

Question Number	Item No	Raised By	Question Raised	Answer
1	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	6.1 states that 'there were 586 homeless acceptances and 852 TA admissions' = 1438 households. What is the total number of people in those households?	The 586 homeless acceptances were for 1,601 individual household members (i.e. 2.7 individuals per household). The 852 TA admissions were for 2,237 individual household members (2.6 per household).
2	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	9.9 'offered one property which they will be expected to accept or risk being removed from the banding system'. Where do people removed from the banding system live?	<p>In general, people who are removed from the Allocations Scheme for 12 months as a result of refusing a reasonable offer will have to make their own arrangements for accommodation. However, if they have children they will be offered access to the council's private sector scheme to fulfil Children's' Act responsibility.</p> <p>In all cases, the customer can appeal the suitability of the offer and if the homeless duty is also being discharged they will have a right to seek a review and if unsuccessful appeal to the county court.</p>
3	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	9.18 states that the council e-mailed 800 Barnet Homes tenants. Does that mean 800 households or 800 individuals, given that some household might include more than one person?	They were individuals.
4	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	9.18 The council e-mailed 800 Barnet Homes tenants, which is 55% of the total number of households and 0% of those without e-mail. Why were people without e-mail excluded from the survey and in what way is that not discrimination?	<p>All tenants with valid emails on the Barnet Homes Viewpoint consultation database were emailed about the consultation with a link to the council's Engage Space website. Links were also placed on the council's home page throughout the 6 week consultation period inviting people to respond to the consultation, either by completing the online survey or respond by post or telephone.</p> <p>In terms of accessing the consultation without access to email, paper</p>

				<p>copies of the survey were made available in the housing reception at Barnet House together with posters explaining how to get involved. Participants to the independently facilitated focus groups were recruited by telephone. Community and voluntary groups such as Community Barnet were also informed of the consultation and gave comments on behalf of residents.</p> <p>The consultation therefore gave opportunities for residents to respond in different ways.</p>														
5	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	<p>9.19 The council e-mailed 800 Barnet Homes tenants, of whom 90 replied. That is, 11% of those who were e-mailed responded, but that is only about 6% of the total number of households. As these are statistically insignificant numbers, what has the council done to assess the reasons for the low response rate? If it has been able to find reasons for the low response, what were those reasons and what has it done to address those issues in order to make sure its consultation is meaningful? If it has not tried to assess the reasons for the low response, why has it not done tried?</p>	<p>90 people completed the online survey which was online throughout the 6 week consultation period with direct access from the council’s home page.</p> <p>As explained in appendix 5, the survey respondents were invited to pick a category that best describes them and there is a spread of local residents, including Barnet Homes tenants and other residents and also representatives of local organisations:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1151 903 1906 1378"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Council tenant</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing applicant</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Living in PRS</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local resident</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public sector organisation</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type	Number	Council tenant	20	Housing applicant	4	Living in PRS	9	Local resident	23	Other	8	Public sector organisation	8
Type	Number																	
Council tenant	20																	
Housing applicant	4																	
Living in PRS	9																	
Local resident	23																	
Other	8																	
Public sector organisation	8																	

				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Voluntary organisation</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total answered</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </table> <p>Together with the focus groups, housing forum and meetings with registered social landlords the council made a reasonable effort to consult with residents and partners on the proposed changes to the housing allocations scheme.</p>	Voluntary organisation	5	Total answered	77	No response	13
Voluntary organisation	5									
Total answered	77									
No response	13									
6	7	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	<p>9.20 '30 people were invited to attend the independently facilitated focus groups and they were attended by 13 residents.' Why was such a small number of people invited and on what basis? Since the number of people attending is less than 1 % of the number of households concerned (1438), and likely to be a far smaller percentage of the number of people in those households, there is no way the results can be representative of the people concerned, so why didn't the council try for a larger focus group in the first instance, and what efforts did they make to get more than 13 people to attend?</p>	<p>Focus groups work best with 10 to 15 participants in each to ensure that everybody has plenty of opportunity to have their say. The council made every effort to ensure that both focus groups were well attended.</p> <p>The first focus group was made up of Citizen's Panel members who were invited by telephone and offered a £20 incentive to attend. 15 residents confirmed their attendance but only 7 turned up on the evening of the focus group. 2 people sent their apologies but it was too late to find replacements.</p> <p>The second focus group of existing applicants was also recruited by telephone and through advertising in the Barnet House housing reception but only 5 people attended. This was despite the fact that 15 people had said they would attend and were reminded by their housing officer during the morning of day the group was held.</p>						

Public Questions – Cabinet 24 September 2013

7	7 (App endi x 2)	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	<p>4.23 '(b) trade down to a smaller property and then have the adaptations or (c) attain a smaller property through a mutual exchange and then have the adaptations'.</p> <p>What safeguards are or will be in place so that people whose ability to function without the adaptations will not be forced to move to another property before the adaptations are made?</p>	<p>Tenants will not be forced to move to another property before adaptations are made. It is accepted that this addition to the scheme is not clear and not required; Cabinet will be asked to agree to its removal.</p>
8	7 (App endi x 6)	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	<p>As in 9.20 (question 6 above), it is stated that there were 13 people in the focus groups. Here it is stated that there were 7 people in the LBB Citizen Panel Group and 5 people in the Tenant/Applicant Panel. Where was the thirteenth person?</p>	<p>There were 12 attendees in total, 7 + 5. The reference to 13 people in the report was an error.</p>
9	7 (App endi x 6)	Mrs Barbara Jacobson	<p>LBB Citizen Panel Group: What size were the majorities in the second and third bullet points?</p>	<p>5 out of 7 in the citizen's panel focus group said that it was reasonable to change to a one offer only policy.</p> <p>6 out of 7 said that it is important to take account of affordability and all 7 said that the proposed placements policy was appropriate.</p>