

APPENDIX ONE

Questions from the Workshop and Answers

October 2012

What will be the potential impact on the policy if “intentionality” is removed as proposed in the White Paper?

Intentionality will be dealt with in the same manner irrespective of the implementation of the Single Access Route to Housing.

Conwy have gone through stock transfer, will this have any impact on the policy?

This does not have an impact on the policy as the Housing Associations are part of the partnership so individuals in Conwy would go through the same process

It could be more difficult to make amendments to the policy because of the number of organisations involved, and the need to seek approval for amendments from each organisation.

It is true that with more partners involved, it may take longer to make amendments. This must be weighed up against the long term benefits of the Single Access Route for customers.

Has the criteria for prioritising cases been agreed, (including local connection criteria)?

The bandings have been drafted and include detail on local connection requirements. There are some further discussions ongoing about the detail to be worked through with regional partners.

Will the new policy help alleviate problems faced with Welfare Reform?

There will be no direct impact but the policy will aim to make best use of available stock and assist people to make realistic choices.

Will “Homeswap” still be available to applicants?

Yes

Will applicants seeking sheltered accommodation go through the same process?

Yes

How many choices of area will applicants be asked to provide? It was suggested that the current 10 options is too many.

This has not been finalised and feedback has been passed on that ten is too many.

How will issues of domestic violence be covered?

Individuals fleeing domestic abuse are given a high priority in the policy.

Will funding be provided by WAG? Is it match funded? If so how much will FCC contribute?

Welsh Government has provided 50% of the project costs. The total development costs are £394,000. This leaves £197,000 to be shared amongst the nine partners. The partner contributions are not finalised and will give consideration to stock size and the council's strategic role and duties.

There are no ongoing costs, the project will work within existing budgets and aim to make efficiencies by pooling resources.

What are the projected savings?

The SARTH working group are currently taking forward some work on a cost/benefit analysis. A detailed business case will be developed and taken to Cabinet for approval before Flintshire signs up to any part of the scheme.

Will each local authority/ RSL area have their own central hub or will there be one to cover the whole 4 counties?

There are no plans for centralised regional offices. The development of hubs and sharing resources will be the next stage of the project to develop. Flintshire has not signed up to this part of the scheme at this stage and will only do so based on a clear business case that demonstrates improved service deliver and/or efficiency savings.

Will this result is a loss of employees?

There may be an opportunity for efficiencies in the future or for staff resources to be focused in different areas.

If it results in employing more staff, will FCC have to contribute towards the cost?

There are no plans for additional staff and the ongoing costs will be within the existing budget.

What are the costs involved in training new staff & converting existing applications.

These costs are included in the project costs that are detailed above.