

Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Housing Market Partnership

Housing Need and Demand Assessment

Technical Appendix 03

Gross Current / Backlog Need

Final

June 2011

HNDA



Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Process – How we went about the assessment of Backlog Need
- 3 Procedure Note
- 4 Data Sources
- 5 Results
- 6 Validation
- 7 Conclusions

List of Tables

- TA03-1 Summary of Backlog Need Assessment Model
TA03-2 Summary of SHCS 2004-2007 results for the GCV area

List of Annexes

- Annex 1 Note on the use of SHS and SHCS data for triangulation purposes
Annex 2 Comparison of HNDA Backlog Need Assessment data from Local Authorities (2009) with Bramley et al model data (2005)
Annex 3 Gross Current/ Backlog Need
Annex 4 Current / Backlog Need Assessment Explanatory Notes by LA

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Technical Appendix summarises the process adopted by the eight local authorities (LAs) within the GCV area in assessing Gross Current/Backlog Need, details the data sources and assumptions used, and outlines the steps taken to validate outputs. The overall approach was modelled on Chapter 6 'Estimate of net annual housing need' in the 2008 HNDA Guidance.

2 Process – How we went about the assessment of Backlog Need

- 2.1 When the approach to Backlog Need assessment was first being considered in spring 2009, the initial intention was to commission appropriate consultants to undertake this element of work. In subsequent discussions it was agreed instead to conduct the analysis in-house, using each authority's own staff resources. This change arose for three reasons:
- it was considered that LAs were best placed to know the most appropriate data sources available
 - it was recognised that there would be considerable value in developing in-house analytical capacity and improved understanding of the housing system, in line with the Scottish Government's HNDA Guidance
 - the significant costs involved in commissioning consultants.
- 2.2 The Housing Sub Group, with representatives of the housing service in each authority, took responsibility for overseeing and guiding the Backlog Need assessment process, as far as possible ensuring consistency of approach and outputs. The Sub Group reports to the Housing Market Partnership Core Group.

3 Procedure Note

- 3.1 It was recognised that different LAs hold data in different ways on their Housing Registers (e.g. using different categories and definitions of need), related to local policy requirements. Some areas operate Common Housing Registers. There are also differences in availability of reliable and up-to-date additional data sources.
- 3.2 We were aware of the difficulties experienced by Communities Scotland in 2007 when it undertook a National Proforma exercise across all LAs in Scotland to identify housing need, comparing data returned by them with national default estimates; it concluded¹ that the information gathered was not sufficiently consistent "to allow us to construct consistent, council based, estimates of absolute or relative affordable housing need."
- 3.3 With these caveats in mind, a Procedure Note was drafted to standardise, as far as possible, the approach adopted by the eight GCV authorities. Drawing on the 2008 HNDA Guidance, it aimed to define a consistent and robust methodological framework for the calculation of backlog need, including where necessary definitions, preferred sources, etc.

¹ *Overall Assessment and Conclusions from responses to 2007 Housing Needs Proforma Exercise.* Duncan Gray, Communities Analytical Services.

3.4 The scope of the Backlog Need assessment included:

- a desk top analysis and evaluation of existing housing needs assessments, LAs' Housing Register data, available RSL data, and further secondary data sources (household surveys, house condition surveys, etc.)
- re-estimation of the backlog of existing need for all LAs and, wherever possible, SHIP (Strategic Housing Investment Plan) Sub-area geographies within the GCV area
- a commentary on assumptions and limitations relating to the estimates.

3.5 There are two key questions to answer relating to Backlog Need:

- What is the total number of households currently in housing need, who cannot afford to meet their own needs in the market and whose needs cannot be met in situ?
- What are the key characteristics of their unmet need (e.g. household type, nature of need)?

3.6 The assessment model is summarised in Table TA03-1 below.

3.7 The Procedure Note specifies assumptions which have been agreed by the Housing Sub Group following discussion and debate, for example:

- on Housing Registers which award points for various categories of need, assume 0 points = no identified need
- Waiting List points only = no identified need
- homeless households do not have an in-situ solution
- for overcrowded households, assume no in situ solution for the social rented sector; with regard to in situ solution in the private sector, assume this will be netted out when considering affordability towards the end
- for harassment, assume 0 [nil] – all cases covered by homeless category; if authorities record harassment category separately, and can accurately calculate the number of households experiencing harassment and in backlog need net of other categories, it may be identified, explained and justified.

3.8 The assessment derived figures for gross backlog need, excluding those with an in situ solution, but before application of an affordability test. The gross backlog need figures were passed to consultants Tribal Group with Optimal Economics for this final step, to ensure consistency of methodological approach with the Affordability Analysis being applied by them to (newly arising) household projections.

TABLE TA03-1

SUMMARY OF BACKLOG NEED ASSESSMENT MODEL

Key data source: the Council's Housing Register (or stock transfer RSL's Register in Glasgow City and Inverclyde) or Common Housing Register.

Total [Net]		Backlog need		Cases where		Allowance for		Overlap
Backlog	=	amongst	-	in-situ solution	+	additional need	-	between
Need		existing		is most		on RSL		LAs
		households		appropriate		registers *		

* RSL data may already be included if Common Housing Register in operation

Backlog need of existing households = homeless households/ in temporary accommodation
 + concealed households
 + overcrowded households
 + households with support needs
 + households whose home is in poor condition
 + households experiencing harassment ^

^ In most cases this is taken to equal 0 as such households are classed as homeless

At each stage, *considerable care was taken to avoid double-counting*, particularly where a household may appear on more than one need category list in a Housing Register, or may be registered with more than one provider.

The base date for assessment of Backlog Need was taken as **31 March 2009**, unless otherwise stated. If a different base date is used, this was explained and fully justified.

4 Data Sources

4.1 The Procedure Note specifies the main secondary sources to be used by each authority. The main common source for homelessness figures is the HL1 return. For other categories of need, the initial source is taken to be the Council's Housing Register or, where available, a Common Housing Register. In the case of Glasgow City and Inverclyde Councils, the stock transfer RSL's Register – Glasgow Housing Association and River Clyde Homes respectively – has been used as the starting point. The base date for analysis, wherever possible, was taken as 31 March 2009.

- 4.2 One authority, East Renfrewshire Council, had recently completed a comprehensive assessment of need and demand for housing in its area, and this study provided base data for its input on backlog need.
- 4.3 It was therefore accepted that various data sources would be required, and each LA was encouraged to use its best judgement in identifying the most robust, accurate and up-to-date available for its area. Each LA identified sources used for each category of need, and provided a commentary explaining their choice of sources, any limitations of the data, and working assumptions.
- 4.4 A particular effort was made to identify overlaps between LA and RSL lists, and between LAs, so that these could be discounted.
- 4.5 The HNDA Guidance stipulates that housing market partnerships should consider a range of data sources for each component of the backlog need assessment, and this approach has been followed by GCV in its Procedure Note. Thus, for triangulation purposes efforts have been made to access appropriate data at LA level from the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) and the Scottish House Condition Survey (SHCS), as well as homelessness and Below Tolerable Standard (BTS) statistics; this involved the use of both published tables and ad hoc data requests from Scottish Government statisticians. These tables are provided in the Procedure Note where appropriate.
- 4.6 However, the use of these sources is significantly constrained for a variety of reasons:

LA data constraints

- for the most part, the structure of databases and the collection of data directly reflect the various policy requirements of each LA or RSL; similarly, data is generally displayed in the most convenient way to facilitate their day-to-day customer-facing housing management functions, which may be less suitable for accessing data for strategic purposes such as the calculation of backlog need
- there is variation in the definitions used by LAs and RSLs for specific categories of need; in addition, some LAs have much more up-to-date data than others (for instance in relation to local housing surveys or stock condition surveys)
- some LAs recognise separate categories of need which are absent from other authorities, for instance:
 - three LAs have a separate category for 'insecure tenancy' while the other five would be likely to include such cases as homeless;
 - five LAs have a separate 'harassment' category, the remainder treating such cases as homeless;
 - five LAs operate a range of other need categories, with numbers involved ranging from 3 to 8,894; some of these categories may be specific to the policies of an individual authority with no corresponding recognition by other authorities that such household circumstances comprise need.

Triangulation data constraints

- SHS and SHCS are national level sample surveys, with relatively small sample sizes at LA level; caution must be exercised in using the data at sub-LA level
- The survey data collection dates varied from local LA data – a relatively insignificant issue compared to other constraints
- These surveys do not ask questions which directly address the requirements of the backlog need assessment; in many instances, the published survey data therefore serves only as a very broad comparator

- The GCV HMP worked with Scottish Government statisticians on ad hoc data requests to try to filter the raw data in such a way that more useful proxy results could be derived. Although an interesting learning process for both practitioners and statisticians, this triangulation analysis proved to be time consuming, easier said than done, and ultimately of limited benefit. The problem of small sample sizes was compounded by the additional analysis to the point where, even at the GCV level, the filtered sample was too small to be reliable.
- 4.7 A more extensive Note on the use of SHS and SHCS data for triangulation purposes is given in **Annex 1**.
- 4.8 The backlog need results for each of the eight GCV authorities, expressed as a proportion of all households in the area, were compared. This revealed a range from around 6% to around 13%.
- 4.9 As a final approach to triangulation, and assuming some similarity in the general scale of backlog need over a few years in an authority, the data collected by LAs were compared to the 2005 backlog need estimates derived by Bramley, Karley and Watkins² in their updated Local Housing Need and Affordability Model for Scotland.
- 4.10 For a number of reasons it is important to treat this comparison with some caution:
- data used by Bramley et al is around 4 years older than our LA data and there are likely to have been changes in affordability conditions in that period
 - Bramley et al used fewer components of backlog need than the HNDA
 - the Bramley et al model applied discounts in a different manner and the figures quoted are gross (i.e. prior to application of any discounts for in-situ solution or ability to meet own needs in the market); the HNDA figures include an adjustment for in-situ solution only.
- 4.11 With these caveats in mind, the comparison was undertaken to assess broad agreement on the scale of backlog (see **Annex 2**). For most LA areas, quite close similarity was found between the new LA data and the 2005 model data, but for others there was some notable variation, most likely accounted for in terms of the constraints noted above in relation to LA data, and the 2005 Model methodology. Bramley et al similarly noted wide variation between their Model results and Local Needs Studies for selected LAs (Table 6.1, page 61 of their report). This also mirrors the difficulties experienced in the National Proforma exercise in 2007, noted above.

5 Results

- 5.1 A standard reporting pro forma was agreed and used for recording Backlog Need figures. **Annex 3** provides resulting Gross current/backlog need figures at GCV and LA sub area level.
- 5.2 The LAs provided Gross Backlog Need figures, after discounting for needs which may be met in-situ. To identify those households which cannot meet their own needs in the market, thus deriving a *net* figure for Backlog Need, a test of affordability has to be applied. The consultants undertaking the Affordability Analysis on projected newly forming households, Tribal Group with Optimal Economics, were commissioned also to

² Bramley, Glen, Karley, Noah Kofi and Watkins, David (2006) *Local Housing Need and Affordability Model for Scotland, Update (2005 based)*. A Report for the Scottish Executive and Communities Scotland. Edinburgh: Communities Scotland [Research Report 72] Annexe E, Table E.1, page 117.

apply the same analytical methodology to backlog need figures, thus ensuring consistency.

6 Validation

- 6.1 Before 'signing off' the Backlog Need Analysis for the GCV area, the Housing Sub Group examined the eight pro forma submissions to satisfy itself that the Procedure Note had been followed and to check any apparently anomalous results. As a result of this iterative review process, LAs revised their figures two or three times.
- 6.2 Each LA specified the data sources used.
- 6.3 Each LA also provided a detailed commentary explaining their choice of data sources; limitations of data sources, including any additional data considered for triangulation purposes; assumptions; and judgements made (ref **Annex 4**).

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 The Housing Sub Group is satisfied that its Procedure Note is broadly consistent with the HNDA Guidance and provides a suitable framework and methodology for the assessment at LA level.
- 7.2 Inevitably, some limitations remain in the consistency of data sources between LAs for certain categories of need. However, the view was taken that each authority should use the available sources which, in its judgement, provided the most reliable picture of current need for that category. LAs explained and justified their data selection decisions.
- 7.3 Although it may have been easier to commission consultants to undertake the whole backlog need exercise, all eight LAs now have a better understanding of the patterns of need in their area because the assessment was conducted in-house.

Note on the use of SHS and SHCS data for triangulation purposes

- 1.1 As stipulated in the HNDA Guidance (March 2008), HMPs should consider a wide range of data sources when undertaking the assessment of backlog need. A partnership must consider whether a source is reliable and robust enough for the assessment. Although the housing register of the largest social housing provider in each area is the principal data source for the backlog need assessment, the Housing Sub Group considered using the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) and the Scottish House Condition Survey (SHCS) to provide further evidence for a number of components of the backlog need assessment. The SHS and SHCS are data sources suggested in the HNDA Guidance, and have been used by the consultants who undertook a housing need and affordability study for a constituent local authority.
- 1.2 An important factor when assessing the backlog need of an area is to discount the overlap between categories. There are some categories where there is a high incidence of overlap e.g. between concealed households and overcrowded households, therefore it is very important to discount the overlap to ensure there is no over-estimation of housing need. With the SHS and the SHCS, the only approach to discount the overlap between categories was to access the raw survey data and pull out the analysis by using a sophisticated software package such as Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This approach required knowledge of the surveys, SPSS and also a good understanding of the concept of backlog need. As the Housing Sub Group had limited working knowledge of the SHCS and SHS, and limited experience of SPSS, the SHS and SHCS teams at the Scottish Government were approached and asked for assistance with extracting the required data. The survey teams' knowledge of the housing concepts was limited therefore some time was spent ensuring each party understood the concepts, the information available and the limitations with the data.
- 1.3 The SHS and SHCS teams were asked to provide results from their respective surveys on the number of overcrowded households, concealed households and households with support needs for each local authority, with the overlap between the categories discounted. The GCV HMP was advised early on in the process that the SHS 2007/08 could not provide the required data as the relevant questions which were to be used as proxy indicators for the categories had changed; the 2005/06 survey would therefore provide the most robust data source for our requirements.
- 1.4 The SHCS team provided analysis from the 2004-2007 surveys. The bedroom standard was used to ascertain whether a household is overcrowded and questions on household composition were used as a proxy to determine concealed households. In terms of assessing households with medical support needs, it was viewed that the best approach was to consider households which have a long term illness or disability and require an adaptation, and then apply a 50% reduction for needs that could be met in-situ³.
- 1.5 Prior to the request, the Housing Sub Group was aware that the sample size used for the SHCS was smaller than the SHS sample (hence why the analysis is taken across

³ Tribal completed a housing needs and affordability study for East Renfrewshire where they used the SHS to assess the number of households that require a new home due to support needs. The approach used is similar to the one outlined in the main text above and they applied a 50% reduction based on a previous study they completed for Lothian local authorities. They study concluded that 50% of perceived need for an adaptation could be met in-situ; the remainder required to be re-housed. This approach was adopted for the GCV Procedure Note.

a number of years). When the SHCS team provided the results from the SHCS, the number of responses and the sample size for the GCV area were fairly low and it was deemed that the results could not be broken down by local authority area to provide a reliable estimate. A summary of the SHCS analysis is in Table TA03-2 below.

TABLE TA03-2: Summary of SHCS 2004-2007 results for the GCV area

	Survey responses	Survey responses weighted
Overcrowded	81	24,750
Concealed	33	11,550
Overcrowded and Concealed	3	1,327
Support Needs	58	16,370
Concealed and Support Needs	1	160
Overcrowded and Support Needs	0	-
Sample Size	2,782	788,319

- 1.6 A comparison between the weighted responses from the SHCS and the results from the housing register assessment showed that there were large differences between the overcrowded, concealed and support needs categories. Given the small sample size and the low number of responses, the Housing Sub Group decided that the analysis from the SHCS was not robust enough to be used for the assessment of backlog need.
- 1.7 Although the SHCS analysis could not be used for this assessment, it was important for the Housing Sub Group to investigate this data source to deem whether it was robust and reliable.
- 1.8 Unfortunately, due to pressure of Scottish Government business at the same time, the SHS team were unable to produce any specific analysis in time for the HNDA assessment of backlog need, and only published SHS data tables were thus available and used in the Procedure Note.

TA03 Annex 2

Comparison of HNDA Backlog Need Assessment data from Local Authorities (2009) with Bramley et al model data (2005)

Local Authority	Households Scenario A1 (2009)	Backlog Need 2009 <i>% of A1</i>	Households 2005 (NRS)	Backlog Need – Bramley Model 2005 <i>% of NRS</i>
East Dunbartonshire	43,227	4,074 9	43,405	3,655 8
East Renfrewshire	35,988	2,918 8	36,728	2,428 7
Glasgow City	284,533	28,428 10	294,819	29,603 10
Inverclyde	37,156	4,117 11	39,376	2,484 6
North Lanarkshire	143,715	9,041 6	142,679	10,833 8
Renfrewshire	79,037	6,325 8	80,632	6,042 7
South Lanarkshire	138,354	13,417 10	136,862	7,114 5
West Dunbartonshire	42,699	4,517 11	43,827	2,524 6
GCV Area	804,709	72,837 9%	818,328	64,683 8%

Sources:

- *Proposed Household Formation Assumptions based on 1991-2008 data (Scenario A1)*. Prepared by Jan Freeke, Glasgow City Council, for GCV Housing Market Partnership (2009).
- *Backlog Need 2009*. Returns from each of the GCV authorities (2009).
- *Households 2005*. NRS data, number of dwellings.
- Bramley, Glen, Karley, Noah Kofi and Watkins, David (2006) *Local Housing Need and Affordability Model for Scotland, Update (2005 based)*. A Report for the Scottish Executive and Communities Scotland. Edinburgh: Communities Scotland [Research Report 72] Annexe E, Table E.1, page 117.

Notes:

- Percentages are rounded to nearest integer.
- Comparisons should be treated with caution as the HNDA approach and the Bramley et al model use slightly different methodologies and lists of need categories; the HNDA figures have been discounted for in-situ solution, whereas the Bramley et al model provides gross backlog need figures without discounts.

TA03 Annex 3
Gross Current/ Backlog Need

TA04-3: Total Current Need¹									
Local Authority	Homeless and in temporary accomm	Insecure Tenure	Concealed Households	Overcrowding	Support Needs	Poor Quality	Harassment	Other Categories	Total Current Need
East Dunbartonshire	455		1,490	833	712	577	7		4,074
East Renfrewshire	92		267	990	1,259	310			2,918
Glasgow City Council	3,900		7,275	617	1,189	6,494	59	8,894	28,428
Inverclyde Council	243		838	1,653	455	925		3	4,117
North Lanarkshire Council	682	1,735	4,514	253	564	540	22	731	9,041
Renfrewshire Council	210	820	2,401	1,476	414	644		360	6,325
South Lanarkshire Council	1,351	2,827	6,727	342	1,449	493	3	225	13,417
West Dunbartonshire Council	252		369	2,450	1,425	9	12		4,517
Glasgow & Clyde Valley²	7,185	5,382	23,881	8,614	7,467	9,992	103	10,213	72,837
Notes									
1: The total has already been adjusted by the authorities to remove existing social renters, and households that can adopt in-situ solutions, so this is not a true "gross" current need figure.									
2: * Total not identical to HSMA total due to rounding									

Source: GCVSDPA Housing Affordability Study, Tribal October 2011

TA03 Annex 4 Current / Backlog Need Assessment Explanatory Notes by LA

Current / Backlog Need Assessment Explanatory Notes

East Dunbartonshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

Main data source was Saffron Housing Management System. Electronic download was as at 26 October 2009. Assessed stats from 31st March 2009 and decided that as no review of the waiting list had been carried out in the previous 6 months the number of applicants either joining or leaving the list was static and therefore the 26 October was reliable for the purposes of assessing backlog need.

Common Housing Register is not currently live in East Dunbartonshire but for the last year the 2 partner RSL's namely Hillhead Housing Association and Antonine Housing Association have been using the common application form. Applicants for all 3 partners are on the council's waiting list (Saffron system). We were therefore able to extract information and identify the level of overlap between the council and RSL waiting lists.

- Other sources include Homelessness databases.
- HL1 statistics were not used because this was deemed unreliable by the Homeless Team as many were missing.
- John Martin Partnership private sector Local House Condition Survey (2005)
- Geography – data has been collected at Local Authority and Local Authority Sub areas ie Kirkintilloch, Bishopbriggs, Twechar, Bearsden, Milngavie, Torrance, Lennoxton and Milton of Campsie.

Electronic download of 26 October 2009 provided the following information:

- Applicants on queues: A1- homeless, A3-urgent medical, A7-demolition, A8-special case, B-waiting list general needs, C1-wheelchair access, C2-sheltered high priority and D-outwith area
- Date of application, Queue number, Areas of choice, overcrowded, sharing facilities, lack of amenities, poor quality/condition, separate household and medical.

Working assumptions:

- All applicants with zero points were removed
- All transfer applicants were removed
- Data collected included applicant origin ie where they live currently

Backlog need categories identified from the electronic download:

- Concealed (living with non household members)
- Overcrowded (households experiencing overcrowding)
- Support needs (those with points for sheltered housing, health and access points, wheelchair user)
- Poor condition (property significantly below BTS)
- Harassment (within and outwith home)
- Other – East Dunbartonshire did not have any applicants falling within this category

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

We initially removed all applicants with zero points and all applicants who are currently social renters within East Dunbartonshire (ie transfers). The remaining applicants formed the basis for East Dunbartonshire's backlog need which was analysed by identifying applicant category.

Double counting was avoided as each need category was netted off in the order identified above (for example if an applicant was awarded points under one need category then they were netted out the other needs categories).

- The homelessness figure includes all live cases ie 372 on priority homeless queue, 48 cases under investigation and 35 cases obtaining advice and assistance. Information provided from Council's waiting list and homeless databases. HL1 data was not used as not reliable. This figure also includes 50 tenants whose properties are due to be demolished in the Twechar Regeneration programme.

- This figure includes 43 applicants who are on transfer queue but sharing amenities. This figure does not include sons/daughters.
- This figure is the total on the waiting list who have points for overcrowding.
- This category includes urgent special needs, urgent medical, wheelchair access and sheltered high priority. This figure includes numbers from specialist RSL's waiting lists.
- No steps have been taken to remedy possible overlap of applicants with other local authorities
- Poor quality – this figure was taken from the private sector local house condition survey as only 12 people on the council's waiting list currently have points for poor condition property

3 Validation procedures within the authority

East Dunbartonshire Council's last Housing Needs Assessment was carried out in 2001 and updated in 2006 by Fordham. No other validation process was undertaken.

4 Data Sources

Need Category	Source(s) and any limitations	Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats	Assumptions made; judgements required	Additional Comments
Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation	Source: Saffron Housing Management electronic download of Council's waiting list as at 26.10.09. This figure includes all live cases ie 372 on priority homeless queue, 48 cases under investigation and 35 cases obtaining advice and assistance. This figure also includes 50 tenants whose properties are due to be demolished in the Twechar Regeneration programme.		HL1 stats were looked at and deemed to be unreliable as many records were missing. Difference between Saffron download and homeless team database.	
	Source: Saffron Housing Management electronic download of Council's waiting list as at 26.10.09.			
Concealed households	Source: Saffron Housing Management electronic download of Council's waiting list as at 26.10.09.		This figure includes 43 applicants who are on transfer queue but sharing amenities. This figure does not include sons/daughters.	
Overcrowding	Source: Saffron Housing Management electronic download of Council's waiting list as at 26.10.09.		This figure is the total on the waiting list who have points for overcrowding.	
Support Needs	Source: Council's waiting list as at 26.10.09. This category includes urgent special needs, urgent medical, wheelchair access and sheltered high priority. This figure includes numbers from specialist RSL's waiting list. Transfers have been excluded		This category includes urgent special needs, urgent medical, wheelchair access and sheltered high priority. This figure includes numbers from specialist RSL's waiting list	
Poor Quality	Source: Council's Private Sector Stock Condition Survey 2005. This figure includes 12 BTS from Council's Waiting list. Also includes 565 which have been extracted from the council's local house condition survey (2005) and deemed BTS. These people are not currently on the council's waiting list.	John Martin Partnership Local House Condition Survey 2005	This figure includes 12 BTS from Council's Waiting list and 565 which have been extracted from the council's local house condition survey (2005) and deemed BTS. These people are not currently on the council's waiting list.	
Harassment				
Other Categories: define:				

East Renfrewshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

Please refer to East Renfrewshire Housing Need and Market Assessment technical appendix D.

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

Please refer to East Renfrewshire Housing Need and Market Assessment technical appendix D.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

Please refer to East Renfrewshire Housing Need and Market Assessment technical appendix D.

4 Data Sources

Needs Element	Definition	Sources Considered	Source Used	Rationale	Comments/Notes
Homelessness	Currently homeless households (live cases), including all those accepted as homeless through statute by local authority and entitled to permanent accommodation	HL1 returns	HL1 returns	Only source available on outstanding homeless cases at the baseline point in time.	Local authority collected data, no concerns over robustness
Concealed Households	Unrelated households sharing a kitchen, bathroom or WC with another household but not sharing meals	SHS, SHCS, ERPSSCS	SHS	ERPSSCS does not provide the variables required to estimate concealed households. SHS provides a significantly larger sample size in ERC than the SHCS and provides flexibility within variables to define the need element and consider double counting across other elements.	Potential issues of non-response bias within the SHS estimates have been noted. Given the response rates achieved in the area (63% in 2005/06) it is not considered that this is likely to result in a significant bias. At a national level it is noted that SHS (1.6% +/- 0.14%) and SHCS (2.3% +/- 0.5%) provide broadly similar results for this element.
Overcrowding	Households overcrowded according to the bedroom standard (using the Below Tolerable Standard Definition)	SHS, SHCS, ERPSSCS	ERPSSCS	ERPSSCS provides a larger sample size at the local area than other surveys and is considered a more robust source	From review of the methodology and sampling frame used in the ERPSSCS, Tribal are satisfied as to the robustness of the survey as a data source. The survey's large local sample size and currency make it a more attractive source of data than the available national surveys.

Needs Element	Definition	Sources Considered	Source Used	Rationale	Comments/Notes
Support Needs	Households containing people with mobility impairment or other specific support needs, living in an unsuitable dwelling	SHS, SHCS, ERPSSCS	SHS	ERPSSCS does not provide the variables required to estimate Support households. SHS provides a significantly larger sample size in ERC than the SHCS and provides flexibility within variables to define the need element and consider double counting across other elements.	Potential issues of non-response bias within the SHS estimates have been noted. Given the response rates achieved in the area (63% in 2005/06) it is not considered that this is likely to result in a significant bias. The local estimate is similar to the national estimate. The Scottish figure is 5.4% +/- 0.25% and the local figure is 3.8 +/- 1.83; thus, there is no statistical difference. At national level, comparing this SHS variable with data from the 2002 SHCS the estimates are similar (5.5% +/- 0.27); the 2004-2007 SHCS which is publicly available does not contain these variables to derive an up to date estimate.
Poor Quality Housing	Households in dwellings which lack a bathroom, kitchen or inside WC or are subject to major disrepair. (Properties that are below the tolerable standard)	SHS, SHCS, ERPSSCS	ERPSSCS	ERPSSCS provides a larger sample size at the local area than other surveys and is considered a more robust source	From review of the methodology and sampling frame used in the ERPSSCS, Tribal are satisfied as to the robustness of the survey as a data source. The survey's large local sample size and currency make it a more attractive source of data than the available national surveys.
Harassment	No estimate of harassment is included in the estimate of current need.			Where a household required a move because of harassment we would expect their need to be reflected in the homelessness statistics. However, typically, we would expect the authority to move the harasser, not the household being harassed. The authority is best placed to deal with	

Needs Element	Definition	Sources Considered	Source Used	Rationale	Comments/Notes
				such situations within the social rented sector, where any such moves would take the form of “churn”, not net need for additional homes	

Glasgow City Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

Glasgow City Council and Inverclyde Council faced particular challenges in completing this exercise as these authorities no longer own social rented stock. Glasgow's situation is unique in other respects not least in the scale of the sector and its diversity. Although Glasgow Housing Association is the largest Registered Social Landlord (RSLs) in the city with over 60,000 units there are 67 other RSLs, mainly small and community based, which own about 45,000 properties in the sector. Currently there is no Common Housing Register covering the whole city from which we could collate relevant data. So there has been a challenging logistical exercise in collecting information from social landlords.

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

As states above we were entirely dependent for this exercise on the support and co-operation of Glasgow Housing Association (GHA), other RSLs operating in the city and the Glasgow Homelessness Partnership (GHP) in the provision of data. As GHA stock constitutes 60% of the sector GHA data would form the core of the information needed together with HL1 data, as is consistent with the Procedure Note. But the 'Other RSLs' data was also essential to provide a more complete assessment/estimation of backlog need in the city.

Our approach was to seek the support of our partners involved in the social rented sector in Glasgow (as indicated above). Following discussion, the exercise and method of collating information was agreed. A covering letter was signed by SFHA/GWOSF partners for our

request to 'Other RSLs' and note on the information that we needed was approved. We requested that RSLs provide as much information as possible in whatever electronic format preferable.

GHA and GHP furnished their datasets separately.

There were three stages in our approach to estimation of backlog need using data/information received: -

- Data Cleansing and Filtering
- Eliminating Overlap
- Estimation

The key assumptions drawn up as part of our estimation of backlog need are also described at each stage.

Data Cleansing and Filtering: A number of applications on the GHA housing list were excluded in our estimation of backlog need as per the Procedure Note, including:

- Those on the Homeless List, assumed already included in the HL1-based calculation
- Transfer applicants, as these are already social tenants, where data made this possible.

12,000 GHA records were omitted because they were not general list applicants.

In the case of the 'other RSLs' we were unable to distinguish transfer from general list applicants. We made the assumption that the ratio of backlog need to total applicants of all categories was the same as for the GHA. We added a further element for non-reporting RSLs in proportion to their stock.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

At each stage of the process the outputs were scrutinised by three members of the Strategy Group. Validation of the figures for homelessness was provided by the Glasgow Homelessness Partnership. The overall Backlog Need figures were compared with Bramley's for validation purposes. Validation of figures below city level against external surveys was not possible although further work will be carried out on validating these figures.

Further scrutiny was carried out by the same members for each category of need figures and validated with external sources where possible. With respect to BTS figures (Quality) these are not comparable with Scottish House Condition Survey (SHCS) as the Older Private Housing Survey (2006) from which the figures are derived used a different sampling methodology.

4 Data Sources

Need Category	Source(s) and any limitations	Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats	Assumptions made; judgements required	Additional Comments
Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation	HL1	Figures validated by Glasgow Homelessness Partnership	In a report made by DRS in July 2009 it was calculated that there was an accommodation requirement of 625 per year for 5 years, or a total of 3,250 lets, to clear the backlog housing need. Account must now also be taken of approximately 635 Asylum Legacy cases (this figure has become available only recently); giving a rounded total of 3,900. All homeless applicants have been removed from RSL waiting lists as far as is practicable to avoid double counting.	
Insecure Tenure	n/a			
Concealed households	GHA/Other RSL General List Data	Compared with available homelessness data	To appropriate this definition as closely as possible, for the "concealed households" figure the applicants currently residing with "friends or family" were examined. The two categories are not separated in the GHA list, but they are in the HL1 list, and this indicates that about one half of the "friends and family" group are residing with non-related persons. Our assumptions are based on this ratio giving a concealed family figure of 7,275.	As the Procedure Note indicates, it is anticipated that the other half will be considered as 'emerging households' in the next stages of the HNDA.
Overcrowding	GHA/Other RSL General List Data		The other need categories are overcrowding, support needs, poor housing quality and harassment, all of which can be inferred from the GHA data, although these may not be complete. Only the main reason for application is given; and if the applicant suffers overcrowding plus one of the other relevant factors, only one of these may be counted. The figure for support needs is possibly an overestimation because we could not differentiate 'households moving to give support' in the data. We, therefore, could not strictly adhere to the Procedure Note in this regard. The figure is still much lower than the relevant triangulation figure provided in the Note	

Support Needs	GHA/Other RSL General List Data		See 'overcrowding' above	The figure for support needs is possibly an overestimation because we could not differentiate 'households moving to give support' in the data. We, therefore, could not strictly adhere to the Procedure Note in this regard. The figure is still much lower than the relevant triangulation figure provided in the Note
Poor Quality	GCC Older Private Housing Survey 2006		As agreed at the HNDA Housing Sub Group meeting with the Centre for Housing Market Analysis, we have included a figure for assessed BTS (in private sector) in our backlog needs figures. This figure (6443) is derived from our Older Private Housing Survey (2006) using the pre-2006 BTS definition.	
Harassment	GHA Data		This need was found on the GHA list to be additional to the figure on the homelessness data and has therefore, been included.	
Other define: Categories:	Other RSL General List Data		Overall the information received from RSLs was insufficient to be disaggregated between the categories agreed. We decided that the Other RSLs information should be recorded separately rather than disaggregations across these headings using the GHA backlog need proportions. In addition, we have estimated a backlog need figure for the balance of RSLs, which were unable to provide information, based on Other RSLs returns. This ensures that the estimation covers the whole sector.	

5 Supplementary Comments

Eliminating Overlap: RSLs use different formats for setting down addresses and different conventions to describe house positions. The data displayed a large number of other variations. This presented a number of challenges in reducing the addresses to a common format. For instance, some address information was incomplete as regards house positions or postcode units.

However, a list was drawn up, with the intention of identifying unique addresses from the different applicant lists, to eliminate multiple counting. We assumed that each unique address represents one, and only one, application and therefore, will be a conservative estimate.

As regards applicants' addresses within Glasgow, the street and street numbers were compared with the CT register. If there was no flat position given for a street number with more than one dwelling, it was ignored. Addresses with more than one flat were counted as duplicates only if the flat position was given, or where it was known that there is only one dwelling at that address.

Out of Glasgow applicants: In the case of applicants from outside the city, it was assumed that the same street and number represented the same applicant, even where no flat position was provided. This figure may also be an underestimation.

Once this was done, about 26,500 individual applicants were identified, in addition to those shown in the GHA list.

The amount of overlap could be calculated, and turned out as follows: -

Of GHA applicants, 22% have also applied to one or more other RSLs
Of other RSL applicants, 82% have applied to the GHA, or to other RSLs.

The overall average overlap is 48%.

This means that many people apply only to the GHA, while those who apply to any other RSL usually choose more than one. In Castlemilk, for example, most applicants appear on both the Cassiltoun and North View lists. Analysis of the data appears to indicate that people tend to apply to all the RSLs with stock in the area they are interested in.

Transfer Applicants:

Scottish Government Guidance on Housing Needs and Demand Assessments states that transfer applicants should be omitted from the current backlog needs exercise. A reason for this is that a tenant who transfers will leave a property that can be let to a household in need. We have followed the Guidance in this respect.

However, we would draw attention to the fact that the GHA is carrying out a very significant clearance and demolition programme (now in excess of 20,000 properties) which will be completed by 2017. Clearly the Re-provisioning Programme of 6,000 new houses aids this programme.

But it will not meet all GHA's tenants rehousing needs and as such will impact on meeting housing need in the city overall. For instance many tenants (perhaps the majority) will be rehoused in existing GHA stock. There may therefore be a 'lag effect' in terms of properties becoming available to meet backlog need (as defined). In short, the available supply of houses will be reduced throughout the period of this programme because of clearances. Further consideration of this issue is needed.

Backlog Need by CHCP/CP and Housing Sub Market Geographies

The estimate at citywide level contains no information that would produce figures for backlog need by CCP area. To assess this we have looked at the pattern of demand across the city as shown by the General List of GHA applicants.

GHA general list has been used to calculate the number of choices made by people wishing to remain within the same CPP area, those residing in each area wishing to live somewhere else, and those living outside wishing to move in.

Our calculations show that inward demand is higher in the West CHCP, about average in East and South West, and below the City average in North and South East. The total net flow represents applicants currently residing outside Glasgow.

The total backlog need was divided among the 10 CCP areas, i.e. 2,843 for each area, and this figure has been applied to the medium demand areas. An extra 20% was added to West, and 10% deducted from North and South East, to reflect the lower demand.

It should be noted that demand patterns are a little different for the non-GHA housing associations: Pollokshaws and South Side is rather more popular, and Govan & Craigton less popular, with applicants for CBHA housing rather than for the GHA general list applicants.

However, much more information is available about the GHA rehousing list, and applicants for other RSLs very often also apply to the GHA (see above). For these reasons the GHA figures have been used for this calculation. In addition, the West areas are in the highest demand across the whole social sector, and a deduction of only 10% has been made for the lower demand areas.

We therefore think that this represents a reasonably fair allocation of the backlog need figure.

It is not possible to validate this analysis with data from other surveys as they are less reliable below local authority level.

Distribution of Backlog Need by CPPs

As part of the HNDA exercise and as an input into Tribal's Affordability work, we have been asked to provide a distribution of need by category across Local Housing Forums.

Given the lack of sufficient data to analyse need by category at this geography we have assumed a proportionate distribution across categories for each Local Housing Forum.

This approach was chosen because we had to provide a response by return to the SDP team.

Clearly there are weaknesses in this approach. For instance, the distribution of other RSLs across the city is uneven. Also, the quality figure is based on BTS data from the Older Private Housing Survey which identified clusters of this stock in certain parts of the city rather than exhibiting an even distribution across the city.

On the other hand it may well be that in reality housing applicants may show much more mobility than implicitly assumed – as indicated in GHA's Homechoice pilot.

We are working on both sets of sub-city figures in order to validate and, if necessary, refine the figures used.

Inverclyde Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

Inverclyde Council has followed the approach set out in the Backlog Need Procedure Note. The principal data source for the backlog need assessment was the waiting list of the main social housing provider in the area, River Clyde Homes. Additional need from other RSL waiting lists was assessed together with additional information on homelessness and house condition. Within the available time and with the available data sources, the Council is confident that the assessment of gross backlog need has been completed in accordance with the Backlog Need Procedure Note and that there has been no major departures from the agreed methodology.

There was a major delay in receiving the waiting list data from RCH and therefore as consequence, some of the queries with the data were not resolved and some working assumptions were made. However, these queries were minor and will not substantially impact on the overall backlog need figures. The Council is confident that within the time constraints the available data sources have been maximised.

Social renters were netted out of the assessment as stated in the Backlog Need Procedure Note however, it should be noted that in Inverclyde there are a large number of properties that have been earmarked for demolition therefore not all of the properties that are vacated will become available for let again. Therefore netting out all of the social renters may underestimate the level of housing need.

Estimates for medical need, overcrowding and concealed households were assessed from RCH's waiting list with additional need from three other RSLs' waiting lists in Inverclyde. Homelessness and house condition were assessed from different data sources therefore estimating the

overlap with the other categories was not possible. Therefore there is potential for overlap between the homelessness and house condition categories with the categories that were assessed from the waiting lists.

Inverclyde's Re-provisioning Programme is ongoing and the underpinning figures for the programme were fed into the gross backlog need assessment. Most of the households that are required to be re-housed will have a new house re-provided to them by RCH, Cloch HA or Oak Tree HA. This has created a 'neutral effect' on the gross backlog need figures i.e. they do not require a new house as there is one planned for the household. However, there are around 400 households that require to be re-housed with no re-provision. There is potential that the new build element of the Re-provisioning Programme will be affected by changes in AHIP funding and may extend beyond the next five years.

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

RCH's waiting list at 11th December 2009 was the primary data source for the assessment. As indicated above, there was a considerable time delay with RCH providing the waiting list. RCH indicated that the quality and content of the data was far better at December 2009, than the frozen data extraction at the 31st March 2009. The Council agreed it was better to have the best quality data for the gross backlog need assessment. There were 4,321 active applicants on the RCH waiting list at 11th December 2009.

When the zero points applicants and the social renters (transfers) were netted out there were 2,064 applicants on the RCH waiting list which demonstrated a housing need in accordance with RCH's allocations policy. Not all of the applicants' current tenure was recorded on RCH's housing management system therefore, the proportion of social renters from the available data was aggregated up to the number of applicants with points on the waiting list. If an applicant had points in more than one category, then the applicant would only be assessed in one category i.e. there was no double counting of applicants on the RCH's waiting list.

Additional need from RSL registers

There are three other general housing providers in Inverclyde: Oak Tree HA, Cloch HA and Larkfield HA (who manage Link Group's housing stock in Port Glasgow). There are four other specialist housing providers in Inverclyde: Bield HA, Key HA, Margaret Blackwood HA and Key HA who provide sheltered and very sheltered housing.

Craigforth completed a Common Housing Register Feasibility Study in 2002 which assessed the overlap of the Council's housing stock with the other mainstream social housing providers in Inverclyde. The study found there was an overlap of 46% between the three smaller RSLs' waiting lists and the Council's waiting list. Since 2002, Cloch, Larkfield and Oak Tree have implemented a single application form which allows applicants to complete one form and to be put on more than one waiting list. The number of applicants on the waiting lists in 2009 is higher than the numbers from 2002 but the RCH waiting list has far fewer numbers on it. The level of overlap is likely to be higher and the Council estimate that the current level of overlap is in the order of 70%. Some of the RSLs were able to provide a breakdown of their waiting lists which gave detail on the number of social renters and zero point applicants. Where the breakdown was not available, assumptions were made based on

the available data from the other waiting lists to produce a net figure. Additional need from other RSL registers was assessed to be 1036 applicants, this includes zero point applicants and transfer applicants netted out and a 705 reduction for overlap.

Data from each RSLs waiting list were not available for the assessment therefore the proportion of waiting list applicants in need was calculated from the RCH waiting list and then applied to the RSL's additional need figure (984). This approach assumes that the characteristics of the waiting lists are the same; the former CHR co-ordinator for Inverclyde agreed this was a valid approach.

Waiting lists for the specialist housing providers in Inverclyde were not available for this assessment. RCH is the largest provider of social sheltered housing in the area.

Homelessness

The method for assessing the number of homelessness applicants is in line with the approach set out in the Backlog Need Procedure Note. The data was taken from the HL1 return for Quarter 1 2009. Inverclyde Council's Homelessness Service confirmed that the figures in the HL1 return were accurate. There is potential to include double counting from concealed households and households in poor condition however with the available information this could not be discounted. There were a number of Homelessness applicants on RCH's waiting list which were not included in the analysis because the HL1 return will cover all of the households assessed to be homeless in Inverclyde. There were 242 households assessed as Homeless. This figure includes no reduction for overlap between the other categories. No in-situ solution was assumed.

Concealed Households

RCH's waiting list was the primary source for this category. Overlap with overcrowding, medical need, redevelopment and tied tenancies were removed. The HNSA Guidance and the Backlog Need Procedure Note state that only unrelated households should be considered in the concealed households category however, the waiting list extract from RCH was limited in this respect and if a household is related or unrelated could not be identified. There is potential overlap with the newly emerging households however it was agreed at the Housing Sub Group that it was difficult to separate out the unrelated households and we should include all concealed households.

There were a number of ways of calculating the number of concealed households from RCH's waiting list. RCH's allocations policy awards points to applicants who have 'shared amenities'. RCH also record the number of 'movers' and 'non-movers' from a household which the applicant is currently living in i.e. the household/applicant that is applying is moving out from another household. However this category has not been completed (there are a number of gaps) and the figures did not match up with what is stated in the shared amenities column. The movers and non-movers category was not included in the analysis. The number of concealed households on the RCH's waiting list was 558, this represents 27% of the RCH's waiting list with social renters and applicants with zero points netted out. Additional need from other RSLs was assessed to be 280 households (27% of 1036 applicants).

Overcrowding

RCH award overcrowding points in accordance with the Bedroom Standard. Overlap with other points categories was netted out. Households that were considered to be overcrowded and concealed were included in this section and were not included in the concealed households section. The number of overcrowded households on RCH's waiting list was 1,104 and this represents 53% of RCH's waiting list with the social renters and applicants with zero points netted out. There were an additional 549 concealed households from other RSL registers (53% of 1036 applicants).

Support Needs

RCH award medical points if the provision of alternative accommodation would help to improve the applicant's quality of life and well being. Inverclyde Council and RCH jointly agree the awarding of points for medical need. There are three levels of medical need according to the urgency of the need for housing. Households with a high and medium medical need were included in this assessment.

RCH has a number of sheltered housing properties and properties that are suitable for the frail, immobile and impaired (FMI). Although there is no specific policy in place for allocating these properties, RCH has confirmed that these properties are usually allocated to applicants with a medical need. Further examination of the waiting list confirms that all of the applicants that expressed a need for a sheltered property and for a FMI property had a low medical need.

From RCH's waiting list, 300 households were assessed to have a high or medium medical need or a need for sheltered and FMI housing (minus the social renters and the double counting with other categories). This equates to 15% of the waiting list. Additional need from other RSLs was assessed to be 155 households (15% of 1036 applicants).

House Condition

The approach outlined in the Procedure Note was followed to assess the number of households in need due to house condition; the Council has included households in regeneration areas and private sector households that are below BTS.

RCH and Cloch HA estimated (at October 2009) that there were 1,713 households in properties that are of very poor quality or are in decant housing that required to be rehoused as part of the Rehousing Programme. Over the next five years and beyond, RCH, Cloch HA, Oak Tree HA plan to develop 1,313 units as part of the Programme. The Backlog Need Procedure states that the gross backlog need assessment should include *'households in regeneration areas and requiring rehousing, where a decision has been made to demolish but no rehousing programme has been agreed'* – there are 400 households with no rehousing. It is likely that these households will be re-housed through submitting a housing application to RCH and the other RSLs in the area, or they will leave the sector and make their own housing arrangements. There are concerns that the anticipated reduction in AHIP funding will impact on the rate of new build therefore this will subsequently impact on the length of time these households will be in unsuitable housing. It may be the case that a large number of households will be waiting a considerable period of time to be rehoused. RCH has stated that the figures were established from a stock

condition survey prior to stock transfer. The planned new build figures were from the Inverclyde SHIP 2009 together the numbers of units that were 'on site' at the time of the assessment.

In addition to the Reprovisioning Programme, there were a number of properties in the private sector that were assessed as BTS. Inverclyde Council's Private Sector House Condition Survey 2005 was deemed to be the most robust data source for assessing the number of BTS households. The sample of the survey is larger than the sample for the SHCS 2006/07/08 and the SHS 2005/06. The local condition survey takes into account the clusters of BTS housing in Inverclyde. Inverclyde has a level of BTS housing that is twice the national average at 2.2% of all private sector households. This equates to 525 households across the authority. The survey is slightly out date (2005) the Council believes that this is counteracted by the large size of the sample in comparison with national data sources.

As house condition was not assessed from RCH's waiting list, eliminating between overlap with the overcrowded households, concealed households and support needs households was very difficult. Households that are in regeneration areas and in BTS housing could be on the RCH's waiting list in other categories. Households with redevelopment points were deducted from the other categories and are not included in the assessment. As stated in the Procedure Note, most properties assessed as BTS will possibly have an in-situ solution rather than a need for new provision. The affordability assessment should net out the households that can provide an-in situ solution.

Other categories

RCH allocate points to households in tied tenancies and bedsits. This equates to three households. RCH has indicated that there are no other needs categories with in their allocations policy.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

The previous housing needs assessment was undertaken in 2005. It was a survey based approach assessment to help inform the stock transfer. The Council has concerns about the application of the methodology that the consultants used for assessment. The gross backlog figure from the 2005 assessment was 8,366 households. Some of the reduction in gross backlog need could be accounted for by the implementation of the Reprovisioning Programme i.e. a large number of households in need will have a property reprovided.

BTS housing across the authority – 505 households (Backlog Need Procedure Note version 6)

Concealed households – 377 households (Backlog Need Procedure Note version 6). The higher number in the gross backlog need assessment is likely to be a result of the inclusion of related households

Overcrowding – 1,509 households (Backlog Need Procedure Note version 6)

Support needs – Numerous approaches outlined in Backlog Need Procedure Note. In comparison, figures from the RSL waiting lists are on the low side.

4 Data Sources

Need Category	Source(s) and any limitations	Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats	Assumptions made; judgements required	Additional Comments
Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation	HL1 housing return 31 st March 2009		No in-situ solution. HL1 will return cover all of Inverclyde and not just largest RSL.	
Insecure Tenure				
Concealed households	RCH waiting list 11 th December 2009 plus data from Cloch HA, Oak Tree HA and Larkfield waiting lists (31 st March 2009).		Social renters netted out. Assumed level of CH is the same on other RSL waiting lists. No mechanism to separate out related/non related households.	Efforts were made to obtain data from SHCS and SHS teams – SHCS sample was too small and the SHS team did not respond in time.
Overcrowding	RCH waiting list December 2009 plus data from Cloch HA, Oak Tree HA and Larkfield waiting lists (31 st March 2009)		Social renters netted out. Assumed level of overcrowding is the same on other RSL waiting lists.	Efforts were made to obtain data from SHCS and SHS teams – SHCS sample was too small and the SHS team did not respond in time.
Support Needs	RCH waiting list 11 th December 2009 plus data from Cloch HA, Oak Tree HA and Larkfield waiting lists (31 st March 2009).		Social renters netted out. Assumed level of support need is the same on other RSL waiting lists.	Efforts were made to obtain data from SHCS and SHS teams – SHCS sample was too small and SHS team did not respond in time.
Poor Quality	Inverclyde Council Stock Condition Survey 2005 together with Re provisioning Programme figures from RCH, Cloch HA and Oak Tree HA			
Harassment	This is recorded under homelessness			
Other Categories: define:	RCH waiting list December 2009			
LA bedsit and tied tenancies				

North Lanarkshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

3 *General Comments*

- Main data source has been Common Housing Register with the base date for data used being 17/8/09 (the date at which an electronic download of all applicants on the CHR was taken circa 16,000 applicants). The CHR covers applicants who have direct access to just over 90% of the social rented stock in North Lanarkshire.
- Other data sources include HL1 Homeless Assessing Applications 09-10 1st Quarter June 2009 and North Lanarkshire Council, Local House Condition Survey (All Tenures) 2007-08.
- Geography – data has been collected at Local Authority and Sub Housing Market Area level. North Lanarkshire's three SHMAs (Cumbernauld, Airdrie & Coatbridge and Motherwell are consistent with SDPA SHMAs and SHIP SHMAs.
- Working Assumptions
 - All applicants with zero points removed (except those awaiting assessment and those who have sheltered points), removed all transfers, removed all social renting applicants from within GCVSDPA
 - Applicants with any points relating to a housing need under the Council's allocation policy were included at the first stage (prior to removal of in-situs etc)
 - No estimate of overlap of applicants with other local authorities has been made (it is important to note that only 679 applicants in the total backlog need are from outwith the NLC area)
 - Data collected included applicant origin (current address) and tenure of current residence (PRS, owner-occupier etc)

- Backlog need categories identified from CHR
 - Insecure tenure (losing accommodation within 2 months, Insecure housing, Roofless/temporary accommodation)
 - Concealed (living with non household members)
 - Overcrowded (households experiencing overcrowding)
 - Support Needs (Health reason to move, persons subject to protocol, sheltered housing points)
 - Poor Condition (Property being demolished, property significantly below BTS)
 - Harassment (within and outwith the home)
 - Other (Give and receive Support, Families living apart, households living in under occupied property, moving to access employment, moving to access facilities, seeking a transfer)

4 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

- We initially removed all homeless applications (as the HL1 return was being used for the snapshot of backlog need), all applicants with zero points and all applicants who are currently social renters within GCVSDPA.
- The remaining applicants formed the basis for North Lanarkshire's backlog need which was analysed by identifying applicant origin and need category.
- Double counting was avoided as each need category was netted off in the order identified above (for example if an applicant was awarded points under one need category they were immediately removed from the CHR list so as not to be double counted if they had a multiple need).
- Homeless Applicants were identified from HL1 Homeless Assessing Applications 09-10 1st Quarter June 09 (466). After some considering we decided to include the difference between HL1 figure and those identified as Homeless from the CHR download. This was felt to be a more accurate measure of the actual homeless backlog at the point of the assessment). Total CHR homeless applicants 682. Therefore Homeless figure used is $466 + 216 = 682$.
- Only 2 applicants were identified as being in need under the poor quality category from the CHR. We therefore decided to use this figure plus data from the council's own all tenure local house condition survey which reported in March 2009. A decision was made to include only those properties identified as BTS in the owner-occupied and private rented sectors (538). This gives a total of 540 under poor quality category.
- Description of backlog need based on North Lanarkshire Council's CHR waiting list categories:
 - Homeless (HL1 466 plus 216 from CHR = 682). It has been assumed that homeless households have no in-situ solution.
 - Insecure Tenure (Households with tenure under notice, real threat of notice or lease coming to an end or in rent or mortgage arrears (1735). Data from CHR. Assumed no in-situ solution.
 - Concealed Households (North Lanarkshire's figure includes households which have related adults e.g. staying with parents & family members - 4514). Data from CHR. Assumed no in-situ solution.
 - Overcrowding (253) Data from CHR. Assumed no in-situ solution.

- Support Needs (564) Data from CHR. Assumed no in-situ solution. Does not include households that require to move to give care or support. Includes those who have Health reason to move, persons subject to protocol (includes care leavers, those moving from institutions), those with sheltered housing points.
- Poor Quality (540) Data from CHR (2 applicants whose property is being demolished or whose property is significantly below BTS and Local House Condition Survey (538).
- Harassment (22) Data from CHR. While it was originally agreed by the HMP that this category would be excluded the CHR identified applicants who need to move under this criteria who were not included in previous categories (i.e. homelessness).
- Other (731) Data from CHR. After netting off above categories which were identified in Scottish Government Guidance there were 731 applicants who had points and had identified need – these include: Give and receive support, families living apart, households living in under occupied property, moving to access employment and moving to access facilities.
- No steps have been taken to remedy possible overlap of applicants with other local authorities.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

- Overall backlog need figure (9041) is similar to figure identified in Local Housing Needs Assessment 2007/08 carried out by David Adamson and Partners on behalf of the council (9096).
- Secondary data sources:
 - Concealed Households (996 - 2001 Census)
 - Overcrowded (7187 – SHS 2005-06 – Households below the bedroom standard)
 - Support Needs (SHS and SHCS – Version 6 Backlog Need Procedure Note)
 - Poor Quality (1365 SHCS)
- Secondary data source information above provides different outputs than our CHR download. The council are happy that the information contained in the CHR provides the most realistic and up to date position for North Lanarkshire. It is an up-to-date measure of real need across the area (although limited by the fact that it requires people in housing need to self refer through the CHR) and is the best information to inform a local housing needs assessment and the LHS.

4 Data Sources

Need Category	Source(s) and any limitations	Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats	Assumptions made; judgements required	Additional Comments
Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation	HL1 Homeless Assessing Applications 2009-10 1 st Quarter June 2009	Difference between CHR download figure (682) and HL1 figure (466) = 216 added to HL1 figure		
Insecure Tenure	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09			
Concealed households	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09	Includes applicants living with parents or family members	Judgement that related households with points should be included. If they were not to be included in this category then the Council would move them into the overcrowding category.	
Overcrowding	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09			
Support Needs	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09			
Poor Quality	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09 & North Lanarkshire Stock Condition Survey 2007/08 by David Adamson & Partners	Local stock condition information only included owner occupiers and private rented.		
Harassment	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09			
Other Categories: define: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give and receive support • families living apart • households living in under occupied property • moving to access employment • moving to access facilities 	Common Housing Register download 17/8/09	A number of applicants not identified in Scottish Government Guidance remained with points therefore these need to be included and have been identified above.		

Renfrewshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 *General Comments*

- Main data source: Council (from download 3.9.09 and RSL waiting list data year end 08/09).
- Other data sources: BTS figures from RC stock condition survey 2002 and HL1.
- Geography: Data has been collected at LA and Sub Housing Market Areas; Paisley and Linwood, Johnstone and Elderslie, West Renfrewshire, North Renfrewshire, Renfrew.
- Working assumptions:
 - Transfers tenants (either RC or RSL) and tenants of other local authorities were netted off at the beginning.
 - Applicants with a need were not double counted within Council figures i.e. if they were counted in one category there were not counted again in any other category (there may have been a small element of double counting in RSL returns due to IT systems being unable to separate out categories).
 - Account taken of overlap of applicants on Council and RSL lists - appropriate overlap percentage was applied to RSL figures (We compared the waiting list information of name, address and DOB of 4 of the locally based RSLs with the Council's waiting list to identify the extent of duplication of applicants on the RSLs and Council list).

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

The procedure note was followed as closely as possible. However, in common with other local authorities, we did include two additional categories “Insecure Tenure” and “other” that are not referred to in the Procedure Note. Also in the Concealed Households category we included related adults, where the Procedure note advises to exclude this group. The reasons for doing so are explained in the relevant boxes below.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

Final results were compared with Renfrewshire Council’s housing needs study completed by DTZ Pidea in 2003. While methodologies differed the overall results are in line with what we would expect based on the 2003 study. In addition, we compared information with an exercise the Council carried out to establish if there was a need to apply for “pressured area” status. Again, the results of the backlog need exercise tie in with what the findings from the “pressured area” status exercise.

4 Data Sources

<i>Need Category</i>	<i>Source(s) and any limitations</i>	<i>Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats</i>	<i>Assumptions made; judgements required</i>	<i>Additional Comments</i>
<i>Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation</i>	Council waiting list 31.3.09 Plus one twelfth of the total number of: accommodation too expensive, under notice to quit and non-priority from HL1 return 2008/09. This is one twelfth of the total yearly amount reported for each of these categories in HL1. We decided to use this method as if we did not take a percentage of these categories we would be using the full year figures, however if we took a snapshot there may be none showing on that particular day.		Did not add in all applicants in temporary accommodation as there would have been substantial double counting with those on the waiting list	
<i>Insecure Tenure</i>	Council waiting list download 3.9.09. Applicants who are in a private let or who are tied tenants. Excludes those applicants already			While not referred to in the Procedure note, this a category of need recognised by the Council (and other Councils in the GCVHMP)

	<p>counted in the concealed, overcrowded or support categories.</p> <p>Limitations: This data relates only to applicants on the Council waiting list.</p>			<p>and this groups' needs could have potentially been missed out completely. This issue was discussed at the Housing sub-group and we added it in relatively late in the process. Therefore we did not request this information from housing associations.</p>
Concealed households	<p>Council waiting list 3.9.09 and RSL returns with overlap deducted. Applicants sharing amenities with another person/household. Includes people living with parents.</p> <p>Limitations: Does not include any estimate of those who are concealed households who have not applied for social housing.</p>	<p>The Population and Household projections 2008-based (prepared by Jan Freeke) estimates level of concealed households in Renfrewshire to be 791.</p>		<p>Related adults included as per minute of Housing sub group 19th Nov 2009. Added in as there was concern that related adults living in the same house but requiring own home may not be picked up in projections of newly forming households and therefore missed out from need/demand calculations</p>
Overcrowding	<p>Council waiting list 3.9.09 plus RSL returns with overlap deducted. Applicants awarded an overcrowding priority</p> <p>To avoid double counting applicants who had already been counted under</p> <p>concealed households were not included in this count.</p> <p>Limitations: Does not include any estimate of overcrowded households who have not applied for social housing</p>	<p>Scottish House Condition Survey (updated to June 2008) – 3,000 mid point Population and Household projections by Jan Freeke estimate 1583 households in the Renfrewshire area.</p>		

<p>Support Needs</p>	<p>Source: council waiting list 3.9.09- Applicants with a “mobility priority”, applicants who have a sheltered housing priority only and who have not been included in any other category and applicants who wish to move to “give or receive support”. RSL returns for “Support Need” category with overlap deducted</p> <p>Limitations:</p> <p>The procedure note outlines the types of household to be included which focuses on mobility/disability issues that make the current dwelling unsuitable. This quite closely matches Renfrewshire Council’s “mobility priority”, however there is variation in the definition of RSLs “support need” category which may include broader definitions of support.</p> <p>The figure does not include an estimate of people who have support needs who have not applied to the Council or RSLs for rehousing.</p>			<p>As the information is drawn from waiting list data and does not include any estimate of people who have support needs but have not applied for social housing, the figure returned is likely to be at the lower level of estimated need.</p>
<p>Poor Quality</p>	<p>Source: Renfrewshire Council stock condition survey 2002 private sector BTS housing figure minus housing improved as reported through annual LHS updates. Also a small number of Council waiting list applicants who as at 31.3.09 had a regeneration priority with no identified rehousing.</p>			<p>RSLs did supply information regarding numbers of applicants in poor condition/quality housing. However given the varying definitions in policies about this category we decided to use the BTS figure.</p>

Harassment	No figure returned as per guidance in Procedure Note. While Renfrewshire Council does recognize this as a need, the number in this category, who would not fall into any other category, would be negligible.			
Other Categories: define:	<p>Renfrewshire Council waiting list categories “nowhere to stay” and “looking for work in area”.</p> <p>These are other categories of need the Council recognises but that are not included in any definition in the procedure note.</p>			As with Insecure Tenure, this was a late addition following discussion at the Housing sub-group. Information relates only to applicants on the Council housing list.

South Lanarkshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

The main data source used was South Lanarkshire Council's housing register with further information obtained from the larger Housing Associations about applicants on their own housing registers. The base date for the data used was 31 March 2009 as set out in the agreed procedure note.

In terms of geography, we analysed information to the local authority level and also to the well established four Housing Market Areas in South Lanarkshire. These are: Rutherglen and Cambuslang HMA; East Kilbride HMA; Hamilton HMA and Clydesdale HMA. These HMA are consistent with the Strategic Development sub areas, the Local Housing Strategy, the Local Plan and the Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP).

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

The SLC housing register had 18,563 applications at 31 March 2009 before any filtering was carried out (Table 1).

Table 1: Applicants on SLC housing register at 31 March 2009

	Waiting list	Transfer list	Homelessness list	Total Register
Clydesdale	2,378	583	185	3,146
East Kilbride	3,561	461	218	4,240
Hamilton	5,571	1,145	396	7,112
Rutherglen/Cambuslang	2,958	947	160	4,065
South Lanarkshire	14,468	3,136	959	18,563

Using applicants reasons for applying and the points awarded to them, we re-categorised applications to coincide with those in the procedure note which reflect those in the HNDA guidance. The outcome is this is shown in Table 2:

Table 2: Needs Categorisation

Procedure note/HNDA categories	South Lanarkshire Reason for Applying/ Points awarded
Homeless Households	Homelessness – maximum points
	Child Leaving Care
	Leaving Prison
	Tied Tenant - NTQ
	HM Forces - NTQ
	In Temporary Accommodation
Notice to Quit	Insecurity of Tenure
	NTQ from Landlord
	Losing Current Accommodation
	Accommodation Too Expensive
	Homelessness Reason (maximum points not awarded)
	No Permanent Accommodation
Concealed Households	Concealed Household
	Sharing Amenities
	Insecure Accommodation (no immediate threat of NTQ)
	Financial Difficulty
	Future Safeguard
	Insecurity
	Want to Live Independently
	Overcrowded
	Relationship Breakdown
Overcrowding	Points awarded for overcrowding
Support Needs	Medical A (Urgent medical need)
	Medical B (Serious medical need)
	Special Need Unsuitable Dwelling
	Wants Sheltered Housing
	Urgent Social Need
	Leaving Hospital
Poor Quality	Lacking Amenities
	Redevelopment Private renters who are unable to find an in situ resolution through the Scheme of Assistance. All private owners excluded.
Harassment	Harassment
Other	Give/Receive Care points only

The next stage of the process involved reviewing the housing register and making decisions about those applications which would be not be included as in need. These were:

- All Transfer applications.
- Applicants who had been awarded no points irrespective of reason for applying.
- Those with 'waiting points' only irrespective of reason for applying.
- Applicants with only Medical C points awarded (as these applicants may be helped with in situ measures).
- Applicants who had been suspended because they had been referred to another local authority.

This process resulted in a reduction of 8,185 applications from the council's housing register. This means that 10,378 applications comprised the core picture of backlog need arising from the Council's housing register. This represents a reduction of 55.9% from the original number on the housing register to those determined to be in backlog housing need. The outcome of this process is shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Applicants in Need

Step	Clydesdale	East Kilbride	Hamilton	Rutherglen/ Cambuslang	South Lanarkshire
Concealed Household	692	1333	2292	1077	5394
Harassment	1	0	1	1	3
Homeless	193	238	480	173	1084
Notice to Quit	319	498	974	475	2266
Other	42	43	50	45	180
Overcrowded	48	63	80	84	275
Poor Quality	4	1	3	7	15
Support Needs	104	424	356	277	1161
Total	1403	2600	4236	2139	10378

The next stage of the assessment was to consider additional need on Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) housing registers. At 31 March 2009, there were 21 RSLs operating in South Lanarkshire with a total RSL housing stock of 5,834 units. We obtained information from the six largest RSLs in South Lanarkshire which between own 74% of the RSL stock in the authority area. The total housing registers for these RSLs amounted to 4,055, assuming same stock, the list proportions gave a total housing register for all South Lanarkshire RSLs of 5,480. It has been assumed from previous affordable housing needs assessments and work related to the development of the South Lanarkshire Common Housing Register that an overlap of 50% with those on the Council's Housing Register was not unreasonable. When this was applied, it

reduced the number of applications to 2,740. Further analysis of the information on RSL housing registers showed that 175 were Transfer applications. When this figure was also deducted it was determined that 2,565 applications from South Lanarkshire RSLs were also from households in need.

This figure was added to the Council's core estimate of need, to provide an overall estimate of need from Social Landlord Housing Registers in South Lanarkshire of 12,943. This additional need was distributed between the four Housing Market Areas in the same proportions as in the 2004 and 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Assessments carried out Newhaven. These were based on previous analysis of waiting list profiles across these areas. The overall findings are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Assessment of Gross Backlog Need

Step	Clydesdale			East Kilbride			Hamilton			Ruth/Camb			South Lanarkshire		
	SLC	RSL	Total	SLC	RSL	Total	SLC	RSL	Total	SLC	RSL	Total	SLC	RSL	Total
Concealed Household	692	320	1012	1333	147	1480	2292	653	2945	1077	213	1290	5394	1333	6727
Harassment	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	1	4
Homeless	193	64	257	238	29	267	480	131	611	173	43	216	1084	268	1352
Notice to Quit	319	135	454	498	62	560	974	274	1248	475	90	565	2266	560	2826
Other	42	11	53	43	5	48	50	22	72	45	7	52	180	44	224
Overcrowded	48	16	64	63	7	70	80	33	113	84	11	95	275	68	343
Poor Quality	4	1	5	1	0	1	3	2	5	7	1	8	15	4	19
Support Needs	104	69	173	424	32	456	356	141	497	277	46	323	1161	287	1448
Grand Total	1403	616	2019	2600	282	2882	4236	1257	5493	2139	410	2549	10378	2565	12943

The final stage of the process was to include 474 households whose homes were projected to be demolished. This gives an overall final assessment of backlog need of 13,417 households.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

The backlog needs assessment was carried out following the guidance within the procedure note as much as possible. The assumptions and judgements used reflect those already used in the Affordable Housing Needs Assessments carried out by Tony O'Sullivan, Newhaven Research in 2004 and 2007.

West Dunbartonshire Council

These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the above local authority to:

- document the **data sources used** and their limitations (both data used as base information and for triangulation purposes)
 - make explicit the **assumptions made and judgements exercised**, and explain and justify them
 - explain and justify any **departure from the agreed methodology** as detailed in the Procedure Note on Backlog Need (Final Version 6, December 2009), and
 - describe **validation procedures** adopted within the authority.
-

1 General Comments

The figures presented in this exercise represent an updating of those contained in the backlog need component of the West Dunbartonshire Council's Housing Needs and Supply Study published in 2008, with variations to meet the criteria contained in the new G&CV methodology. The key elements making up the backlog need are broadly similar. The outcomes of the two exercises were not dissimilar, with the GCV one arriving at a more conservative total. In both instances overcrowding and "unsuitable for special needs" were the main reasons for households being in "backlog" housing need. The Council intends to update its own HNSS in the lead up to the preparation of the new Local Housing Strategy scheduled for completion in September 2011.

2 Methodology: explanation for any departure(s) from agreed Procedure Note

West Dunbartonshire Council figures are based on their HNSS Study carried out in July 2008 by Arneil Johnston, Public Sector Housing & Facilities Management Consultancy⁴. Where possible, figures were updated. The methodology employed in the HNSS to ascertain backlog need is very similar to that agreed by the G&CV. The study was household survey as opposed to waiting list based. The backlog need was broken down by the settlement areas of Clydebank, Dumbarton, and Vale of Leven.

3 Validation procedures within the authority

All household survey results were based on a sample size of 1,119 residents in the West Dunbartonshire Council area and have been validated against core statistical sources such as GRO population projections (2004 based) and 1991 and 2001 Census results. In addition, the HNSS

⁴ WDC Housing Needs and Supply Study Final Report July 2008

project board comprising WDC and Scottish Government Housing Investment Division officers was used as a “sounding board” in progressing the work. In the course of writing the HNSS all results

Household survey outcomes were validated against GRO household projections (2004 based) to ensure that they were representative of projected household composition and age profiles. In addition, validation of the tenure profile of respondents was carried out utilising a tenure tagged Council Tax dataset. These validation checks indicated that the survey profile was representative of the wider population in terms of age, age of head of household and/or household composition, with only very small variances in the survey population and the projected population/tenure data.

4 Data Sources

Need Category	Source(s) and any limitations	Additional Source(s) used for Triangulation and any caveats	Assumptions made; judgements required	Additional Comments
Homeless households and those in Temporary accommodation	252 HL1 Statistics: Snapshot at end Q1 2008	Compared with HL1 Average 2004-2008. Also complies with WDC temporary accommodation stock list figure.		
Insecure Tenure			Assumed to be contained in HL1 and concealed households figures.	
Concealed households	369 HNSS Survey Q18 It should be noted that although the Final Report is dated July 2008, the survey and other figures informing the report date from 2007.	WDC WaitingList Points November 2009: sharing amenities- 1757. HL1 Reasons for Homelessness: friends/families no longer willing/able to accommodate-208	Having noted the low HL1 figure, agreed to go with the more conservative source. Although the HNSS was 2 years old at the time of preparing this backlog analysis, it was considered to be still valid.	The figure of 369 may be on the low side, especially given the WL figure which however may contain some double counting.
Overcrowding	2450 HNSS Survey Q21(3469) WL Households with 1 or more bedrooms fewer than needed excluding single people (1430).		Both figures seem reasonable and valid; decision made to use the midpoint figure of 2450.	This figure may appear high for WDC. However, the “concealed households” category is low. There is likely to a definitional issue here. A pattern has emerged across the GCV whereby where there is a high figure in one category the other is low. This bears out the suggestion that definition is an issue.

Support Needs	1425 HNSS Survey WDC information aids and adaptations budgetary information	OccupationalTherapist Aids/Adaptations waiting lists. The SHCS shows WDC as the authority with the highest proportions of dwellings in need of adaptations, at 11%. It also has the highest percentage of dwellings with at least one member having LTI/disability at 52%. ⁵	Comprises 2 elements A) Those who require major adaptations which cannot be met through their own or the Council's budgets = 161 (HNSS Survey Q 73 (1543) minus those adaptations considered to be minor (692) minus those households who will undertake the adaptations themselves Q74 (90) minus WDC estimate of requests that can be funded from the available budget (600) = 161 B) Those who need a special form of housing= 2479 (HNSS Q71.) The total of 2640 has been reduced pro rata 54/46 to remove those in social housing where it is assumed that those rehoused would free up their existing accommodation.	Latest WDC Waiting List figures show a considerably lower figure of 1460. However, there was evidence that there were high numbers of people rejecting offers on the grounds that the house offered was not suitable due to access issues. It was also considered more consistent to use the HNSS survey figures. A key finding of the survey was that there were too many houses with stairs. It should be noted that the analysis of backlog need is predicated on the principle that those who have need which can be resolved in-situ will be eliminated from the requirement for alternative housing. This means that the calculation is likely to under-estimate the overall level of need if an appropriate level of investment in aids and adaptations is not provided.
Poor Quality	9 WDC BTS latest Scottish Government return ("old pre - 2006 BTS definition". ⁶	SHCS gives figure of 170 but based on low sample size.	Not thought to be major issues of disrepair in WD but data is limited pending completion of PSHCS. The situation is likely to be very different if the new BTS definition is used.	New Private Sector House Condition Survey is being carried out but is not due to report until August 2010.
Harassment	12 HNSS Survey Q37E(3)	HL1 figure is given as 38.	Survey figure for those who have moved as a result of harassment which would not go through homeless route.. It is considered that this is in addition to Homelessness figures whereas HL1 "Reasons for Homelessness: Harassment: other/racial" will largely be duplication	
Other Categories: define:				

⁵SHCS Local Authority Report 2004-07 Tables 5.15 & 5.4

⁶ Annual WDC Statistical Return to Scottish Government March 2007





GLASGOW *and*
the CLYDE VALLEY
strategic development
planning authority

Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Planning Authority

Lower ground floor, 125 West Regent Street, Glasgow G2 2SA

t 0141 229 7730 | e info@gcvsdpa.gov.uk | w www.gcvsdpa.gov.uk