been that that £18,500 was in one financial year.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Was it an annual --

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, Greater London Authority): It was a two-year.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): There was £37,000.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): It is £37,000 over two years? Thank you for clarifying that.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): It was 12 months but it went over two financial years. Effectively it funded a worker. That worker, as we said earlier, had a smaller caseload, worked with the cohort that had most complex needs, worked with people on the streets, worked with people in those training flats that I described earlier that we already have, worked in our shared supported housing schemes, in PRS and also worked in the council-nominated social housing. We have people who either were in those types of accommodation or were street homeless and then moved into one of those different types of accommodation, and when they were there they had this additional support. The cohort that was selected had particularly complex needs, as I said. The work that that person did was not hugely different to the work we would typically do anyway with people with that level of complex need, they just had more time to do it. Their client load was much smaller. Over the year, we had --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): So it was additional capacity?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Additional capacity, and the design of the post itself was to work with a smaller cohort. We recruited somebody with particular experience and background to do this type of work and they could focus a lot more on liaising with the landlord, for example, and with local treatment providers and so on. It was successful. In terms of the 30 rough sleepers worked with, the targets were exceeded. Fourteen people were accommodated. There was a pretty high tenancy sustainment rate, I think, and engagement in mental health treatment as well.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Is that how you are measuring the outcome? Are those things you have listed the indicators that you are using to measure the outcome?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Yes. It is tenancy sustainment and engagement in health treatment.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): OK. Were you saying that both of those have improved as a result?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): Yes, undoubtedly.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Excellent.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): If you have a lower staff-to-client ratio, you can do more work with more people with complex needs. It is both with the individual and with the other stakeholders in their housing and their support. Undoubtedly that helps. You would not design a service where one worker has a caseload of 30 or 40 clients with complex needs, but sometimes funding limitations are such that that might be a typical caseload. If you can have a smaller caseload per worker, you can do more work and it is more effective. Because we were working on what was already in existence in Richmond and Wandsworth it was not necessarily about finding new sources of housing, it was across the different types of tenures that were available in any case.

The other difference was that through local authorities being stakeholders you could get a shared understanding that there is some positive risk-taking going on, offering independent tenures to people with more complex needs and saying to the housing association, for example, or potentially the private landlord, "Look, this person does have complex needs. There is more support in place. We will be there to help you and

the resident if something does not work out but we are going to try our best to make it work". There is something constructive about giving that message to landlords and trying to get that buy-in to the principle of it. Just to pick up on what Mark [Taylor] said earlier, when we as a charity like the Single Homeless Project (SHP) recruit private landlords to work with us, we do find private landlords that have a genuine interest in the public benefit that will follow from working with a charity, which makes life an awful lot easier. It is similar with housing associations, but you do need that co-operation.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Can I just ask finally on this bit, has the project continued after the mayoral funding has ended?

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond):

Yes and no, inasmuch as the service itself has not - it is being replaced like for like - but the provision has increased in those two areas on account of other funding that we have brought in. For us, we try to keep service provision going and to scale it up as demand goes up, but different funding streams come and go.

Recently, we have been very successful with MHCLG funding. That is specifically to bring rough sleeping down as much as possible, the RSI funding and the rapid rehousing pathway funding. We have had some corporate funding going into Wandsworth for outreach provision as well. Often when you get time-limited funding it can bridge a time gap but it can also generate evidence that you can use to secure more funding to come in. It does not always work, but in this case it has worked and over the recent past it has worked. There is undoubtedly learning from what works that is natural and organic over time. When you have smaller caseloads and you work effectively with people with very complex needs, that does inform the approach that organisations take in future.

It was certainly helpful - so thank you, David - and time-limited and part of a bigger picture. That is for us.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): OK. If I could turn to you now, David, why was this the only Housing First project the Mayor has funded so far?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): I would say obviously that the GLA did fund, as I said, back in 2012 to 2015 --

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, there was a --

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): There was a Housing First pilot. I would disagree that it is the only thing.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Sorry.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): It is the only thing this Mayor has funded.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): This Mayor. Apologies.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): In my lifetime here there has been a previous Mayor and we did fund something in relation to Housing First to pilot the approach, as I said.

In terms of this being the only thing funded, this was funded through our Rough Sleeping Innovation Fund. We have a Rough Sleeping Innovation Fund that goes out and basically says to providers and to boroughs, "Would you like to come and test innovative ways of working?" This was the approach we got in relation to Housing First. This is the only Housing First application that was made in relation to that funding stream, hence it is the one that we have funded. Obviously, we scored it against all the other applications that we got in at the same time, which included a number of different projects. That is the reason.

The main reason why the Mayor has only looked at funding this project rather than anything else is that, as we mentioned at the start, in terms of the feasibility study and looking at doing this at scale, all the research that is out there, in terms of the Nicholas Pleace [Director of the Centre for Housing Policy, University of York] research that they did with St Mungo's, is that for Housing First to truly work in a large area, it needs to be done to scale and it needs to look across the entire system. To do that, you need to be looking at it more strategically. You need to look at the additional funding and you need to look at potentially getting additional funding in.

As Hannah [Gousy] has mentioned, whichever way you look at it there was going to be that short gap where you are dual funding aspects of things. That is the reason why obviously we were very disappointed not to get the money from MHCLG for the Housing First pilots that they are doing in other regions, because that is what they are providing. They are providing that money that goes in between to fund that stop-gap. If you were looking at doing that in London, you would be looking at £84 million for the numbers that we are talking about. It is a substantial amount of money that you are talking about in terms of funding that would potentially be needed to cover that gap and basically enable that systematic change.

That is not to say that the Mayor is not supportive of Housing First. I have had quite a lot of conversations with James Murray [Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development] about Housing First and about what we should be looking at doing, more and more of a personalised approach, but it is difficult to do that at scale. We do not have the funding for hostels, as I mentioned. The funding for supported accommodation is at borough level. We need to bring boroughs along with us in terms of looking at how this model might potentially work.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): You mentioned the money you did not get from MHCLG. Does that mean that you cannot go ahead with the pan-London Housing First service?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): That does not mean at this stage you cannot do that.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Right.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): I am saying basically that if you are looking at the numbers we have, the 3,500 individuals who we said at the start might be eligible for Housing First, the pilots that they are doing in the regions are targeting 1,000 people with £28 million. If you do the maths, that means it is £84 million --

Tom Copley AM: For London.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): -- that you would potentially need for London to provide that type of service. It does not mean that we cannot look at it and that is the reason why we want to do the feasibility study but to get to that stage we need to bring boroughs along with us and we need to bring the housing associations along with us. This is more of a long-term thing.

That is the reason why we want to do the feasibility study, so that potentially we have that evidence base to say, "Will this work in London? Which partners do we need to bring along with us? How exactly will we get there?" Then we will be in a position to hopefully get to the relevant people.

Boroughs can do small-scale work, which they are doing, and there are some really good small-scale projects that are working with specific groups in terms of Housing First. If you are looking at doing Housing First pan-London, then you need to be bringing everyone along with you.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Can I just get clarity on what happened with the pilot funding from MHCLG? You had this pilot that you already had, we have the statement in the Mayor's Rough Sleeping Action Plan that we wanted to do pan-London work, and yet I think what you said earlier was MHCLG did not even approach us about this, they just kind of decided to look at Liverpool and Manchester. Why do you think that is? Is that because they wanted to pilot it in smaller but largish cities and they just went to them and did not think of coming to us?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Potentially. Obviously housing stock is a lot more difficult in London and housing prices are a lot more expensive. I do not know. I am not central -- I do not work --

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes. They did not discuss it and then say that?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): I do not know. Obviously, I do not work for MHCLG. No, they did not discuss it and say. We had some early conversations and we shared our learning with Manchester especially in terms of, "This is what we did in relation to the pilots, these are the specifications we used and this is what we would suggest", once they had been allocated the money. But no, it was not that we had any informal conversations with them before the announcement or anything like that. It came as quite a surprise to us.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That is really interesting. Maybe we might want to write to them and ask because £84 million sounds like a lot but for emergencies like the homelessness crisis that we have, money does come from central Government in those kinds of quantities.

Tony Devenish AM: Chair, I suggest you ask James Murray [Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development] first before you ask the Government.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): Yes, we will have some questions for the Mayor as well about whether he has been putting in suggestions, but I think it would be interesting to know what their reasoning was for not even getting into a conversation with London. That would be interesting to know.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Before we get on to the pan-London service, is the Mayor considering funding any further Housing First projects or is the focus going to be on this pan-London service?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): We have the latest round of the Rough Sleeping Innovation Fund and the rest of my team are currently looking at those bids. I do not know what came in. The deadline was only on Friday [29 March 2019] and they were looking at bids yesterday and today, so I do not know whether there are bids in there in relation to Housing First. Not that I am aware of, until we have done potentially this feasibility study.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Moving on to the pan-London Housing First service, moving back to Mark, Stuart [Nevill] and Hannah [Gousy], how beneficial would this be in tackling the increasing problem of chronic homelessness and what are the key elements that are going to be needed to make the service effective?

Mark Taylor (Assistant Director of Services, The Single Homeless Project): An equal offer across the boroughs would be great. This is quite anecdotal, but we are finding in those boroughs where there is an offer, not purely in terms of Housing First but in terms of service provision generally, it tends to almost operate as a magnet. We are seeing an increase in the newcomers to the streets there so there is increased pressure on the services where there is an offer. In Newham and Redbridge, I think that is something that we have seen.

Given the fidelity of the model is an issue, at least a pan-London service would offer a model that shared similar attributes and the offer would be the same. Clearly the boroughs are experiencing different levels of need but I think a service like this would be able to respond to those and respond to the need as it emerges in each of those boroughs. The delivery of a model of that scale is a challenge but I must say we deliver pan-London service for offender services and we have found that to be relatively effective. It is definitely doable.

Stuart Nevill (Chief Executive Officer, Single Person's Emergency Accommodation in Richmond): My view is somewhat different. I think that if you are looking to trying to reduce rough sleeping and street homelessness, if that is the aim and the purpose of a Housing First commission service, then it is important to look locally first of all. You look at what is already in existence and make sure that if you commission something else, it integrates with what is already there. The MHCLG is putting a lot of funding in at the moment on a local level, as are local authorities, and I do not think it is an impossibility but there is a challenge of linking local or sub-regional provision, a small number of us working together, with regional provision so that they work together. When you are thinking about councils, voluntary sector organisations, housing associations and health treatment providers coming together, if you work on the basis that that is going to be part of the solution, then you need to work local up. You need to work on a local scale up. That is my view.

There are exceptions and there are examples of where pan-London provision works extremely well. You do have a proportion of people who are street homeless who do not strongly identify with one area, who move in and out of boroughs. You also have people who do not have a strong local connection to one particular borough. But what I do believe passionately is that once somebody who has complex needs starts to build a trusting relationship with a charity or a health professional, the social capital of that engagement is hugely important moving forward. Consistency of support is really important in that person's recovery further on. If somebody is doing well and is linked in with local services in Richmond and then we say there is accommodation available in Newham, they may very well move to Newham and engage with services there and they may do well, but you have a much greater success if you can try to find the solution locally, build on what is already there and keep the momentum and the consistency in service provision. The challenge is to integrate the regional and the local.

I would give credit to the recent commissioning approach of the MHCLG. They have very much worked with councils and their partners to say, "What do you have? Where are the gaps? Tell us where you think you can build on what is already there to address the gaps", and they scrutinise that. What has been very effective about their commissioning approach is that it is capacity-building not just for local voluntary sector organisations but the councils as well, and the partnership between the council and their delivery partners. Together you go on a journey where you have a better idea, with external scrutiny, support and funding, of what a local solution looks like. I would advocate the balance between local and regional.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): I completely agree with Mark in the sense that one of the most important elements of having a pan-London approach to this would be ensuring consistency across all of the boroughs, particularly in terms of the fidelity of the model. When we are thinking about the evidence on this and those really high tenancy sustainment rates that we are seeing in this country but also in other countries across the world, those pieces of research are being conducted with projects that comply with a high-fidelity model. Ensuring that high-fidelity approach across the whole of London and that consistency between projects would be incredibly important.

The other thing that we found in Liverpool when we were looking at having a pan-local authority approach to Housing First was that some of those really important partnerships that Stuart [Nevill] described earlier with other public bodies – say the NHS, for example – are done much more effectively across boroughs. Having a consistent approach in terms of how you develop and work with those partnerships is much more effectively done that way, rather than each individual borough having to negotiate some of those really important partnerships. Most of the other stuff has probably been covered and you are probably running out of time but local connection is incredibly important on a pan-London basis.

Also, at the beginning I mentioned that there are around 2,300 people who would be eligible for Housing First. That is around 70 to 80 in each borough but you would expect those numbers to be probably a little bit lower in the outer London boroughs.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. They would be concentrated in certain boroughs.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes. In terms of providing that consistency and support to outer London boroughs, that would be well achieved through a pan-London approach. I guess that is the way the Mayor already delivers a lot of the pan-London services in terms of outreach but also more specialist services for people with complex needs. That is obviously well evidenced in terms of having good results.

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): Yes, I would agree with the rest of the panel. I agree with Hannah. One thing I would say in relation to the potential feasibility study is that we are trying to get MHCLG to hopefully joint-fund part of this. That is what we are trying to work out at officer level and James [Murray, Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development] is trying to work out as well, because we think if we can get them to buy into this then hopefully that will help in terms of moving forward. That is the reason why we have not just gone ahead and done it ourselves. Just as Crisis is, we want to make sure we are bringing all the relevant partners along.

I agree explicitly around the fidelity of the model and making sure there is that consistency. As you have seen from the panel, the definition of what Housing First is and those principles are key but can be interpreted in very different ways. We took elements of a more housing-led approach and have included that within the Clearing House and in our tenancy sustainment, but we were very clear during the course of that that it is not Housing First. Although we are taking people, as I said, directly from the streets, because they have to engage with support as part of it that is not Housing First. Even though there are still some people and some services that would label themselves as ‘Housing First’ if they were doing that, the reality is that is not the purity of the Housing First model.

Tom Copley AM (Deputy Chair): You mentioned some funding potentially from MHCLG, some joint funding for this, but how do you think the Mayor could ensure the right funding is available in the long term to make sure the service is sustainable?

David Eastwood (Rough Sleeping Lead Manager, Housing and Land, GLA): That is a question around how exactly we show the long-term benefits of what we are proposing to do. From the services that we run in terms of pan-London, in relation to the Clearing House, we know we have 97% tenancy sustainment within those units. We have built that up over a number of years. We would be looking at doing something similar. If we are looking at doing something pan-London we obviously would be commissioning that service out. We would be commissioning that service out with very robust key performance indicators, as we do for the current services. There would be that aspect of it.

More longer-term funding is a very difficult question. As everyone has mentioned, in relation to potential savings to other areas and in relation to money coming in from areas, that is where it is key to bring along the other partners and bring along partners in health. I used to be a Substance Misuse Commissioner myself. Public health has been substantially cut in terms of local authorities accessing those services. We need to bring those partners along with us to ensure that that funding is there and looking at more joint commissioning is probably the way forward.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): That was very interesting. It was good to have that quite open-ended discussion. We might have some follow-up questions. Hannah, you may have promised us some data.

Hannah Gousy (Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis): Yes, I think I did.

Sian Berry AM (Chair): David, we will probably write to you via the Mayor to ask for some more details of what you are doing, and we might write to MHCLG to see if they can break their rule about waiting for the evaluation before they start funding something in London. That would be really useful of us.

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Summary List of Actions

Report to: Housing Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 May 2019

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out actions arising from previous meetings of the Housing Committee.

2. Recommendation

2.1 **That the Committee notes the outstanding actions arising from its previous meetings.**

Action arising from the meeting 2 April 2019

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
4.	<p>Housing First</p> <p>During the course of the discussion Members, requested the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a summary of the breakdown of funding provided to homeless services across London; and • Provide a breakdown of the number of people who are sleeping rough compared to the number of people in the hostel system. <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Rough Sleeping Lead, GLA</p> <p>Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Crisis</p> <p>Scrutiny Manager</p>

Actions arising from the meeting of 26 March 2019

City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

Enquiries: 020 7983 4100 minicom: 020 7983 4458 www.london.gov.uk

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
7.	<p>Update on the Use of Transport for London Land to Build homes</p> <p>During the course of the discussion Members, requested the following information;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an update in March 2020 on how Transport for London (TfL) are progressing towards their March 2021 housing target; • Provide confirmation when the first residents will move into a home built on TfL land; • Provide detail on the sites where TfL are working in partnership with Network Rail and how the two organisations are working together; • Circulate the design charter use by TfL in discussions with developers; • Provide information as to whether the procurement processes differ for those developers that are on the Framework Panel, compared to those developers that are not; • Whether TfL are working with enough different partners to guarantee effective competition for the sites; • Provide information as to how it came about that Triangle London Developments has won three of four contracts offered so far to the 13 Property Partnership panel members; • Why the biggest site in Canning Town has been withdrawn from the Property Partnership and earmarked instead for Build to Rent; • What were the reasons for selecting a single partner to build out and manage all 3,000 homes on the Build to Rent sites you have brought forward so far; and • How and when will TfL make a judgement on the whether the right balance has been achieved between consolidating effective relationships with a few partners and spreading resources. <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.</p>	Ongoing.	Commercial Development Director and Head of Property Development, TfL
		Ongoing	Scrutiny Manager

Actions Arising from the Meeting of 22 January 2019

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
6.	<p>Temporary Accommodation in the Era of Welfare Reform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide further information on the number of out-of-borough placements from other London Boroughs that are placed within the London Boroughs of Croydon; and • To provide further information as to the experience and process, from the perspective of a London Borough, of inputting landlords onto the rogue landlord database; and • Provide clarification on whether the work coach, provided under Universal Credit, remains the same if the individual moves to a different Borough and how continuing of support is provided. <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.</p>	<p>Ongoing Chased on 6 March 2019.</p> <p>Ongoing. Chased on 5 March 2019.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Director of Gateway Services, London Borough of Croydon</p> <p>Head of Universal Credit Engagement Division, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and Homelessness Policy Lead, DWP.</p> <p>Scrutiny Manager</p>

Actions Arising from the Meeting of 28 November 2018

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
6.	<p>Affordable Housing Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how the fast-track planning arrangements were affecting the speed of starts of affordable housing; • Confirm how often Newham reported affordable housing starts to the Greater London Authority; • Confirm from the 2018/19 starts, what number and what percentage were social housing; <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Chased on 21 February 2019.</p> <p>Ongoing. Chased on 20 February 2019</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development</p> <p>Mayor, London Borough of Newham</p> <p>Scrutiny Manager</p>

Actions Arising from the Meeting of 4 October 2018

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
5.	<p>Question and Answer Session with Housing Associations</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, Members requested the proportion of Network Homes forward programme that is affordable rent.</p> <p>At the end of the discussion, the guests from the g15 committed to support publishing on an annual basis a London report from housing associations including, what they are spending on maintenance in London and how many homes they have in London.</p> <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree an output from the discussion.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Chased on 13 February 2019</p> <p>Ongoing. Chased on 13 February 2019</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Vice Chair, g15.</p> <p>Scrutiny Manager</p>

Actions Arising from the Meeting of 4 September 2018

Minute Number	Topic	Status	For action by
5.	<p>Housing Delivery Vehicles</p> <p>That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Scrutiny Manager</p>

3. Legal Implications

3.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers:

None.

Contact Officer:	Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer
------------------	-----------------------------------

Telephone:	020 7084 2825
------------	---------------

Email:	jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk
--------	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Action Taken Under Delegated Authority

Report to: Housing Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 May 2019

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out recent action taken by the Chair of the Housing Committee under delegated authority.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the action taken by Sian Berry AM, the Chair of the Housing Committee during the 2018/19 Assembly year, under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members, namely to agree the Committee's response to a call for evidence from the Affordable Housing Commission.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Under Standing Orders and the Assembly's Scheme of Delegation, certain decisions by Members can be taken under delegated authority. This report details those actions.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The Committee at its meeting on 5 June 2018, noted the following standing delegation to the Chairman of the Committee, as agreed by the London Assembly at its Annual Meeting on 10 May 2018:

To respond on the Committee's behalf, following consultation with the lead Members of the party Groups on the committee or sub-committee, where it is consulted on issues by organisations and there is insufficient time to consider the consultation at a committee meeting.

- 4.2 The Affordable Housing Commission, set up in 2018, issued a call for evidence in February 2019 on the causes and effects of the affordability crisis, and what should be done to tackle the issue.

- 4.3 A response to the call for evidence was submitted to the Affordable Housing Commission on 3 April 2018. The response included links and appendices to relevant work which the Housing Committee has undertaken in relation to the affordable housing crisis in London and the potential solutions to this issue. The work included;
- Transcript of Housing Committee meeting, Wednesday 28 November 2018 – Affordable Housing Delivery Update;
 - Transcript of Housing Committee meeting, Thursday 4 October 2018 – Question and Answer Session with Housing Associations;
 - London Assembly – London Plan consultation response (Planning Committee) – with reference to:
 - Response to Policy H7: Affordable housing tenure
 - Response to Policy H10: redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration
 - Response to Policy H12: Housing size mix
 - London Plan Examination in Public – London Assembly Written Statement;
 - Matter 24 - Affordable Housing
 - Policy H5 – Delivering Affordable Housing
 - Policy H6 – Affordable Housing Tenure
 - Transcript of Housing Committee meeting – 23 January 2018 – Draft London Plan;
 - Housing Committee Letter to the Mayor – Response to Draft Housing Strategy; and
 - London Assembly Planning Committee report – Tax Trial – A Land Value Tax for London – February 2016
- 4.4 A copy of the response was circulated to Housing Committee members. A copy of the covering letter, and the written statement from the Housing Committee to the Examination in Public on Matter 24 are attached at **Appendix 1**.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 – Housing Committee response to the Affordable Housing Call for Evidence.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: Member Delegated Authority Form 1059 (Housing Committee response to the Affordable Housing Commissions call for evidence)

Contact Officer: Jonathan Baker, Committee Officer

Telephone: 020 7084 2825

E-mail: jonathan.baker@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

London Assembly Housing Committee
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

The Affordable Housing Commission

The Smith Institute
Somerset House
South Wing
Strand
London WC2R 1LA

3rd April 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you on behalf of the London Assembly Housing Committee in response to your call for evidence on the causes and effects of the affordability crisis, and what should be done to tackle the issue.

The Housing Committee has done a large amount of work on the affordability of housing in London and so welcomes this opportunity to contribute.

Below are the links to the relevant work which the Housing Committee has undertaken in relation to the affordable housing crisis in London and the potential solutions to this issue, which I hope you can consider as part of your work.

Housing Committee formal meeting - Affordable Housing Update (November 2018)

The purpose of this meeting was to scrutinise the Mayor's funding programmes and delivery of affordable homes over the last year and to consider the likely impact of his new funding for council homes.

The transcript of this meeting can be found attached and also via the link in the footnotes¹.

Housing Committee formal meeting – Question and Answer Session with Housing Associations (October 2018)

The purpose of this meeting was to understand the changing nature of the housing association sector and hold associations to account for the tenures of the homes they are delivering and the way they operate. Discussions on affordability are on pages 2-17 in the transcript, which can be found attached and also via the link in the footnotes².

London Assembly Planning Committee response to the Draft London Plan

The complete response to the draft London Plan can be found attached and also via the link in the footnote below³.

Response to Policy H7: Affordable housing tenure is on pages 48 – 49.

¹ <https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=302&MId=6460&Ver=4>

² <https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=302&MId=6459&Ver=4>

³ <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/London%20Assembly%20Planning%20Committee%20%282536%29.pdf>

LONDON ASSEMBLY

Housing Committee

Response to Policy H10: redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration discusses concerns around the potential loss of affordable housing is on page 49.

Response to Policy H12: Housing size mix. The committee argues that a more detailed consideration of criteria to assess whether affordable housing meets identified local needs is needed, on page 51.

Housing Committee response to Matter 24 – Affordable Housing, as part of the Examination in Public (EiP).

Matter 24 of the EiP is: *Would policies H5 to H8 provide a justified and effective approach to delivering affordable housing to meet the good growth objectives set out in Policy GG4? Overall, would they provide an effective strategic framework for the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans in relation to affordable housing?* The Housing Committee's answer to this can be found attached.

Housing Committee meeting on the Draft London Plan (January 2018)

The purpose of this meeting was for the committee to discuss the draft London Plan in relation to housing. The transcript of the meeting can be found attached and also via the link in the footnote below⁴. Discussion on affordable housing can be found on pages 16- 30.

Housing Committee response to the Draft London Housing Strategy 2017:

This response raises a number of concerns surrounding the proposed delivery of affordable homes in London. It can be found attached and also via the link in the footnote below⁵.

Planning Committee – A Land Value Tax for London (Feb 2016):

This report sets out a potential solution to the housing crisis in London. Land Value Taxation provides incentives for bringing land into more productive use and discourages keeping land empty or derelict. Thus, it would have serious potential to bring more land forward for development, including for housing.

The report can be found attached to this email and also via the link in the footnotes below⁶.

Thank you again for the opportunity to contribute to your investigation. I hope this information is useful to you. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours faithfully,



Sian Berry AM

Chair of the Housing Committee

⁴ <https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=302&MId=6213&Ver=4>

⁵ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/housing_committee_strategy_response_0.pdf

⁶ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/final-draft-lvt-report_2.pdf

London Plan Examination in Public – Written Statement

Respondent Number	2536
Organisation	London Assembly
Contact name	Paul Watling/Lorraine Ford
Email	lorraine.ford@london.gov.uk
Telephone	020 7983 4394
Dated	18 December 2018

Matter 24 Affordable Housing

M24. Would policies H5 to H8 provide a justified and effective approach to delivering affordable housing to meet the good growth objectives set out in Policy GG4? Overall, would they provide an effective strategic framework for the preparation of local plans and neighbourhood plans in relation to affordable housing?

Key argument:

The London Assembly welcomes the ambitious goal of increasing to 50 per cent the proportion of all new homes which are affordable. However, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 indicates a need for almost two thirds (65 per cent) of homes to be affordable, so the policies, were they to be successful, nonetheless fall short of meeting assessed affordable need.

Whether or not the policies, as set out, will deliver is also in question:

- **In recent years London has never delivered enough affordable homes with the levers it has, yet the Plan sets out a requirement for a significant hike in delivery**
- **The Mayor has limited influence over the use of non-GLA public land to boost affordable delivery, and**
- **The Mayor's preferred affordable products may not meet the identified need.**

Summary

Policy H5 Delivering Affordable Housing

- a) Would the definition of 'genuinely affordable housing' and the Mayor's 'preferred affordable housing tenures', include the affordable homes needed?
- b) Would the strategic target of 50% of all new homes to be genuinely affordable be justified in light of the identified need?

The SHMA sets out a need for 65 per cent of new homes to be affordable. The Assembly therefore supports the Mayor's strategic target to deliver half of all homes as affordable.

The Mayor's definition of 'genuinely affordable housing' no doubt includes many of the affordable homes needed. However, 'London Affordable Rent' homes are more expensive than existing social rents, and 'Affordable Rents' more expensive again. The SHMA does not specify the respective proportions of Londoners requiring 'social,' 'London Affordable,' or 'Affordable' rents. Instead it categorises these groups jointly as being in need of 'low-cost' rents. It is therefore unclear whether homes built for low-cost rent will in fact deliver the required number of homes at lower rent levels.

Moreover, the London Assembly Housing Committee recently heard that even social rent levels may be too high for many Londoners.¹

- c) In requiring major developments which trigger affordable housing requirements to provide affordable housing through the threshold approach, would the policy be effective in delivering the quantum of affordable housing required?

The benchmark level of 35 per cent affordable, while significantly higher than levels achieved in recent years, remains 15 per cent below the proportion needed. Moreover, London has failed to deliver this amount of affordable housing in recent history.² It may be some time, therefore before even the 35 per cent target is achieved. There is also the risk that setting a 35 per cent benchmark level, below the 50 per cent target, will bake in a land price which can only deliver 35 per cent affordable in the market.

- d) Would the approach to affordable housing providers, public sector land and industrial land be justified and effective?

The London Assembly Housing Committee has heard from a number of strategic delivery partners that they are committed to the 60 per cent target for affordable homes across their portfolios, as per Policy H5 A 5. This is welcome news, though most schemes are still only in the early stages. It will be some time before it becomes clear that they can successfully deliver on this target. Given current uncertainty around the wider economy, and the housing market specifically, there is a risk that delivery programmes, increasingly reliant on cross-subsidy from market products, will be detrimentally affected.

The Housing Committee has consistently heard from Transport for London (TfL) and its delivery partners about the range of obstacles they face in seeking to build 50 per cent affordable on its many small and constrained sites.³ Public landowners, including TfL, have their own strategic targets which may conflict with the Mayor's aim of maximising

¹ See for example the transcript from the London Assembly Housing Committee, 4 Oct 2018 p11 (<https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/b17620/Minutes%20-%20Appendix%201%20-%20Transcript%20of%20Housing%20Associations%20Thursday%2004-Oct-2018%2014.00%20Housing%20Commi.pdf?T=9>)

² For example, 18 per cent of net units approved in 2016/17 were affordable. Source: Annual Monitoring Report 14, Greater London Authority, September 2018 (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/amr_14_final_20180927.pdf)

³ Homes Down the Track, London Assembly, June 2017 (<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/london-assembly/london-assembly-publications/homes-down-track-marathon-and-sprint-tfl>)

affordable homes. There is a significant concern, therefore, that it may be unrealistic to deliver as affordable half of all new homes built on London's public land.

Policy H6 Threshold Approach to Applications

- a) Would the threshold approach to viability, with a fast track route and viability tested route, as set out in policy H6, be justified and effective? Would the threshold level of affordable housing as set out in Policy H6B be justified and effective?
- b) Would it provide a framework to increase delivery of affordable homes to meet the full range of identified need?
- c) Would the approach taken to scheme amendments be effective in increasing delivery of affordable homes?

Dispensing with the need for a formal viability assessment at application stage (Fast-track approach) should, in principle, speed up the planning process, enabling developers to start on site more quickly. However, developers have told the London Assembly Housing Committee that the fast-track route incentive is unlikely to determine the level of affordable housing proposed on schemes. And because viability may change with market conditions during the development period, reviews may be triggered at a later stage, irrespective of initial developer intent. Consequently, it is not clear that the threshold approach itself will be effective in delivering the required quantum of affordable homes.

Policy H7 Affordable Housing Tenure

- a) Would Policy H7 be effective in delivering the tenure of affordable housing to meet the objectives of Policy GG4?
- b) In light of the identified need for low cost rental homes, would the split of affordable products in this policy be justified and effective? Would it provide sufficiently for boroughs to determine tenure locally to meet local needs and reflect local circumstances?

The London Assembly Housing Committee welcomes a mayoral policy stipulation in terms of the split of affordable products to be delivered locally. However, the boroughs will determine themselves the mix of 40 per cent of their affordable delivery. Borough resources are stretched and diminishing, especially for planning and housing.⁴ Facing challenging local housing delivery targets, some may find it hard to resist pressure from

⁴ For example, borough spending on Planning & Development fell by 50 per cent between 2010/11 and 2017/18 despite an increased number of planning decisions. Source: The London Intelligence, Centre for London, 9 May 2018 (<https://www.centreforlondon.org/reader/the-london-intelligence-issue-4/local-authority-spending/#political-differences>)

developers to permit too many 'affordable' homes in tenures or sizes which do not fully reflect local need.

The Housing Committee is particularly concerned that London risks building insufficient affordable rented stock. The SHMA indicates that almost three quarters of affordable need (72 per cent) is for low-cost rented homes, rather than intermediate. In contrast, half of the mayor's funding from the current Affordable Homes Programme will be devoted to intermediate homes – partially because more units can be delivered at intermediate rates for the same level of grant. Affordable providers have told the committee of the relative difficulty of making the finances for socially-rented homes stack up, compared with those for intermediate rented or shared-ownership products. It is likely that private or social developers seeking to build affordable homes will prefer the greater financial flexibility and higher and earlier returns offered by affordable homes for London Living Rent (LLR – a rent-to-buy product) or shared ownership, over those offered by social rented homes.⁵ And because shared ownership may be preferable to LLR on similar grounds, there is a further risk that London may end up not even delivering enough intermediate rented homes, but instead, too many homes for shared ownership. The GLA evidence we have to date relates to schemes started with some mayoral-funding, rather than the overall picture of affordable delivery, but this indicates that where there is a choice, providers intend to deliver more than ten times as many homes for shared ownership, as for LLR.⁶ When offered an acceptable quantum of 'affordable' homes within a new scheme, it may be hard for the boroughs to reject on grounds of detailed affordable tenure or bedroom number.

⁵ See for example the transcript from the London Assembly Housing Committee, 4 Oct 2018 pp8-9 (<https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/b17620/Minutes%20-%20Appendix%201%20-%20Transcript%20of%20Housing%20Associations%20Thursday%2004-Oct-2018%2014.00%20Housing%20Commi.pdf?T=9>)

⁶ Of the 6,658 LLR/shared ownership homes started in 2017/18, 6,089 (91 per cent) are likely to be for shared ownership, compared with 569 for London Living Rent. Source: Response to Mayor's Question 2018/2624 asked by Andrew Boff AM, 19 October 2018 (http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_300758)

Subject: Help to Buy in London	
Report to: Housing Committee	
Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat	Date: 8 May 2019
This report will be considered in public	

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out the background information for a discussion with invited guests on the Help to Buy Equity Loan scheme in London.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee agrees the areas for consideration set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report and notes this report as background to the discussion with invited guests and notes the subsequent discussion.**
- 2.2 **That the Committee delegates authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any output from the discussion.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Help to Buy: Equity Loan scheme was introduced by the Government in Spring 2013. It was designed to assist families struggling to access home ownership and to support the 'for sale' housing market. The Government provides a loan of up to 20% of the new build home cost, for properties of up to £600,000 in value. The scheme was extended first in 2017 (to 2021), and again, in the Autumn 2018 budget (to 2023). It is not currently proposed to extend it further.
- 3.2 Since 2016, a London Help to Buy Scheme has offered a 40% equity loan, recognizing the higher costs of home purchase in London.
- 3.3 The Mayor has no direct involvement in Help to Buy schemes but does provide funding for the building of shared ownership homes, and is running a portal¹ to help Londoners to find properties to buy or rent, including through Help to Buy.

¹ <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing-and-land/homes-londoners/search/>

4. Issues for Consideration

Supporting new supply for home ownership in London

- 4.1 Many London renters would like to own their own home, and in recent years, public funding to support the housing market has been heavily weighted in favour of ownership. This was particularly important to stimulate the new build 'for sale' housing market following the financial crash. However, property agent data suggests that the greatest supply shortfall in London's housing market is for rented tenures at sub-market or lower mainstream rents.²
- 4.2 Nationally, developers are reported still to be heavily dependent on the Help to Buy Equity Loan Scheme for sales.³ In London, a lower proportion of new build sales has been supported by Help to Buy than elsewhere, probably reflecting often unaffordable prices in the capital. But a growing proportion of outer London new builds are supported by Help to Buy, accounting for over a quarter of sales in several boroughs.⁴
- 4.3 There are reports of some big national developers making large profits building homes for sale under the Help to Buy scheme.
- 4.4 Questions have also been raised over the additionality of the homes supported by the scheme. The Government's own evaluation in 2016 estimated that 43% of the new homes built with Help to Buy were 'additional' to those which would anyway have been built. However, it may be that some of the buyers of these homes would simply have bought a smaller or more affordable property, had the scheme funding not been available.

Effect on house prices

- 4.5 Critics complain that the schemes have contributed to the ongoing rise in London's house prices. GLA data from September 2018 suggest that Help to Buy is unlikely to be the primary factor influencing new build house prices in London.⁵ However, the additional credit availability arising through the Help to Buy Equity Loans might well be expected to support some increases in new build prices. Academic work also suggests there may be an inflationary London price effect.⁶

Supporting Londoners to own homes

- 4.6 The Help to Buy Scheme in London tends to assist similar types of households to those who are accessing homeownership without the scheme's assistance. The average income of Help to Buy buyers is just under £72,000 in London. In contrast, Shared Ownership is known to assist many households with significantly lower incomes than the average for all first-time buyers; for instance, in 2015/16, the median income for households purchasing shared ownership properties was £41,000, similar to the median income for all working age London households, and around a third lower than the median income for all London first-time buyer households.
- 4.7 Help to Buy really took off in London after the upper loan limit was raised to 40% in February 2016. The first five years of the Help to Buy Loan are interest-free, but after that borrowers are charged 1.75% of the loan value. This charge rises annually thereafter by RPI plus 1%. This is in addition to

² See, for example: https://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/216234-0

³ See, for example: Does Help to Buy prop up housebuilders?, BBC News, 27 Feb 2019 (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-47372385>)

⁴ Housing in London 2018, GLA (<https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/housing-london>)

⁵ Housing Research Note 2018/02, Help to Buy in London, GLA, Sept 2018

⁶ https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/construction/sites/bartlett/files/affhoupaper_carozzi-hilber-yu.pdf

the cost of the buyer's commercial repayment mortgage. Questions may arise as to the continuing affordability of Help to Buy homes, if interest rates rise in future.

4.8 The Committee may therefore wish to consider:

- How beneficial Help to Buy has been in London;
- Any negative consequences there have been;
- Who is benefiting from Help to Buy London and why; and
- The value and nature of any successor scheme to Help to Buy London.

4.9 The following guests have been invited to attend the meeting and participate in the discussion:

- Henry Pryor, buying agent and market commentator;
- Professor Yolande Barnes, Chair of the Bartlett Real Estate Institute, UCL;
- Iain McPherson, Chief Executive Partnerships South, Countryside; and
- Daniel Tomlinson, Research and Policy Analyst, The Resolution Foundation.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no direct financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

None.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None.
Contact Officer: Lorraine Ford, Scrutiny Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 4394
Email: Lorraine.Ford@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Housing Committee Work Programme

Report to: Housing Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 May 2019

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out the work programme for the Housing Committee for the beginning of the 2019/20 Assembly year.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the remainder of its meeting dates in the 2019/20 Assembly year, which are subject to approval at the Annual Meeting of the Assembly on 2 May 2019, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report.**
- 2.2 **That the Committee notes that the topic for its meeting on 13 June 2019 will be a review of the Affordable Housing Monitor, as agreed at the meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee on 8 April 2019.**
- 2.3 **That the Committee delegates authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the scope and terms of reference for the Committee's review of the Affordable Housing Monitor on 13 June 2019.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Annual Meeting of the Assembly on 2 May 2019 will agree meeting slots for the Housing Committee for the 2019/20 Assembly Year. The Committee may choose to use the meeting slots for formal meetings, site visits, informal meetings or other engagement activities.

4. Issues for Consideration

Work programme for 2019/20

4.1 The table in paragraph 4.2 below sets out the allocated dates for the Housing Committee in 2019/20 and the topics for the meetings up to June 2019, which were approved at the GLA Oversight Committee on 8 April 2019.

4.2

Meeting Date	Topic
8 May 2019	Help to Buy in London
13 June 2019	Affordable Housing Monitor
2 July 2019	To be confirmed
3 September 2019	To be confirmed
3 October 2019	To be confirmed
20 November 2019	To be confirmed
18 December 2019	To be confirmed
21 January 2020	To be confirmed
11 February 2020	To be confirmed
3 March 2020	To be confirmed

Help to Buy in London

4.3 The Committee will use its first meeting slot for a discussion with invited guests on the Help to Buy Equity Loan Scheme in London. The report at **Agenda Item 6** gives more information on this subject.

Affordable Housing Monitor

4.4 The Committee will use its meeting on 13 June 2019 to review the Affordable Housing Monitor.

Work Programme for the Remainder of the Assembly Year

4.5 Other topics for investigation will be added to the work programme during the year.

4.6 As in previous years, the Committee may wish to use some of its meeting slots to undertake site visits, hold roundtables and receive briefings to support its scrutiny work.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None
Contact Officer: Lorraine Ford, Scrutiny Manager Telephone: 020 7983 4394 E-mail: scrutiny@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank