

## WHAT KIND OF ECONOMY DO WE NEED IN CROYDON?

### Croydon Council's Growth Plan and District Centre Investment: Growth For All

A supplementary commentary with recommendations by a Working Party of Croydon Trades Union Council on papers being considered at the Council Cabinet meeting on 15 September 2014

#### Introduction

1. Having produced its first report on the Growth Plan last month, the Working Party was expecting a further paper on aspects of the Growth Plan to the Cabinet meeting on 15 September. This is not the case. The Working Party has emailed the leading Cabinet members responsible for the Plan requesting information of when that further paper will be considered. As several of the papers being considered on 15 September overlap with the Growth Plan the Working Party has looked at them. This report sets out its analysis of aspects of them and makes a series of recommendations.

2. The papers commented on are:

Paper 6. Devolution of Powers - paras 4-15. Recommendations 1-6.

Paper 7. Strategic Metropolitan Centre - paras 16-19. Recommendation 7.

Paper 8. Increasing Affordable Housing Outside the Croydon Opportunity Area - paras 20-32. Recommendations 8-17.

Paper 9. Cultural Quarter - paras 33-43. Recommendations 18-20.

Paper 14. 2014/15 Financial Performance - Quarter 1 - paras 44-45. Recommendation 21..

#### Recommendations

3. The recommendations are:

- (1) that the Cabinet deletes bullet point 2 under Education, skills and employment and agrees to discuss it in greater depth at a future meeting.
- (2) that in devolving freedom to local government to set the levels of Council Tax, Business rates and fees and charges, Government should set down minimum service standards below which authorities must not go.
- (3) that the Cabinet ask the Health and Well-being Board to consider the proposals relating to VAT and duty on tobacco and alcohol sales.
- (4) that further consideration be given to the proposal for the retention by local councils of savings from the Housing Benefit bill.
- (5) that the Cabinet amend bullet point 1 on planning by the deletion of ' . This could be achieved'.
- (6) that the Cabinet should consider not proceeding with any lobbying that simply involves changes to the Formula and the Area Cost Adjustment, and give further consideration to a more fundamental reform of the Local Government finance system based on need.
- (7) that the Council discuss with Croydon Partnership, Croydon Voluntary Action, Croydon BME Forum and other umbrella groups the setting up of an independent community fund to enable Croydon Partnership to give donations but not control who receives the grants.
- (8) that the officers inform relevant Cabinet members of the receipt of new pre-application proposals to discuss the basis on which a higher % of affordable housing can be negotiated with a view to the proposal being considered by the Planning Committee.
- (9) that the officers make it clear to applicants wishing to start pre-application discussions that the Council's policy is to seek to negotiate a higher % than the 30% minimum.

- (10) that the Cabinet give consideration to amending the formula for calculating the economic viability of 'affordable' housing by taking into account the projected increases in sales and rental values that are likely to occur between the planning application and construction completion stages.
- (11) that the Council should monitor the sale prices and rentals of new housing developments containing affordable homes.
- (12) that the Officers should present to the next meeting of the Cabinet figures on housing benefit claims from tenants in 'affordable' housing in private apartment developments.
- (13) that the Cabinet agree to note in the minutes a timetable for reviewing the minimum affordable housing % requirement in the Croydon Opportunity Area including any negotiations with the Mayor of London to amend the Area Planning Framework document adopted in January 2013 and other changes in detailed planning such as the creation of the Cultural Quarter.
- (14) that the Officers be asked to state at the Cabinet meeting that there will be no increase in crime and disorder and that their statement be minuted.
- (15) that the Cabinet request either the Planning or the Scrutiny Committees to review how the Croydon Local Plan can be fine tuned to secure a five year supply of housing land to meet the Borough's housing needs.
- (16) that the Cabinet instruct the Officers to provide a report showing the bedroom size needs of those on the Council transfer and waiting lists and in temporary homelessness accommodation, and how the 'affordable' homes being built by developers match these in terms of unit size and location.
- (17) that the Cabinet should instruct the Officers to develop a report setting out a policy on housing families in tower blocks, limited the floor levels on which families with young children can be housed, and ensuring that sons and daughters do not have to share a bedroom above a laid down age.
- (18) that the officers should clarify at the Cabinet meeting which proposed developments are referred to and the number of units involved in each one.
- (19) that the officers inform the Cabinet at the meeting:
  - (a) which key cultural stakeholders have been consulted so far on the vision of the Cultural Quarter;
  - (b) of the date that the full report of the 8 July culture seminar will be published, emailed to participants, and put on the website.
  - (c) of the dates for the proposed engagement of communities on the development of the project.
- (20) that given the complexity of needs and aspirations of such a diverse Borough as Croydon that the draft EqIA be made available for public consultation especially with those involved in providing and developing cultural activities and those organisations whose services are targeted at meeting the needs of different diverse communities.
- (21) that the Cabinet meeting be informed by the Officers and recorded in the minutes:
  - (a) How much of each component of the overspend was incurred in the period 1 April to the day the new administration officially took office?
  - (b) How much of each component of the overspend was incurred in the period from the day the new administration official took office to 30 June?
  - (c) What is the projected underpayment of interest in each Quarter 2-3?

## **PAPER 6. DEVOLUTION OF POWERS ETC**

4. Having discussed the problems facing local government in its first report (paras 140-3 and Appendix 6) and proposed that the Council should be lobbying and campaigning to change a wide range of aspects of Government policy (Recommendation 64), the Working Party applauds the proposed decision to develop a

lobbying agenda, and particularly the setting of it in the context of the deprivation in the Borough, which the Working Party discussed in its report (paras 25-34).

5. **Education skills and employment.** The Working Party endorses bullet points 1 and 3-5. Given the problems involved with the joint Street Light Replacement programme with Lewisham Council, the minority position the Council has on the South London Waste Authority in respect of the Beddington Lane Incinerator, and the under-representation of the Council on the Board of the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership, the Working Party is not convinced of the value of entering joint arrangements without a degree of greater discussion including an explanation of what Economic Prosperity Boards are and what other approaches could be taken. It notes that no mention is made of the Government consultation in April on the idea of Boards and that until the result of the consultation and the Government's decisions are known it is premature to refer to them.

(1) The Working Party therefore **RECOMMENDS:**

(1) that the Cabinet deletes bullet point 2 under Education, skills and employment and agrees to discuss it in greater depth at a future meeting.

6. **Finance.** The Working Party has argued that reform of the financing of local government is needed. It fully endorses the idea of putting up planning fees especially for big larger scale developments. It is concerned that apart from bullet point 2 on business rates, there are potential dangers with these proposals. Freedom to set levels, fees and charges works both ways. It could be used to cut Council Tax leading to cuts in services and lead to overpricing of Council services reducing take-up by those experiencing social deprivation. It

**RECOMMENDS:**

(2) that in devolving freedom to local government to set the levels of Council Tax, Business rates and fees and charges, Government should set down minimum service standards below which authorities must not go.

7. **Health and Social Care.** While the Working Party agrees that there should be joined up seamless health services, it does not see how this can be achieved through commissioning which usually entails awarding contracts to private companies. Unless the Government knows how much VAT and duty is received from each Borough, the Working Party cannot envisage how this would work. There is a danger that a local authority could see it as an incentive to grant more liquor licences in order to increase sale of alcohol to increase the duty receivable. It is not convinced that these proposals make sense, and **RECOMMENDS:**

(3) that the Cabinet ask the Health and Well-being Board to consider the proposals relating to VAT and duty on tobacco and alcohol sales.

8. **Housing.** The Working Party fully endorses bullet point one for the power to increase borrowing. However given the increase in housing benefit in Croydon the Working Party wonders whether any savings are being made. It is concerned that if savings are being made from the bedroom tax then it is at the expense of individual households who often cannot afford to move to smaller accommodation because of rent levels. Back in March 2013 it was estimated that about 2,000 households would be hit by the bedroom tax: 1,061 in Croydon North, 951 in Croydon Central and 896 in Croydon South. (2)

9. The proposal does not seem to be based on any analysis of the experience of the tax given the following question and answer under the Freedom of Information Act:

Question: Where households in social housing are having to move to smaller accommodation because of the spare rooms benefit reduction, is the Council monitoring the saving made in housing benefit? If so how much has been saved so far, bearing in mind that households moving in not subject to the reduction, may also be claiming housing benefit?

Answer: As Housing Benefit is funded by central government, we only receive funding/subsidy for what is accurately paid there are no savings to the council due to under occupancy or benefit cap. Families move for a number of reasons and the council will not always be directly involved or aware of individual circumstances behind those changes in circumstances. (3)

10. The Working Party therefore **RECOMMENDS:**

(4) that further consideration be given to the proposal for the retention by local councils of savings from the Housing Benefit bill.

11. **Planning.** The Working Party is concerned that introducing incentives to developers could enable some authorities to reduce planning conditions, decrease the % requirement for affordable housing, reduce public consultation, and reduce planning fees. An example of how this can be done within the current planning rules was evidenced by the former Leader of the Council announcing before the local election that the Council would fund the additional access road for the Cane Hill hospital site and not the developer. The Working Party therefore suggests that some further consideration be given to the wording. It **RECOMMENDS:**

(5) that the Cabinet amend bullet point 1 on planning by the deletion of ‘. This could be achieved’.

12. **Roads.** The Working Party takes the same view on this as with VAT and duty above.

13. **Sections 6 & 7. Formula & Area Cost Adjustment.** The Working Party considers that the discussion in this section is simply tinkering with a bankrupt system. This is the view of London Councils’ - whose response to the Government’s consultation on the Local Government Finance Settlement 2014-15 concluded that: ‘This settlement raises significant concerns about the transparency and long-term sustainability of the local government finance system’ (4)

14. Simply changing the zone Croydon is in will not necessarily lead to more funding. If the Government agreed to make a change it may simply allocate the same amount of money to be shared by eleven not ten authorities leading to less money for each Borough. The Working Party considers that the funding should be on a needs basis and therefore **RECOMMENDS:**

(6) that the Cabinet should consider not proceeding with any lobbying that simply involves changes to the Formula and the Area Cost Adjustment, and give further consideration to a more fundamental reform of the Local Government finance system based on need.

15. **Para 9.3. Current funding issues.** The Working Party supports bullet points 1-6, and 8. It does not know enough about the issue in bullet point 7 to take a view. In relation to bullet point 9 on extending the tram network, it wonders why only Crystal Palace is included, and not other parts of the Borough. In particular there appears to be a strong case for another loop around the Town Centre as a way of ensuring continuance of service, especially between West and East Croydon when a tram breaks down on the current single line provided.

## **PAPER 7. STRATEGIC METROPOLITAN CENTRE**

16. In its first report the Working Party warned of the uncertainties still hanging over the Westfield/Hammerson scheme (paras 42-48). The Cabinet paper confirms that warning. The Working Party rejects the officers’ statement on options. If a different approach is taken - not based on a comprehensive scheme as ambitious as that proposed by Westfield/Hammerson, then viable options could be considered that provide for a more mixed and diverse economic redevelopment.

17. The Croydon Partnership (CP) recently announced a £12,000 fund to help youngsters become more employable open to organisations developing the employability of 12 to 18 year olds, (e.g. improving skills, the provision of training and equipment, activities which develop positive attitudes towards work, and projects which provide practical experience of the workplace) to apply for up to £2,000. This is a drop in the ocean and represents just under £10 per unemployed young person based on the latest figure of 1,280 18-24 years old job-hunting. (5)

18. The Working Party is very concerned at such community fund initiatives which can be seen as attempting to buy off potential questioners and critics of their scheme. If the CP wishes to fund community initiatives it should donate a lump sum into a community controlled fund, enabling the community to decide the spending priorities, and over which the CP would have no influence of the grants to be made.

19. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS:**

(7) that the Council discuss with Croydon Partnership, Croydon Voluntary Action, Croydon BME Forum and other umbrella groups the setting up of an independent community fund to enable Croydon Partnership to give donations but not control who receives the grants.

## PAPER 8. INCREASING AFFORDABLE HOUSING OUTSIDE THE CROYDON OPPORTUNITY AREA

20. The Working Party welcomes this first stage move to ensure that the minimum requirement for affordable housing is 30% on schemes outside the Croydon Opportunity Area. Being a minimum the negotiating position with developers should be to meet a higher %. The Working Party therefore **RECOMMENDS**:

- (8) that the officers inform relevant Cabinet members of the receipt of new pre-application proposals to discuss the basis on which a higher % of affordable housing can be negotiated with a view to the proposal being considered by the Planning Committee.
- (9) that the officers make it clear to applicants wishing to start pre-application discussions that the Council's policy is to seek to negotiate a higher % than the 30% minimum.

21. It appreciates that the Cabinet is constrained in seeking a higher % of affordable housing by the agreed formula in the Croydon Local Plan. Given that there are still aspects of the Plan which have yet to be finalised, the Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

- (10) that the Cabinet give consideration to amending the formula for calculating the economic viability of 'affordable' housing by taking into account the projected increases in sales and rental values that are likely to occur between the planning application and construction completion stages.

22. This recommendation will need to be supplemented by a further one due to the fact that the Council 'does not monitor house the sale prices of units in Croydon.' (6) A recent report by the Trades Union Congress shows that Croydon house prices rising faster than salaries, and now stand at 7.57 times above the average salary. 'An affordability ratio of five is particularly significant, as the Bank of England has recently instructed banks to limit the proportion of mortgages they offer that are more than 4.5 times applicants' salaries.' The ratio is of course not as high as Inner London nor as Sutton at 8.5 and Bromley at just under 10. TUC General Secretary Frances O'Grady said: "Over the last 16 years, the increase in house price rises in London has outstripped the increase in peoples' pay packets. There is now not a single borough in London in which housing is affordable for those on an average local salary. "This has a massive impact on families and communities, and also on the transport system, congestion and our environment, as more and more people can no longer live near to where they work." (7)

23. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

- (11) that the Council should monitor the sale prices and rentals of new housing developments containing affordable homes.

24. Although the housing is called 'affordable' the Working Party is concerned about what this means and whether most tenants in private development 'affordable' housing are having to claim housing benefit, especially in view of the dramatic increase in housing benefit claimants. The number of working families on housing benefit in Croydon soared by 1,100% between May 2011 and 2014, according to figures from the House of Commons Library. The national increase has been 59%. With 12,610 working claimants Croydon has the most in the UK. The extra claimants will cost taxpayers £5bn by the 2015 election. (8) The total amount of claimants also rose from 32,953 to 36,559 which is an increase of 11 per cent. (9)

25. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

- (12) that the Officers should present to the next meeting of the Cabinet figures on housing benefit claims from tenants in 'affordable' housing in private apartment developments.

26. **Equalities Impact Assessment.** The Working Party welcomes the inclusion in the paper of the Equalities Impact Assessment summary from the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. It does not see how the increase to a minimum of 30% will help to meet the specific accommodation needs detailed in the assessment. Nor does it see how the cost of 'affordable' homes can be afforded by without dependence on housing benefit and to meet the additional space needs of households with special needs. The paper does not show how households in housing need are routed into new 'affordable' homes in developers schemes. Unless the Council has 100% nomination rights, how will the 'affordable' housing be available to meet existing needs of Croydonians?

27. The Working Party notes that this paper only deals with schemes outside the Croydon Opportunity Area. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

(13) that the Cabinet agree to note in the minutes a timetable for reviewing the minimum affordable housing % requirement in the Croydon Opportunity Area including any negotiations with the Mayor of London to amend the Area Planning Framework document adopted in January 2013 and other changes in detailed planning such as the creation of the Cultural Quarter.

28. The Working Party notes that the report states that 'There are no impacts on crime and disorder reduction arising from the recommendations'. However it does not categorically state whether there will be no increase in crime and disorder. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

(14) that the Officers be asked to state at the Cabinet meeting that there will be no increase in crime and disorder and that their statement be minuted.

#### 29. **Para 9.1. Environmental Impact**

The Working Party is concerned that while there may not be an environmental impact from the inclusion of more affordable housing in schemes, the schemes themselves have an environmental impact in respect of population density, and its impact on the quality of life in developers schemes especially those based on multi-story tower blocks.

30. **Para 11.1.** The Working Party is concerned that this brief sentence that preparation of the Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is the only way for the Planning Service to secure a five year supply of housing land in the medium to long term is meaningless. Given the property development world works quietly behind the scenes before it announces it plans the Working Party cannot see how the Local Plan can ensure a five year supply, unless there are site specific policies which commit developers to meeting the Borough's housing needs.

31. The Working Party convenor asked the Press Office on 28 August to obtain the following information:

What are the bedroom unit requirements of:

- (1) Council tenants on the housing transfer list
- (2) people on the Council housing waiting list
- (3) projected population increase needs by bedroom sizes

and what are the total number by bedroom units in all housing developments

- (1) currently under construction
- (2) with planning permission that have not yet started on site?

It is too early to have received a detailed reply.

32. Drawing on Freedom of Information requests last year the Working Party sets out some of the information that is known and in the public realm in the Appendix. Unless the Council has a clear idea of the bedroom size and location needs of Croydonians it will not be able to assess whether the unit size and location of 'affordable' housing in developers' schemes will meet that need. In their reports on the proposed developments in George St and College Rd (Planning Committee 4 September) the Officers appear to accept that a three bedroom flat will house 6 people and 4 bedrooms eight. This implies that in addition to two parents children regardless of age and sex and adult sons and daughters will be expected to share bedrooms. This means that affordable housing is expected to be cramped from the start. This is not acceptable. Further these particular schemes are only going to be 'affordable' on a shared ownership basis. This may well rule out the opportunity for many in need to be able to afford these units. The case against housing families with small children in Council tower blocks developed in the late 1960s and 1970s. Labour controlled Wandsworth for example adopted a policy of not housing them above the fourth floor. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS**:

- (15) that the Cabinet request either the Planning or the Scrutiny Committees to review how the Croydon Local Plan can be fine tuned to secure a five year supply of housing land to meet the Borough's housing needs.
- (16) that the Cabinet instruct the Officers to provide a report showing the bedroom size needs of those on the Council transfer and waiting lists and in temporary homelessness accommodation, and how the 'affordable' homes being built by developers match these in terms of unit size and location.
- (17) that the Cabinet should instruct the Officers to develop a report setting out a policy on housing families in tower blocks, limited the floor levels on which families with young children can be housed, and ensuring that sons and daughters do not have to share a bedroom above a laid down age.

## **PAPER 9. CULTURAL QUARTER - REJUVENATING FAIRFIELD**

33. While the Working Party welcomes the development of a more positive strategy to supporting cultural activity in the Borough, the proposed Cultural Quarter appears to be just a re-packaging of an approach based on tinkering with the existing business not community model of planning driven by property developers not the needs of Croydonians. This analysis is underpinned by para 2.2.

34. The Working Party fully supports the need for investment in Fairfield Halls to ensure it is repaired and modernised. It is more than just investment in the building's structure that is needed. It is also needs to develop programmes which attract bigger audiences at affordable prices especially among those Croydonians experiencing inequalities and social deprivation, and create a venue that people wish to visit, meet friends and family and socialise in.

35. **Para 3.1.** The Working Party has checked whether or not Croydon Green is 'directly visible from East Croydon Station'. Although the upper floors of the College buildings can be seen, the Green itself cannot be because of the hoardings on the empty site on George St. The proposed multi-storey blocks for that site considered by the Planning Committee on 4 September will be a major visual block to even the upper floors of the College. While the George St report indicates there will be a new public space the lack of a drawing on the Council planning register site means the public cannot assess whether it is adequate to be draw for people to walk round into College Green.

36. **Para 3.5 and Diagram 1.** The Working Party is not clear how there will be improved safe pedestrian access between Fairfield Halls and Queen Gardens across the main road so that people will want to go into the section of the Cultural Quarter on the western side. It further considers that further thought will be needed to how to make the route past the Clocktower round into Surrey St and into Exchange Square can be improved, and ways to ensure that the empty units are let to make the Square an attractive place to want to visit.

37. There do not appear to be any proposals for what to do to either improve or replace the underground and multi-storey car parks on the Fairfield/College Green side of the main road.

38. **Para 3.8. Bullet Point 4.** The number of units in this para. (400-500) seems to conflict with the up to 600 figure in para 5.1. If the schemes referred to are the proposed tower blocks on George St and College Rd then the actual figure looks like 464 (Planning Committee 4 September). The Working Party **RECOMMENDS:**

- (18) that the officers should clarify at the Cabinet meeting which proposed developments are referred to and the number of units involved in each one.

39. **Section 7. Consultation.** The use in para 7.1 of the abbreviation FLC instead of Fairfield Croydon Ltd (FCL) is an example of jargon which not all members of the public will know what is meant and may not understand that it manages the Halls. It does not state which are the key cultural stakeholders already consulted.

40. **Para 7.3** states that the 'Cultural Quarter is part of a wider conversation with residents and cultural groups' and refers to the 8 July seminar. While some of the proposed improvements in the Halls were explained, no mention was made of the idea of developing the Cultural Quarter so those attending could express their views on it. Further the credibility of this seminar and proposed future ones is declining as every week passes without the completion of the full report on it. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS:**

- (19) that the officers inform the Cabinet at the meeting:

- (a) which key cultural stakeholders have been consulted so far on the vision of the Cultural Quarter;
- (b) of the date that the full report of the 8 July culture seminar will be published, emailed to participants, and put on the website.
- (c) of the dates for the proposed engagement of communities on the development of the project.

41. **Section 11. Equalities Impact.** The proposed full Equalities Impact Assessment (para 11.1) is welcome. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS:**

(20) that given the complexity of needs and aspirations of such a diverse Borough as Croydon that the draft EqIA be made available for public consultation especially with those involved in providing and developing cultural activities and those organisations whose services are targeted at meeting the needs of different diverse communities.

42. **Section 12. Environmental Impact.** The Working Party welcomes the emphasis on creating ‘a truly integrated site-wide environmental strategy’ especially in relation to energy. It is surprised that reference is not made to the contribution to the development of the Council’s proposed heating network about which Bob Fiddik, Sustainable Development & Energy Team Leader at the Council, explained at the March 2013 Combined Heat and Power Association (CHPA) district heating conference some the challenges to achieving it were ‘not unfortunately getting easier’. (10)

43. **Section 15. Options Considered and Rejected.** The Working Party welcomes the inclusion of this section.

- **Option 1.** It is clear that this has wide spread support following the initiative of the South Croydon Community Association to start a public debate about the future of the Halls which led to the establishment of the Croydon Arts Network.
- **Option 2.** It makes sense to maximise the potential for the public use of the Green and enable Fairfield Halls to have an entrance directly onto it.
- **Option 3.** The Working Party would have preferred to have seen more detail about this and the reasons for the officers rejection of it. The Working Party is concerned that options are rejected at officer stage rather than being presented in full to Councillors to make the decisions.

#### **PAPER 14. 2014/15 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE - QUARTER 1**

44. The Working Party is very concerned that the Departmental overspend in the first Quarter of 2014/15 was £7.864m, especially as many of the component elements of spending may well occur again in Quarters 2-4, without the benefit of the one off contingency and unallocated grant income which offset the overspend in Quarter 1, bringing it down to £2.864m. Para 3.15(a) specially indicates that the cost of temporary accommodation will rise in Quarter 2. The Working Party is concerned that the cumulative overspend by 31 March 2015 could be as high as £18m, and that this may require cuts to be made in other services to keep a balanced budget. This is hinted at in respect of SEN transport in para 3.1.4(c). There is a danger that any reduction in the cost of negotiated care package providers in para. 3.1.5(b) could result in loss of jobs or reduced pay in an already low pay industry. The Working Party strongly supports the importance of the Equalities Impact statement.

45. The report does not provide sufficient analysis for the Cabinet to understand what happened in the first Quarter. The Working Party **RECOMMENDS:**

- (21) that the Cabinet meeting be informed by the Officers and recorded in the minutes:
- (a) How much of each component of the overspend was incurred in the period 1 April to the day the new administration officially took office?
  - (b) How much of each component of the overspend was incurred in the period from the day the new administration official took office to 30 June?
  - (c) What is the projected underpayment of interest in each Quarter 2-3?



## CONCLUSION

46. The Working Party's recommendations fall into two categories:

- those seeking amendment to papers.
- those seeking additional decisions.

The Working Party is aware that the Leadership does not feel comfortable about making amendments to papers at Committee stage in the light of new information or representations made after papers are published. This reluctance runs counter to the aim of the new administration to be more open, listening, accountable and responsive to the public and local organisations. There is no reason why papers should not be amended in the interests of scrutiny of what officers are saying and recommending and to improve the basis for policy development and action. The Working Party therefore hopes that the Cabinet will feel able to make amendments and additional decisions based on those recommendations with which members agree.

12 September 2014

Working Party Members:

Sean Creighton, member Unite Retired Members branch

Melanie Jenner, retired member Public and Commercial Services Union

Peter Latham, member UCU Retired Members branch, author of *The State and Local Government* (2011) and *The Imminent Demise of Local Government?* (2014)

Kevin Smith, member Communications Workers Union

## FOOTNOTES

- (1) Department of Communities and Local Government. Proposal to amend legislation relating to combined authorities and economic prosperity boards. April 2014.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/307661/300414\\_Combined\\_authority\\_consultation\\_doc\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307661/300414_Combined_authority_consultation_doc_FINAL.pdf)
- (2) <http://insidecroydon.com/2013/03/06/more-than-2000-people-in-croydon-hit-by-1000-bedroom-tax>
- (3) Freedom of Information response to Sean Creighton 17 July 2013)
- (4) Quoted in *What Kind of Economy do we need in Croydon?*, Croydon TUC, August 2014, p. 49).
- (5)  
[http://www.croydanguardian.co.uk/news/11450116.Croydon\\_Partnership\\_unveils\\_12\\_000\\_fund\\_for\\_youth\\_employability\\_schemes](http://www.croydanguardian.co.uk/news/11450116.Croydon_Partnership_unveils_12_000_fund_for_youth_employability_schemes)
- (6) Freedom of Information reply to Sean Creighton 23 July 2013
- (7) <http://www.croydonadvertiser.co.uk/Croydon-house-prices-rising-faster-salaries-new/story-22859460-detail/story.html>
- (8) <http://www.swlondoner.co.uk/number-of-croydon-families-on-housing-benefit-soars-by-more-than-1-000>
- (9)  
[http://m.croydanguardian.co.uk/news/11200571.Housing\\_benefit\\_claimants\\_rise\\_by\\_1\\_000\\_per\\_cent\\_in\\_Croydon](http://m.croydanguardian.co.uk/news/11200571.Housing_benefit_claimants_rise_by_1_000_per_cent_in_Croydon)
- (10) <http://www.energyforlondon.org/tag/croydon>

## Affordable Housing: Need and Supply

Bedroom size	Council stock as at 31st March 2013	%	Bedroom size of Tenants wanting transfers	Transfer list Bedroom size requirements	Bedroom needs of households on waiting list and homeless
Bedsits	479	0.34%	17	-	-
1 bed	3967	28.3	111	233	2,103
2 bed	4807	34.3	192	128	1,975
3 bed	4393	31.3	174	87	737
4 bed	344	2.5	16	49	229
5 bed	30	0.21	1	11	66
6 or more	8	0.06	0	3	22
Total	14,028		511	511	5,132

Source: Freedom of Information responses to Sean Creighton 15 & 16 July 2013

## The geographic locations of where tenants on the transfer list live and where they want to move

	Move from	Move to	Waddon	7%	29%
South Norwood	5%	26%	South Croydon	4%	46%
Woodside	1%	34%	Purley	2%	46%
Ashburton	6%	33%	Sanderstead	2%	41%
Addiscombe	1%	45%	Coulsdon	1%	34%
Central Croydon	7%	42%	Kenley	2%	29%
West Croydon	4%	31%	Old Coulsdon	1%	31%
Shirley & Heathfield	0%	33%	Source: Ditto 16 July 2013		
Shrublands	7%	10%			
Monks Hill Estate	2%	9%			
Selsdon & Forestdale	0%	30%			
Fieldway Estate	5%	9%			
New Addington	17%	21%			
Upper Norwood	4%	24%			
Green Lane Estate	2%	15%			
Norbury	4%	28%			
Thornton Heath	9%	28%			
Selhurst	5%	28%			