

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION APPENDIX

Number	Content Name
1	The Licensing process
2	Licensing case studies and best practice
3	Private Rented Sector Dwelling Proportions by ward
4	Private Rented Sector Population Density
5	Private Rented Sector evidence – New Housing Benefit Claimants in Havering (Migration)
6	Private Rented Sector evidence – Anti-Social Behaviour in Havering by ward
7	Criminal Damage, Burglary & Crime Rate in Havering by ward
8	Private Rented Sector Condition/Environmental Crime evidence Category 1 Repair Hazards
9	Private Rented Sector Condition/Environmental Crime evidence Category 2 Repair Hazards
10	Private Rented Sector Condition/Environmental Crime evidence Noise Complaints
11	HMO's in Havering's Private Rented Sector evidence – HMO prevalence
12	HMO's in Havering's Private Rented Sector evidence – crime and ASB
13	Average Score of Deprivation in Havering by Ward
14	Geographical size of wards in Havering

Appendix 1 – The Licensing Process

There are several steps the local authority needs to consider before deciding to implement a licensing scheme. The Topic Group had identified there are seven stages that the Council would have to surpass in order to justifiably introduce a licensing scheme in Havering in practice.

As part of this topic group report, stages 1 and 2 of the process have been considered. If recommendations are taken forward by members, the Council can look towards stage 3 of the process (consultation) and a collating a formal business case report summarising the reasons and evidence for recommendation introductions.

1. Strategic assessment – *How well will tighter PRS regulation through licensing deliver Havering's wider strategic policy objectives?*

The Housing Act 2004 stated that any decision to implement a selective or additional licensing scheme must be consistent with the Council's homelessness strategy and must be a co-ordinated approach for dealing with homelessness, empty homes and anti-social behaviour.

The Topic Group had considered that licensing links up to its wider strategic objectives as detailed in Havering's Housing Strategy, in terms of;

- Increasing a healthy supply of good standard PRS accommodation
- protecting and improving the existing housing stock
- offering a way to target housing advice and support to people in housing need
- enabling people to live independently in the borough
- sustaining strong neighbourhoods
- improve the health and wellbeing of local people through decent homes and neighbourhoods
- prevent homelessness
- prevent the occurrence of empty homes
- prevent ASB

2. Evidence – *How much quantitative evidence is there to support the need for licensing in Havering? Have alternative methods been used to address any deficiencies?*

The development of a strong evidence base was necessary to support the implementation discretionary licensing scheme. The evidence collected would depend on the nature and scope of the scheme in consideration and the evidence requirements under additional or selective licensing would differ.

The types of evidence that could be addressed before implementing either one of the discretionary schemes could include;

- Migration data
- PRS Stock condition surveys
- Housing Benefit Records

- Council tax database
- Service requests from private tenants
- Service complaints from private tenants
- Market data from local lettings agencies
- Primary research i.e. opinion surveys of tenants in the PRS, engagement with the local community both landlords and tenants via consultation research

The core aim of collecting a substantial evidence base would be to gain an accurate snapshot of PRS activity in Havering

3. **Consultation** – *If a need for exists, how would the Council use consultation with key stakeholders who licensing would affect to affect decision making?*

Havering Council needs to consider the need for a licensing scheme subject to local consultation. In order to introduce licensing schemes, local authorities are required to consult with local residents, landlords and tenants for a minimum of ten weeks.

The consultation method can include a variety of techniques including online questionnaires and proposal information, postal surveys, local meetings in designated areas, drop in centre sessions and direct interview contact with landlord associations, councillors, landlords, tenants and other key stakeholders in the community.

As part of the consultation exercise the Council will need to give a detailed explanation of the licensing proposal, share the supporting evidence base and explain how licensing will tackle the problems that exist to all stakeholders.

Havering should consider the judicial review decision that occurred in 2014 in Enfield for additional and selective licensing schemes. The review was allowed on two reasons that the council did not consult all of the people that should have been included and this included people outside of the borough and that it did not consult for the minimum of 10 weeks.

4. **Financial appraisal** – *What are the financial implications of introducing licensing for Havering Council and key stakeholders?*

As with the Mandatory HMO licensing regime, landlords must pay a charge for a licence issued under a selective or additional licensing scheme. Local authorities can set the level of the fee – the intention is that the rate should be ‘transparent’ and should cover the actual cost of the scheme’s administration.

The explanatory memorandum to the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation and Other Houses (Miscellaneous Provisions) (England) Regulations 2006 states:

‘Once the schemes have been set up, they will be self- financing. (In other words) Running costs of licensing schemes including costs of further training and development and enforcement costs will be covered by licence fees. ‘

However, the Topic Group noted that there had been a recent development with case law concerning Licensing in Westminster. The Court of Appeal upheld a High Court decision that licensing fees can only cover the administration of licensing schemes (i.e. not enforcement). The implications of the decision are discussed in Local Government Lawyer (2013) "Local Authorities, Licensing Fees and the Hemming's Case". Therefore it must be considered the money used for any enforcement activity including investigating and prosecuting unlicensed operators will come out of the Council's General Fund.

There was no cap for the fees which the local authority can charge for licensing but fees cannot be used to raise extra revenue for the authority. The Council could decide to run the scheme cost-neutral or be subsidised depending on the enforcement activity.

So, for clarity, the income that Havering receives from the fee charged to landlords to licence their property (either under an Additional or a Selective Licencing Scheme) can only be used cover the cost of setting up and administering a licensing scheme. Income from fees cannot be used to investigate and prosecute unlicensed landlords.

If topic group recommendations are agreed as suitable for Havering, the Council will need to develop a full detailed financial business model that will establish accurate figures on;

- The set up and operating costs
- The charge to landlords for the license fee

The set up and operating costs

If the Council decided to pursue the option of either additional or selective licensing we need to ensure that adequate resources in place from the start. The Topic Group had considered a detailed business model would need to be developed that will take full account of the operating costs over the life of the scheme.

The introduction of mandatory licensing under the Housing Act 2004 means that Havering has some, but limited, existing resources which can be re-used, such as licence forms, enforcement procedures, licence fee scales and administrative procedures. However, the extension of licensing through the proposals particularly with selective licensing will certainly result in increased work for existing licensing teams. These costs will significantly vary under either an Additional or Selective Licencing Scheme because of the number of potentially licensable properties concerned. To place this in broad context, using figures used in this report, the HMO analysis data identified 265 HMO properties while the most recent Census in 2011 showed there were 10,337 private rented properties with in borough. Both figures are likely to be higher than reported with many HMOs yet unidentified and the numbers of overall properties in the private rented sector increasing in line with national trends.

The charge to landlords for the Licence Fee

The calculation of the initial registration fee Havering could charge landlords would be based on two main influencing factors:

- The current fee Havering Council charges Landlords under the Mandatory Licencing Scheme – which is £129.30 per room
- The fee charged by neighbouring local authorities and authorities across the south east region with similar demographics to Havering. For example, the Barking and Dagenham Council charge a set rate of £714 for up to 5 rooms, £786 for 6 – 10 rooms and £852. See Pan-London Analysis table for further information attached in the appendix. This research provides an outline of full comparative licencing fee charges for all local authorities in London who have implemented additional or selective licensing schemes or both. When deciding the Council's own fee setting, fees could be benchmarked against other local authorities to ensure an element of fairness

The comparative research of other additional or selective licensing schemes in London also brought other considerations for fee-setting forward. The topic group discussed that future decisions must be made on;

- How fees will be charged, this method can differ. It can be based on the different property size or can be charged as one standard fee not dependant on property sizes
- The use of renewal fees - that could be charged at the same level as the initial registration fee or at a reduced level
- The use of any extra, additional fees to cover administrative costs to the Council incurred by;
 - License changes e.g. for changes to name of license holder or type
 - Scheduled inspection dates that are missed by landlords
 - Finder's fee for unlicensed or poor condition properties – in addition to formal legal repercussions that can be employed or as a 'pre-warning' to unlicensed landlords or those who are not meeting license conditions
 - Charges for requiring help with submitting an application or charges for paper applications
- Discounts can be offered as a way to incentivise landlords for different purposes, for example;
 - Discounts for landlords with a lease or management agreement contract with the Council's Liberty Housing service
 - Discounts for landlords who sign up to landlord accreditation schemes (a promotion of two-tier regulation) that will incentivise landlords to access appropriate training
 - Discounts if applications are made correctly, in full and submitted within a set time limit
 - Discounts for HMO new build properties to promote supply of PRS properties
 - Discounts for portfolio landlords or setting of a maximum threshold fee

The final decision on these financial costs will be made as part of a full business model case for the recommendation that is taken forward.

5. **Licensing Conditions Decision Making** – *What conditions could Havering Council attach to the license to ensure key issues are tackled?*

The Topic Group was informed that there are certain conditions that must be applied to an additional or selective license, including

- Producing gas safety certificates for inspections
- Keeping electrical appliances and furniture in a safe condition
- Providing working smoke alarms
- Giving all occupants a written tenancy or license agreements

Selective Licensing must have an extra condition requiring the landlord to obtain references from prospective tenants. Whilst obtaining references is good practice, Havering Council must consider how this will be applied as it may create barriers for people seeking accommodation such as young people leaving home or migrants or the homeless.

Selective Licensing can only apply conditions for the management use and occupation of the house. In contrast additional licensing can apply conditions for the management use, occupation of the house and its overall condition and contents.

Additional Licensing can add conditions that will help to achieve broader aims but they must be reasonable, justified and fall within the statutory framework. For example Bath and Somerset Council has added the condition that within two years the HMO property must reach a minimum 'E' EPC rating and had made the maximum improvements possible through the Green Deal and ECO.

6. **Operation** – *How is the scheme going to work in practice?*

The Topic Group was informed that the proposals of either scheme, implementation cannot come into either scheme until at least three months after the designation but the Council needs to consider enough time for publicity and the launch. For example, for Waltham Forest this was a period of 9 months from decision to designation start date.

The Council would need to agree on a comprehensive communication strategy including substantial marketing and promotion efforts. The early phases of implementation could be expected to involve processing a large influx of applications and enquiries. Developing user friendly IT systems may be required to streamline the process.

The Council would need to make decisions on the following aspects relating to the operation of the scheme;

a) Effective communication strategy

Including substantial marketing and promotion efforts.

b) Data processing systems

Developing user friendly IT systems may be required to streamline the process and deal with large influx of applications

c) *The time limit of licenses*

The Council would need to consider if it wants to set licenses for five years and whether it will set a lesser duration for landlords who have had history of poor management at what level

d) *Inspection policy*

Critics have described the scheme as a money making exercise if a Council's inspection policy is not taken seriously. There was no requirement to inspect every property through licensing, however this has been said to lead to the success of the scheme and correct levels of enforcement. Research of all London boroughs (attached within appendix) who have introduced licensing have shown that the majority promise to inspect each property at least once over the five years license period. No local authority claims to be pro-active in inspecting the property before the license is issued. Inspecting all properties prior to license approval is resource intensive.

e) *Staffing resources*

Depending on the inspection policy the Council will need to make decisions relating to the supply of qualified officers to carry out the work

f) *Links to other schemes or initiatives*

Havering Council could consider if it would like to supplement funding to achieve the objectives of licensing in other ways through the introduction of other initiatives. For example, licensing may provide an accessible client base the Council can take advantage of. Licensing could work best if introduced alongside a Landlord Accreditation Scheme or similar scheme that will offer training, support, e-bulletins or promote energy efficiency schemes that will give something back to its local landlords that will forge on-going communication and stronger relationships.

If this is agreed, the Council will need to agree on this administration aspect – at what stage through the licensing process these initiatives will be offered.

g) *Use of Liberty Housing*

The Council's in-house social lettings agency Liberty Housing offers a shared living scheme that procures HMOs in the borough. Liberty Housing provides local landlords with the best financial 'offer' in the market over all commercial lettings agencies. It offers an intensive management service to landlords in exchange for a fee that generates profit for the Council that is then reinvested into supporting and enabling vulnerable tenants to live independently in its accommodation.

If recommendations are taken forward, the Council could consider how the use of Liberty Housing's services could benefit landlords experiencing management problems.

7. *Enforcement – What techniques would be employed to ensure the Council reaches its goals of improving good landlord practice in the PRS?*

Effective intelligence led enforcement is a challenging and resource intensive process.

Havering Council would have to make decisions on implementing the following enforcement techniques, such as

- a) Use of publicity & campaigns to raise awareness of the type of enforcement that could occur
This may encourage landlords to comply and reduce the likelihood of unlicensed landlords in the first instance

Appendix 2 – Licensing Case Studies and Best Practice

As part of this report, the topic group considered the current context of licensing schemes in all London Boroughs. This research enabled the topic group to determine if the Private Rented Sector characteristics in Havering were of any comparison to local authorities who have also gone through the process of considering and introducing a licensing scheme.

This research provided background intelligence on;

- the proportion and number of licensing schemes introduced in London by type (additional or selective)
- the private rented sector demographics of local authorities who have introduced licensing
- the reasons used by Councils to justify the introduction of licensing
- local authority experiences with consultation processes
- the fee brackets charged to landlords by local authorities for licensing
- how the local authority enforces licensing
- what licensing has achieved for respective local authorities

The topic group first looked holistically at London, and then progressed into in-depth research case studies of Newham and Barking and Dagenham.

Across London, the topic group identified there are 15 local authorities in London that has introduced or is expected to introduce additional and selective licensing (or both).

	Snapshot of Local Authorities(32) in London with Licensing Schemes	Proportion of PRS as a housing tenure - Census 2011 Data
Additional Licensing	• Harrow	20-25%
	• Brent	30-35%
	• Hounslow	20-25%
	• Hillingdon	15-20%
	• Kingston upon Thames	20-25%
	• Haringey	30-35%
	• Newham	30-35%
	• Barking and Dagenham	15-20%
	• Croydon	15-20%
	TOTAL: 9 Local Authorities	Median average 20-25%
Selective Licensing	• Newham	30-35%
	• Barking and Dagenham	15-20%
	• Brent	30-35%
	• Waltham Forest	25-30%
	TOTAL: 4 Local Authorities	Median average 30-35%

Formal consultation phase for licensing	• Southwark (additional & selective)	20-25%
	• Tower Hamlets (selective)	30-35%
	• Redbridge (additional & selective)	20-25%
	• Enfield (additional & selective)	20-25%
	• Camden (additional & selective)	30-35%
	TOTAL: 5 Local Authorities	Median average 20-25%
Initial phase (topic group)	• Havering	10-15%

The majority of boroughs who have introduced additional licensing have a 20-25% size PRS. The majority of boroughs who have introduced selective licensing have a more prevalent PRS on average 30-35%.

Whilst this table demonstrates Havering has the lowest PRS density across all local authorities who have introduced licensing or of those in consultation phase, it is not suggestive that licensing is unnecessary in the borough. The table does not show ward level PRS density where parts of boroughs may have pockets of high density private renting and does not consider the rate of PRS growth.

SELECTIVE LICENSING IN NEWHAM CASE STUDY

The Topic Group considered the scheme in Newham, noting that it was the largest and most successful licensing scheme operating in London.

Newham had become the first LA in England to implement ‘mandatory’ licensing as a method to “ensure that all privately rented properties were well managed”.

Why was Licensing introduced in Newham?

The core reasons behind why Newham Council introduced selective licensing included;

- As of June (2012) there was an estimated 40,000 private rented sector dwellings in Newham, a significantly large PRS
- The scheme was a response to growing anti-social behaviour in the borough, the ‘sheds with beds’ phenomena caused by extremely high levels of inward migration. Sheds with beds phenomena started causing very recognisable problems with growing refuse and noise nuisances that were encroaching on the nature on communities and neighbouring housing stock
- Failure of landlords to properly manage properties was considered the primary cause of such disturbances, notable problems existed with high levels of rogue landlords
- Newham’s privately rented property stock had a significant proportion of pre 1919 stock (44.9%), this stock required high maintenance in terms of repairs and management

What has Licensing achieved for Newham?

Newham’s scheme has been heavily criticised as being a ‘desktop exercise’ and for not appropriately ensuring that the desired outcomes of selective licensing are being achieved. The local authority only inspects properties when landlords are non-compliant or only when a complaint against a property. As a result it has been criticised for not achieving a rise in the quality of rented home throughout the borough.

The dangers associated with only perusing landlords who have not purchased a license have been publically recognised, not only for Newham but for similar local authorities who are operating licensing schemes in this way. Failure to inspect properties and investigate licensed landlords who have submitted applications in a timely manner represents a great risk for the Council who can be seen to not have taken appropriate action in line with licensing obligations. The topic group recognises the importance of implementing a licensing scheme that can process applications in realistic timescales, where un-inspected license holders are left for long durations without necessary licensable checks.

LICENSING IN BARKING AND DAGENHAM CASE STUDY

As part of a case study, the Topic Group considered the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham scheme that implemented its additional and selective licensing schemes on 1 September 2014 and is set to run for 5 years as a means of improving the quality of private rented homes and tackle anti-social behaviour in the area.

Why was Licensing implemented?

Some of the main PRS factors behind why licensing was introduced by the local authority includes,

- PRS grew by at least 47% in the last five years
- LBBD found there was evidence in the PRS related to substandard property conditions, particularly rubbish, fly tipping or litter and significant problems with ASB
- LBBD found there was an increasing problem with incorrect gas certificates
- Over 40% of PRS properties have a category one hazard

Experience throughout Consultation Process

Extensive consultation was carried out involving both tenants and landlords in the borough to consider the options of additional and selective licensing.

Over a 12 week period a commissioned research agency used the following methods to gather opinions on the scheme:

- Open access consultation on the council's website;
- Postal survey questionnaires sent to a list of known private rented sector landlords with properties rented in the Borough;
- Door to door interviews with identified private housing tenants;
- Door-to-door interviews with residents and private housing tenants in a representative range of locations across the Borough;
- Two open consultation meetings with landlords and interested residents, on 12 December 2013 and 8 January 2014.

Key findings from consultation included the following opinions;

- Landlords were strongly opposed to the selective licensing proposals: 75% disagreed with the proposals, while 18% agreed

- 85% thought it would increase landlord costs and 86% believed it would increase rents
- 84% believed it would increase bureaucracy and red tape ideology
- 28% believed it would make areas more attractive to residents but 48% disagreed
- Only 21% said it would have a positive effect in Barking and Dagenham as a whole, 57% disagreed.
- Landlords also stated that if licensing was to be introduced, they would prefer it to be on a 'worst first' basis, rather than ward-by-ward or all in one go.
- Tenants were strongly supportive of the selective licensing proposals: 82% agreed with the proposals, while 18% disagreed
- The conditions of the general licence were widely supported by tenants: 82% agreed with them, 12% disagreed
- 73% believed it would ensure PRS properties were better maintained and managed, while 14% disagreed
- 62% believed it would make areas more attractive to residents, only 19% disagreed.

Overarching Views on Selective Licensing

- Eight out of ten residents agree with the proposal to require landlords of all privately rented properties to apply for a licence (80%); 12% disagree.

Reasons for disagreeing with the proposals included:

- Most residents who disagree think that it is a money making scheme (31%).
- Over one in five thinks that it won't solve the current issues (21%).
- 18% think that the cost will be passed onto tenants.

LICENSING IN REDBRIDGE CASE STUDY

The Topic Group noted that Redbridge was currently at the consultation stage of approving proposals for additional and selective licensing in the borough.

Why was licensing being considered in Redbridge?

- Redbridge was the 11th largest London borough, and its population had grown over the past 10 years over the average rate at 16.9 per cent. It was expected, by 2021, to be the sixth highest area of growth. With the increase in population, the borough had seen a significant growth in the private rented sector. And with this it had seen a rise in anti-social behavior and environmental crime.
- The council dealt with 900 incidents a month with 600 of these relating to fly tipping, rubbish and environmental crimes – a number of these problems relate directly to private rented properties. With increasing concerns from residents, requests have been made for action to be taken against crime, environmental nuisance and anti-social behavior
- Considering the importance that approximately one in four households lived in private rented properties in the borough the Council wishes to ensure the PRS was a safer and more appealing sector that people enjoy living in
- Redbridge was also considering introducing the scheme due to collecting an increasing amount of evidence and rising concerns from local residents who have been demanding the Council to address reducing the incidence of ASB in the PRS

- It also became clear to the local authority that there were significant problems with the way that an increasing number of HMOs were managed and maintained, impacting on other residents as well as on tenants living in these properties. Of the 25 prosecutions Redbridge Council had carried out over the last few years, 23 were brought against landlords of HMOs
- Although Redbridge Council had been using all its powers necessary to address problems in the PRS, it believes licensing would help to take a more proactive and targeted approach when dealing with service requests and complaints. This was because it would know the details of the landlords Registered whilst it currently relies heavily on tenants coming forward to make a complaint about their landlord. It believed many tenants are scared to do so as they fear being evicted so they estimate more problems may exist in the PRS than is actually known
- The council considered using a voluntary accreditation scheme but it decided rogue landlords will not join a voluntary scheme and therefore this option would not improve the management of poorly run private rented properties or reduce anti-social behaviour
- It considered that a borough wide scheme to regulating the PRS would be necessary as evidence suggests that private rented homes are scattered across the whole Borough and that the incidence of anti- social behaviour exists Borough wide.

Experience through the Consultation Process

- Redbridge launched its 12 week consultation in November 2014
- Redbridge had a 1,700 response rate from online surveys
- The Council was currently using its research and consultation to submit a proposal in June 2015
- If the Council agreed with the proposals, Redbridge would then submit an application to the Secretary of State to approve selective licensing

The proposal for additional and selective licensing

- The proposed fee would be £500 per property for a five year license
- Landlords applying within the first three months would receive a 50% discount – (£250).

PAN-LONDON ANALYSIS - SELECTIVE LICENSING SCHEMES IN OPERATION

LOCAL AUTHORITY	IMPLEM-ENTATION	INITIAL LICENSING FEE	RENEWAL COST	EXTRA FEES E.G LICENSE CHANGES	DURATION OF LICENSE	DISCOUNTS	ENFORCEMENT METHOD	SUCCESS RATE SO FAR
NEWHAM	Borough wide	£500	£500	Paper applications cost £100 extra. £500 for any license change	Up to 5 years	Discount of £150 for new build properties and no one has lived there before. Maximum set threshold fee £1250 for landlords who have 20+ properties to let in the borough. No discounts for accredited landlords	Guarantees at least one inspection during license period, but will not be 'proactive' before granting licenses.	PRS sector consists of 55,790 properties. 34% of Housing Stock is Privately Rented, significantly higher than London average (25%). Newham has been the most successful with enforcing out of all other boroughs. As of Feb 2015, 29,457 selective licenses have been issued. Even though Newham Council have licensed a huge number of properties, they think there could be up to 38,000 licensable properties in the borough, the split of what licensing scheme they would be eligible for is unknown. Newham has devoted significant resources into housing enforcement action. 359 housing prosecutions have been made over the last three years (April 2011-2014) by far the highest of all London Boroughs. The Council have obtained four rent repayment orders from unlicensed landlords over the last three years (April 2011-March 2015)
BARKING AND DAGENHAM	Borough wide	£500	£500	£500 for change of license holder, would still charge the £500 if licenses are refused for any reason	1 year	None	Guarantees at least one inspection during license period	18% of the housing stock is privately rented, significant lower than the London average (25%). As of February 2015, the council had applications from 9000 selective licenses. B&D estimates there are 17,500 licensable PRS properties in the borough but the proportion estimated to be eligible for selective licensing is unknown. Barking & Dagenham Council have not taken any housing prosecutions over the last three years (April 2011 to March 2014), which puts them at the bottom of the housing prosecution league table when compared to other

Appendix 2

								<p>London Boroughs.</p> <p>The Council have not obtained any Rent Repayment Orders from the landlords of unlicensed HMOs over the last three years (April 2011 to March 2014)</p>
BRENT	Selected areas of Harlesden, Wembley Central and Willesden Green	£340	£300	License changes – initial fee £340, reminder issue £15, missed inspection £100, finders fee (unlicensed property fine) £300, £50 charge for needing help with application	5 years	£40 discount for being with a landlord accreditation scheme	Guarantees at least one inspection during license period, but will not be 'proactive' before granting licenses.	<p>PRS consists of 35,000 properties. 30% of the housing stock is privately rented, higher than the London average (25%). As of January 2015, Brent had 259 selective licenses, a further 3200 licenses had been received and were being processed (some of these would be mandatory or selective). Brent estimates there are about 14,400 licensable HMO s plus 3000 PRS properties eligible for selective licensing. No rent repayment orders have been made. No housing prosecutions have been made over the last three years (April 2011 to March 2014), which is at the bottom of the housing enforcement league table when compared to other London Boroughs. No rent repayment orders have been made</p>
WALTHAM FOREST	Borough wide	£500	None	£500	5 years	<p>There is an early bird discount period 16 March - 15 June 2015 offering a 50 per cent discount on the fee, so the charge will only be £250.</p> <p>Applications submitted from 16 June 2015 will be subject to the full fee</p>	Guarantees at least one inspection during license period, but will not be 'proactive' before granting licenses.	<p>26% of the housing stock is privately rented, just above the London average of (25%). The scheme only came into force on 1st April, so no data is available for the amount of licenses currently issued. Waltham Forest estimates there will be 26.000 selective licenses issued.</p>

AVERAGE FEE FOR SELECTIVE LICENSING	NEWHAM	BARKING AND DAGENHAM	BRENT	WALTHAM FOREST	AVERAGE PAN LONDON INITIAL REGISTRATION FEE FOR ADDITIONAL LICENSING
1 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
2 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
3 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
4 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
5 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
6 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
7 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460
8 bed property	£500	£500	£340	£500	£460

Appendix 3– Private Rented Sector Dwelling Proportions in Havering by Ward

This table shows that Romford Town has the highest percentage as a single ward of PRS accommodation as a proportion of total dwellings. In this sense Romford Town's profile is most like those of inner-London areas where licensing proposals are more commonly being introduced as methods of regulatory control. A high proportion of PRS dwellings can be expected with the characteristics of local town centres. Interestingly Heaton has had the greatest % increase change in the number of PRS accommodation over the past ten years (2001-2011). Brooklands also is highlighted as having the second highest proportion of PRS dwellings and second highest for the projected size of the private rented sector by 2021.

ward	2001				2011 Census				Growth over 10 years (2001-2011 Census)				2021 (projected, estimated stock)			
	Total dwelling stock by ward	Total PRS dwellings by ward	PRS composition as a % of total dwelling stock	Rank	Total dwelling stock by ward	Total PRS dwellings by ward	PRS composition as a % of total dwelling stock	Rank	Total growth all dwelling types	Rank	PRS growth	Rank	Total dwellings	PRS dwellings	PRS composition as a % of total dwelling stock	Rank
Romford Town	5928	687	11.59%	1	7311	1687	23.07%	1	23.30%	1	145.60%	5	9016	4142	45.94%	1
Brooklands	5566	443	7.96%	2	6270	1045	16.67%	2	12.60%	2	135.90%	8	7063	2465	34.90%	2
Squirrel's heath	5050	271	5.37%	5	5701	810	14.21%	3	12.90%	3	198.90%	2	6435	2421	37.62%	3
Rainham and Wennington	4971	273	5.49%	4	5124	660	12.88%	4	3.10%	11	141.80%	7	5281	1595	30.20%	4
St Andrews	5619	381	6.78%	3	5856	718	12.26%	5	4.20%	8	88.50%	17	6102	1353	22.17%	8
Harold Wood	5386	287	5.33%	6	5663	623	11.00%	6	5.10%	7	117.10%	13	5954	1352	22.71%	7
Mawneys	5227	268	5.13%	7	5402	507	9.39%	8	3.30%	10	89.20%	16	5582	959	17.18%	11
South Hornchurch	5594	189	3.38%	14	5747	494	8.60%	9	2.70%	14	161.40%	3	5904	1291	21.87%	9
Elm Park	5155	174	3.38%	15	5303	431	8.13%	10	2.90%	12	147.70%	4	5455	1067	19.56%	10
Heaton	5302	143	2.70%	18	5434	430	7.91%	11	2.40%	15	200.70%	1	5569	1293	23.22%	6
Hacton	4977	191	3.84%	10	5021	395	7.87%	12	0.90%	19	106.80%	15	5065	816	16.11%	13
Upminster	5103	181	3.55%	11	5219	403	7.72%	13	2.30%	16	122.70%	11	5337	897	16.81%	12
Gooshays	6016	210	3.49%	13	6077	455	7.49%	14	1.00%	18	116.70%	14	6138	985	16.05%	14
Havering Park	4947	173	3.50%	12	5258	388	7.38%	15	6.30%	4	124.30%	10	5588	870	15.57%	15
Hylands	4822	196	4.06%	9	5078	366	7.21%	16	5.30%	6	86.70%	18	5347	683	12.77%	16
Pettits	5129	147	2.87%	17	5272	325	6.16%	17	2.80%	13	121.10%	12	5418	718	13.25%	17
Cranham	5216	141	2.70%	19	5283	325	6.15%	18	1.30%	17	130.50%	9	5350	749	14.00%	18
Emerson Park	4549	149	3.28%	16	4707	275	5.84%	19	3.50%	9	84.60%	19	4870	507	10.41%	19
Brooklands Gooshays, Heaton	16884	796	4.71%	8	17781	1930	10.85%	7	5.30%	5	142.50%	6	18770	4743	25.27%	5
All wards	94557	4504	4.76%		99726	10337	10.37%		5.50%		129.50%		105177	23724	22.56%	

- PRS abbreviation (Private Rented Sector) information obtained from ONS Census data, based on statistical estimations

Appendix 4–Population Density in Havering by ward

This ward analysis breakdown provides background information on framing what the level of impact could be upon local resident populations. As can be expected with the characteristics of a borough town centre, Romford Town as a single ward has the highest population density in Havering and has had most significant change to density over time. Notably, when compared as a cluster Brooklands, Gooshays and Heaton have a total population density higher than Romford town. The introduction of a licensing scheme would have more impact for local residents on the combined cluster where population is greater than any other single ward

Wards	Scope of Geographical area		Population Density (Persons living in Havering per sq km)								
	Hectares	Square Kilometres	2001 (Census)	2006 (Census)	% increase 2001-2006 population density	2011 Census population density	2011 census population density rank	% increase 2006-2011 population density	2013 population density (projected from 2011 census)	2013 population density rank (projected from 2011 census)	% increase 2011-2013 population density
Romford Town	286.6	2.9	4569	4896.6	7.17%	5500	2	12.32%	5931	2	7.84%
Squirrel's Heath	264.6	2.6	4557.7	4730.8	3.80%	5096.2	3	7.72%	5096.2	3	0.00%
St Andrews	268.7	2.7	4759.3	4814.8	1.17%	4963	4	3.08%	4981.5	4	0.37%
Hacton	246.1	2.5	5020	4960	-1.20%	4920	5	-0.81%	4960	5	0.81%
Hylands	290.2	2.9	4275.9	4396.6	2.82%	4482.8	6	1.96%	4500	6	0.38%
Mawneys	304.9	3	4200	4166.7	-0.79%	4316.7	7	3.60%	4316.7	7	0.00%
Brooklands	420.1	4.2	3107.1	3202.4	3.07%	3571.4	9	11.52%	3785.7	8	6.00%
Heaton	341.5	3.4	3470.6	3500	0.85%	3705.9	8	5.88%	3779.4	9	1.98%
Elm Park	366.7	3.7	3270.3	3283.8	0.41%	3378.4	10	2.88%	3391.9	10	0.40%
Pettits	395.3	4	3212.5	3187.5	-0.78%	3250	11	1.96%	3237.5	11	-0.38%
Emerson Park	463.9	4.6	2489.1	2521.7	1.31%	2608.7	12	3.45%	2608.7	12	0.00%
South Hornchurch	684.7	6.8	1860.3	1941.2	4.35%	2000	13	3.03%	2198.5	13	9.93%
Gooshays	776.1	7.8	1801.3	1794.9	-0.36%	1891	14	5.35%	1916.7	14	1.36%
Cranham	655.6	6.6	1856.1	1863.6	0.40%	1901.5	15	2.03%	1901.5	15	0.00%
Harold Wood	759.6	7.6	1585.5	1638.2	3.32%	1671.1	16	2.01%	1730.3	16	3.54%
Havering Park	978.8	9.8	1265.3	1239.8	-2.02%	1331.6	17	7.40%	1326.5	17	-0.38%
Rainham and Wennington	1690	16.9	718.9	727.8	1.24%	739.6	18	1.62%	754.4	18	2.00%
Upminster	2253.4	22.5	564.4	566.7	0.41%	571.1	19	0.78%	571.1	19	0.00%
Brooklands+Gooshays +Heaton Cluster	1537.7	15.4	8379	8497.3	1.41%	9168.3	1	7.90%	9481.8	1	3.42%

Appendix 5 – Private Rented Sector Characteristics – New Housing Benefit Claimants in Havering (inward migration indicator)

Analysis of new Housing Benefit Claimants can be used as an indicator for inward migration. Data shows that Brooklands and Romford Town have seen the greatest increase in people claiming housing benefit in the private rented sector, a strong indicator of PRS growth. When analysed as a cluster, Brooklands Gooshays and Heaton have almost double that of new Housing Benefit claimants than any single ward.

New HB claimants in Havering by ward 2013-2014				
Ward	Dwelling Stock composition (Ward Breakdown %)	Number of new HB Claimants 2013-2014	Ward breakdown (%) of new HB claimants 13-14	Rank
Brooklands	10.11%	296	14%	2
Romford Town	16.32%	286	14%	3
Heaton	4.16%	186	9%	4
South Hornchurch	4.78%	169	8%	5
Gooshays	4.40%	146	7%	6
Rainham and Wennington	6.38%	139	7%	7
Havering Park	3.75%	118	6%	8
Mawneys	4.90%	106	5%	9
Elm Park	4.17%	104	5%	10
Squirrel's Heath	7.84%	104	5%	10
Harold Wood	6.03%	101	5%	11
St Andrews	6.95%	65	3%	12
Pettits	3.14%	63	3%	13
Hacton	3.82%	46	2%	14
Hylands	3.54%	43	2%	15
Cranham	3.14%	41	2%	16
Emerson Park	2.66%	28	1%	17
Upminster	3.90%	19	1%	18
Total (all wards)		2060		
Brooklands+Gooshays +Heaton Cluster	18.67%	651	30%	1

- Source – Local Authority Internal Data

Appendix 6 –Anti-Social Behaviour in Havering by ward

This table indicates the level of recorded Anti-Social Behaviour in Havering by ward breakdown across all housing stock types. ASB data shows that Romford Town have the worst issues in the borough, however higher incidents of ASB can be expected due to the local characteristics of town centres. This may have some impact on distorting the comparative validity of this ward against other wards. The table demonstrates Gooshays, Brooklands and Heaton have the next highest prevalence of issues concerning ASB incidences. As a cluster which could be used as an area selection for selective licensing, it could be expected licensing control would have the greatest impact on resolving issues in areas that have by far, the greatest combined amounts (also in terms of individual wards) of ASB in the borough.

ASB in Havering by ward 2013-2014				
Ward	Dwelling Stock composition (Ward Breakdown %)	Recorded incidents of ASB in Havering (all dwelling types)	Ward breakdown (%) of recorded ASB incidents	Rank
Romford Town	16.32%	1480	16.16%	2
Gooshays	4.40%	984	10.75%	3
Brooklands	10.11%	752	8.21%	4
Heaton	4.16%	677	7.39%	5
South Hornchurch	4.78%	594	6.49%	6
Havering Park	3.75%	502	5.48%	7
Rainham and Wennington	6.38%	494	5.39%	8
Harold Wood	6.03%	480	5.24%	9
St Andrews	6.95%	473	5.17%	10
Elm Park	4.17%	443	4.84%	11
Mawneys	4.90%	423	4.62%	12
Squirrel's heath	7.84%	367	4.01%	13
Hylands	3.54%	318	3.47%	14
Upminster	3.90%	273	2.98%	15
Pettits	3.14%	264	2.88%	16
Emerson Park	2.66%	235	2.57%	17
Cranham	3.14%	215	2.35%	18
Hacton	3.82%	183	2.00%	19
All wards		9157	100%	
Brooklands+Gooshays + Heaton	18.67%	2413	26.35%	1

- Source – (internally held local authority data - ASB – ASB Problem Profile.docx)

Appendix 7 – Crime in Havering by ward (Criminal Damage)

Analysis of more crime data shows that Romford Town, Gooshays, Brooklands and Heaton have the highest reported incidents of criminal damage. This is a similar trend to that found with ASB data. As a cluster, the latter three wards have almost double the number of recorded criminal damage incidences compared to Romford Town.

Wards	Criminal Damage in Havering by Ward 2001-2013 Historical Data (All dwelling types)													Rank
	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Ward breakdown (%) of total reported incidents of criminal damage in Havering	
Romford Town	519	462	447	486	407	471	403	326	315	304	302	217	14.16%	2
Gooshays	483	387	420	334	274	285	286	236	196	167	154	175	11.42%	3
Brooklands	302	327	256	209	216	274	217	184	182	197	102	128	8.36%	4
Heaton	338	241	243	238	215	215	168	201	188	142	105	115	7.51%	5
Rainham and Wennington	267	234	248	278	227	237	190	215	173	180	141	114	7.44%	6
St Andrews	252	207	292	277	281	175	189	178	132	156	108	97	6.33%	7
South Hornchurch	236	259	271	303	283	235	169	268	171	151	116	91	5.94%	8
Harold Wood	280	260	222	170	204	237	135	154	125	135	119	81	5.29%	9
Havering Park	226	166	207	234	185	178	148	153	118	127	92	79	5.16%	10
Mawneys	182	194	282	207	233	166	171	115	92	68	85	66	4.31%	11
Elm Park	204	276	276	256	171	176	157	213	116	121	87	62	4.05%	12
Hylands	148	167	211	146	169	147	138	149	108	85	84	59	3.85%	13
Cranham	135	206	121	196	142	62	89	69	57	35	67	51	3.33%	14
Squirrel's Heath	174	153	163	150	129	117	69	78	119	82	51	49	3.20%	15
Pettits	132	148	171	127	131	105	76	73	76	59	63	44	2.87%	16
Upminster	206	173	196	197	199	175	123	113	106	72	50	41	2.68%	17
Hacton	131	153	146	182	130	109	96	141	75	39	49	32	2.09%	18
Emerson Park	110	114	125	104	149	97	80	77	72	58	52	31	2.02%	19
Total (all wards) 2012/13												1532	100.00%	
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton cluster	1123	955	919	781	705	774	671	621	566	506	361	418	27.28%	1

- <http://data.london.gov.uk>)

Appendix 7 – Crime in Havering by ward (Burglary)

Analysis shows that Romford Town and Brooklands have the highest prevalence of Burglary as single wards. As can be expected with analysing combined wards together Brooklands, Heaton and Gooshays have the highest combined burglary rate as a cluster. This is in comparison to any other cluster that could be formed that would be under the Selective Licensing 20% for area designation rules of private rented sector prevalence. .

Burglary in Havering by Ward Historical data (All dwelling types)														
Wards	2001/0 2	2002/0 3	2003/0 4	2004/0 5	2005/0 6	2006/0 7	2007/0 8	2008/0 9	2009/1 0	2010/1 1	2011/1 2	2012/1 3	Ward breakdown (%) of total reported incidents of burglary in Havering	rank
Romford Town	197	199	178	200	184	263	191	200	200	183	198	245	8.88%	2
Brooklands	132	172	126	161	162	172	160	145	224	169	208	222	8.05%	3
South Hornchurch	208	173	148	165	187	164	132	202	179	125	185	212	7.69%	4
Elm Park	134	146	122	128	102	92	79	79	82	103	138	192	6.96%	5
Harold Wood	213	212	100	170	133	158	189	141	198	192	179	185	6.71%	6
Rainham and Wennington	139	165	102	131	148	147	135	157	139	136	185	166	6.02%	7
St. Andrew's	142	116	132	153	161	175	112	100	119	120	144	166	6.02%	8
Pettits	129	113	101	84	105	118	118	133	169	102	184	156	5.66%	9
Squirrel's Heath	128	147	87	103	96	127	122	127	128	91	158	150	5.44%	10
Hylands	88	117	128	95	72	132	102	112	136	116	136	144	5.22%	11
Mawneys	92	113	114	107	108	133	137	157	129	128	162	135	4.89%	12
Gooshays	176	174	117	144	120	130	160	164	206	223	197	133	4.82%	13
Hacton	72	88	64	129	116	83	68	116	110	93	105	130	4.71%	14
Heaton	160	112	145	90	77	108	84	107	134	128	180	118	4.28%	15
Emerson Park	136	106	84	99	127	156	147	110	107	121	139	111	4.02%	16
Upminster	119	145	115	173	180	190	140	160	177	109	125	110	3.99%	17
Havering Park	153	101	101	109	140	125	97	128	129	107	156	98	3.55%	18
Cranham	43	101	82	96	101	86	71	92	125	78	110	85	3.08%	19
Total (all wards) 2012/2013												2758	100.00%	
Brooklands+Gooshays + Heaton	468	458	388	395	359	410	404	416	564	520	585	473	17%	1

Appendix 7 – Total Crime Rate in Havering by ward

Total Crime Rate Data provides evidence for combined incidences of criminal behaviour in Havering on a ward level analysis. This includes incidences of criminal damage, burglary, robbery and ASB amongst other behaviour indicators. Romford Town has an extremely high crime rate, over double the crime rate in comparison to any other single ward. Statistically crime rates are usually higher surrounding town centre locations. As can be expected with analysing combined wards together Brooklands, Heaton and Gooshays have the highest combined burglary rate as a cluster. This is in comparison to any other cluster that could be formed that would be under the Selective Licensing 20% for area designation rules of private rented sector prevalence.

Total Crime Rate in Havering by ward														
Names	2001/0 2	2002/0 3	2003/0 4	2004/0 5	2005/0 6	2006/0 7	2007/0 8	2008/0 9	2009/1 0	2010/1 1	2011/1 2	2012/1 3	Ward breakdown (%) of total crime rate in Havering	Rank
Romford Town	328.7	324.4	298.3	317.6	284.1	297.7	254.9	253.2	260.7	253.3	220.4	196.1	16.70%	2
Brooklands	105.4	132.9	114.5	93.5	93.5	96.2	79.6	78.1	82.3	79.9	75.0	80.1	6.82%	3
Gooshays	107.9	97.6	92.5	88.0	84.7	86.8	88.4	91.3	88.0	93.0	84.5	78.0	6.64%	4
Rainham and Wennington	103.0	98.6	97.0	98.5	99.5	101.3	84.6	90.0	73.3	80.6	81.4	76.7	6.53%	5
St Andrews	98.2	92.3	106.3	102.7	113.0	102.6	76.3	86.5	75.8	80.9	78.3	75.5	6.43%	6
South Hornchurch	94.9	98.8	102.1	108.3	120.0	103.5	76.3	88.3	68.5	67.4	82.8	72.8	6.20%	7
Harold Wood	114.9	109.8	90.6	88.4	91.2	99.5	73.2	77.0	77.6	87.8	72.0	69.4	5.91%	8
Heaton	96.6	75.6	81.9	76.3	70.6	72.2	61.5	73.2	68.2	68.4	69.7	65.8	5.60%	9
Hylands	67.3	76.2	77.9	66.1	68.1	71.7	65.2	63.5	59.1	62.8	61.5	57.9	4.93%	10
Elm Park	58.5	73.7	70.0	66.4	59.9	58.9	51.8	54.1	43.8	50.4	49.8	55.3	4.71%	11
Mawneys	67.0	71.9	85.4	72.3	73.0	78.4	67.3	65.4	55.3	54.8	59.5	54.2	4.62%	12
Havering Park	62.0	61.6	57.9	61.7	64.7	63.3	51.2	51.2	47.0	50.1	52.0	47.9	4.08%	13
Upminster	70.0	68.6	71.2	82.9	80.3	83.1	59.4	57.6	53.9	45.8	49.6	47.8	4.07%	14
Squirrel's Heath	72.4	59.9	58.6	56.7	53.9	55.6	48.5	46.2	48.5	45.2	47.2	46.9	3.99%	15
Pettits	60.7	66.0	63.3	62.8	60.2	68.0	52.0	54.5	52.4	50.2	56.5	44.9	3.83%	16
Emerson Park	55.9	61.1	60.8	57.7	59.7	64.4	52.3	52.4	38.4	45.9	46.5	40.5	3.45%	17
Hacton	39.6	43.3	46.7	55.9	51.4	43.0	36.9	43.8	39.4	30.1	33.7	34.8	2.97%	18
Cranham	32.9	45.8	38.1	53.5	44.8	35.4	29.8	32.4	28.3	31.2	34.0	29.4	2.51%	19
Total (all wards) 2012-13												1174.2	100.00%	
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton	309.9	306.1	288.9	257.8	248.7	255.2	229.5	242.6	238.5	241.3	229.2	223.9	19.1%	1

- <http://data.london.gov.uk>)

Appendix 8 – PRS Conditions/Environmental Crime evidence – Category 1 Repair Hazards

Evidence collated from the local authority's data on reported Category 1 Hazards found from property inspections has found Romford Town has the highest number however it does have the highest % of the housing stock and therefore may be unrepresentative in comparison to other single wards. Proportionally, Gooshays, Heaton, Elm Park and South Hornchurch have some of the highest numbers of Category 1 Hazards in the private rented sector. Category 1 hazards have a higher-representation in these wards in the context of having lower demographics as a % of the total housing stock in Havering.

Category 1 Hazards 2010-15 in Havering by Ward				
Ward	% of housing stock	No. of Hazards reported	Ward breakdown (%) of total cat.1 hazards reported	Rank
Romford town	16.32%	65	15%	2
South Hornchurch	4.78%	40	9%	3
Rainham and Wennington	6.38%	39	9%	4
Brooklands	10.11%	37	8%	5
Gooshays	4.40%	33	7%	6
St Andrews	6.95%	31	7%	7
Squirrel's Heath	7.84%	30	7%	8
Elm Park	4.17%	27	6%	9
Heaton	4.16%	26	6%	10
Harold Wood	6.03%	25	6%	11
Mawneys	4.90%	19	4%	12
Pettits	3.14%	16	4%	13
Hacton	3.82%	12	3%	14
Havering Park	3.75%	12	3%	15
Hylands	3.54%	10	2%	16
Upminster	3.90%	8	2%	17
Cranham	3.14%	6	1%	18
Emerson Park	2.66%	5	1%	19
Total (all wards)	100.0%	441	100%	
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton	19%	96	21%	1

- Source – Environmental Health- Havering Council Internally held data

Appendix 9– PRS Conditions/Environmental Crime evidence – Category 2 Repair Hazards

Evidence collated from the local authority's data on reported Category 2 Hazards found from property inspections has found similar to Category 1 Hazard findings that Romford Town has the highest number however it does have the highest % of the housing stock and therefore may be unrepresentative in comparison to other single wards. Brooklands has a very high level of Category 2 Hazards in light of having a smaller ward % of the total housing stock. Proportionally Elm Park, Rainham and Wennington, South Hornchurch and Heaton have some of the highest numbers of Category 2 Hazards in the private rented sector. Category 2 hazards have a higher-representation in these wards in comparison to some of the other wards in the context of having lower demographics as a % of the total housing stock in Havering.

Category 2 Hazards 2010-15 in Havering by Ward				
Ward	% of housing stock	No. of Hazards reported	Ward breakdown (%) of total cat.2 hazards reported	Rank
Romford town	16.32%	113	16%	2
Brooklands	10.11%	75	11%	3
Elm Park	4.17%	55	8%	4
Rainham and Wennington	6.38%	53	8%	5
South Hornchurch	4.78%	50	7%	6
Heaton	4.16%	50	7%	7
Harold wood	6.03%	45	7%	8
Squirrel's heath	7.84%	37	5%	9
Gooshays	4.40%	34	5%	10
Mawneys	4.90%	31	4%	11
Hacton	3.82%	30	4%	12
St Andrews	6.95%	27	4%	13
Pettits	3.14%	25	4%	14
Havering Park	3.75%	21	3%	15
Hylands	3.54%	15	2%	16
Upminster	3.90%	14	2%	17
Emerson Park	2.66%	9	1%	18
Cranham	3.14%	6	1%	19
Total (all wards)	100.00%	690	100%	
Brooklands+ Gooshays+ Heaton	18.67%	159	23%	1

- Source – Environmental Health- Havering Council Internally held data

Appendix 10 – PRS Conditions/Environmental Crime evidence – Noise Complaints

As can be expected with the characteristics of a town centre location, Romford Town has the highest recorded levels of noise complaints over the past 5 years. It should be recognised that Brooklands has an unusually high number of recorded noise complaints, falling just behind Romford town. Havering Council is experiencing an increasing number of noise complaints for Heaton and Brooklands wards.

Historical Noise Complaints in Havering by Ward						
Ward	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	Ward breakdown (%) of noise complaints in Havering	Rank
Romford Town	103	85	75	63	12.63%	2
Brooklands	65	50	46	52	10.42%	3
Heaton	46	48	35	37	7.41%	4
Gooshays	70	60	55	34	6.81%	5
Havering Park	41	32	26	33	6.61%	6
St Andrews	51	42	28	32	6.41%	7
Harold Wood	38	27	31	27	5.41%	8
Elm Park	39	32	20	26	5.21%	9
South Hornchurch	33	33	36	24	4.81%	10
Hylands	26	27	21	22	4.41%	11
Upminster	33	38	38	22	4.41%	12
Rainham and Wennington	36	29	27	21	4.21%	13
Squirrel's Heath	38	50	33	21	4.21%	14
Pettits	40	26	20	20	4.01%	15
Mawneys	56	35	34	19	3.81%	16
Cranham	27	20	21	17	3.41%	17
Hacton	39	21	18	15	3.01%	18
Emerson Park	38	15	16	14	2.81%	19
Total (all wards)	819	670	580	499	100.00%	
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton	181	158	136	123	24.65%	1

- Source – Environmental Health- Havering Council Internally held data

Appendix 11 – HMO's in Havering's PRS evidence – HMO prevalence

Information has been provided from checks of housing benefit system (where credit is paid to individuals in shared accommodation or HMOs known on the Public HMO Register), the public HMO register, Liberty Housing properties, addresses which are being looked at suspected of use as HMOs, and data from council tax records for properties of shared accommodation and bedsits.

These are summarised below:

- HMO Public Register – addresses confirmed and registered as HMOs.
- Benefits List – Properties in receipt of housing benefit identified as HMO/Shared Accommodation not on public register.
- Council Tax List – Properties recorded on council tax register as being HMO/Bedsit/Shared Accommodation
- HM1 HMO – Bedsits – these are known HMOs below the mandatory licence level.
- HM2 HMO – Section 257 – these are known HMOs below the mandatory licence level.
- HM3 HMO – Shared House – these are known HMOs below the mandatory licence level.
- Liberty Housing properties, which are HMOs
- Suspected, unconfirmed HMO – addresses which are currently being investigated by planning.

It should be noted that some addresses appear on multiple lists. Addresses are not duplicated/double counted in the table below. Those on official lists (HM1, 2, 3, Liberty Housing and HMO Public Register) have been removed from the Benefits, Council Tax and Suspect, unconfirmed lists. A total of 265 addresses have been considered as part of this data exercise. The distribution and type/category of HMO by ward within Havering is shown in the table below.

Just fewer than one-third of the properties identified are categorised as HM1, HM2, HM3 – below the mandatory licence level. Whilst these properties are spread throughout most wards, they are concentrated largely around Romford Town (28) and Brooklands (16) wards, the biggest contributor being HM1 (Bedsits).

Where licensable HMOs are more prevalent are Heaton (29), Gooshays (20), Brooklands (19) and Romford Town (18). The Harold Hill area (Heaton, Gooshays and Harold Wood wards) contains 39% of HMOs known either to the public register, Liberty Housing or in receipt of housing benefit payments, and the highest proportion of suspected HMOs currently being investigated by planning are also in Harold Hill.

Harold Hill, which is a key area of concern brought to our attention, is home to approximately 13,000 properties, with 429 sales being made in the previous 12-months (according to RightMove) and 46 rentals advertised, including house shares and room renting (according to RightMove). Whilst this may be an emerging issue, it should be stressed that the significant majority of properties in Harold Hill are unaffected.

Appendix 2

The map below shows the distribution of aforementioned categories of HMOs, with clear clusters of properties notable within Brooklands, Romford Town and Heaton wards. The thematic shading denotes the total number

Just fewer than one-third of the properties identified are categorised as HM1, HM2, HM3 – below the mandatory licence level. Whilst these properties are spread throughout most wards, they are concentrated largely around Romford Town (28) and Brooklands (16) wards, the biggest contributor being HM1 (Bedsits).

Where licensable HMOs are more prevalent are Heaton (29), Gooshays (20), Brooklands (19) and Romford Town (18). The Harold Hill area (Heaton, Gooshays and Harold Wood wards) contains 39% of HMOs known either to the public register, Liberty Housing or in receipt of housing benefit payments, and the highest proportion of suspected HMOs currently being investigated by planning are also in Harold Hill.

Harold Hill, which is a key area of concern brought to our attention, is home to approximately 13,000 properties, with 429 sales being made in the previous 12-months (according to RightMove) and 46 rentals advertised, including house shares and room renting (according to RightMove). Whilst this may be an emerging issue, it should be stressed that the significant majority of properties in Harold Hill are unaffected.

The map below shows the distribution of aforementioned categories of HMOs, with clear clusters of properties notable within Brooklands, Romford Town and Heaton wards. The thematic shading denotes the total number of HMOs per ward, ranging from 45-56 (darkest shaded regions) to 1-12 (lightest shaded regions) – please refer to table above for Ward number breakdowns.

Row Labels	Benefits	Council Tax	HM1 HMO - Bedsits	HM2 HMO - Section 257	HM3 HMO - Shared House	HMO Public Register	Liberty Housing	Suspected	Grand Total	Below Mandatory Licensing Level	Confirmed or Suspected HMO
Brooklands	4	11	9	2	5	1		4	36	16	19
Cranham		1			1				2	1	1
Elm Park	1	3	1		2	7		2	16	3	6
Emerson Park		1			1		1		3	1	2
Gooshays	6	4					1	9	17	0	20
Hacton	1	1	3						5	3	2
Harold Wood	1	2			3	4	1	6	13	3	10
Havering Park	2	5	1		2	3	2	1	15	3	10
Heaton	5	8	2		2	1	4	12	32	4	29
Hylands			3		1				4	4	0
Mawneys	1	2	4		1			3	11	5	6
Pettits	1	3	1				1	1	7	1	6
Rainham and Wenningt	3	2	1	1	3	1	3	2	16	5	10
Romford Town	4	12	20	4	4	10	1	1	56	28	18
South Hornchurch	6	7	2		1			1	17	3	14
Squirrel's Heath		2	2		1	4			9	3	2
St. Andrew's		1	3				1		5	3	2
Upminster		1							1	0	1
Grand Total	35	66	52	7	27	31	15	32	265	86	148

Appendix 12 - HMO's in Havering's PRS evidence – Crime and ASB

The addresses identified have been cross referenced with data on noise nuisance (collated by London Borough of Havering), 999 calls to police and reported and recorded crimes (from the Metropolitan Police). Due to the different methods of recording address data, this information has been retrieved manually through searching for each individual address within each separate database. The data retrieved covers the 2014-15 financial year (April 2014 to March 2015).

The table below provides the total number of records for noise complaints, police calls for service, police calls for domestic violence and total crime and crime related incident records, where the venue was a HMO. The total number of HMOs identified locally accounts for less than 0.3% of all properties (265 of approximately 100,000). Proportionately, these properties were over-represented in all areas observed (most notably calls regarding domestic violence and noise), however, in volume terms the amount of calls/complaints generated accounted for >=1.27% of the borough total.

Category	No. Addresses	Total Number of Noise Complaints 2014-15	Total Number of Police Calls (exc. Domestic Violence) 2014-15	Total Number of Police Calls regarding Domestic Violence 2014-15	Total Number of Crimes Recorded 2014-15
HMO Public Register	31	2	11	10	13
Benefits List	35		17	25	14
Council Tax List	66		14	5	9
HM1 HMO Bedsits	52		22	23	21
HM2 HMO Section 257	7		1	7	10
HM3 HMO Shared House	27	1	2	4	23
Liberty Housing	15		5	2	9
Suspected	32	4	5		3
Total HMOs	265	7	77	76	102
Borough Total (to nearest hundred/thousand)	100,000 (addresses)	700 (complaints)	94,000 (calls)	6,500 (calls)	15,000 (crimes)
HMOs as per cent of borough total	0.3%	1.0%	0.08%	1.27%	0.6%

A further breakdown looking at the number of actual properties affected reveals that less than 1 in 5 HMOs were a contributor of, or affected by, noise complaints, police calls for service and domestic violence calls; less than 1 in 4 HMOs were a contributor of, or affected by, crimes. It should be noted that this is based only on what is known to the recording agencies. We acknowledge that incidences of crime, noise and anti-social behaviour can go unreported.

A small number of addresses were identified as being significant contributors to police calls for service, with two addresses generating more than 10 calls each.

Category	No. Addresses	Noise Complaints 2014-15 <i>Number of properties affected (%)</i>	Police Calls (exc. Domestic Violence) 2014-15 <i>Number of properties affected (%)</i>	Police Domestic Violence Calls 2014-15 <i>Number of properties affected (%)</i>	Crimes Recorded 2014-15 <i>Number of properties affected (%)</i>
HMO Public Register	31	2 (6%)	4 (13%)	6 (19%)	9 (29%)
Benefits List	35		4 (11%)	6 (17%)	8 (23%)
Council Tax List	66		9 (14%)	5 (8%)	8 (12%)
HM1 HMO Bedsits	52		8 (15%)	9 (17%)	9 (17%)
HM2 HMO Section 257	7		1 (14%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)
HM3 HMO Shared House	27	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	11 (41%)
Liberty Housing	15		3 (20%)	2 (13%)	7 (47%)
Suspected	32	4 (13%)	2 (6%)		2 (6%)
Total	194	7 (4%)	24 (12%)	27 (13%)	49 (24%)

In terms of **calls made to police**, there were 3 addresses which contributed to 50% of all calls made to police. Those were **ADDRESS REDACTED** (missing children reports by staff/support workers of care home – no calls since November 2014, HM1 HMO Bedsit); **ADDRESS REDACTED** (HM1 HMO Bedsit) and **ADDRESS REDACTED** (no calls since September 2014, on the HMO Public Register). It should be noted that the number of all police calls to HMOs in January to March 2015 was just 4, compared to 45 for the same periods in 2014.

In terms of **Domestic Violence calls**, there were 5 addresses which contributed to 55% of all calls made to police. Of all HMOs identified, 15% had made calls to police about domestic incidents/domestic abuse, this was higher for properties where residents were in receipt of housing benefit (38% of these properties reported domestic abuse to police), and where the HMO was on the public register (19%) or classed as a Bedsit (17%).

Of all **crimes and crime related incidents recorded** at HMOs, 45% related to domestic disputes / domestic abuse (46 of 102 offences reported and recorded) – this would correlate somewhat with domestic violence calls. Rates of burglary per 100 households were one-and-a-half times higher than the borough average (although this amounted to just 6 offences). Other types of crime were generally reported at a lower than average rate for Havering.

There were two addresses whereby data was omitted in the above tables, due to excessively high numbers of calls. One was a children's care home **ADDRESS REDACTED** which generated 189 calls to police over a 12-month period. A high proportion of these were missing person reports about a young person residing in the address. The second address was **ADDRESS REDACTED** which generated 59 calls to police over a 12-month period. A large number were identified as misuse of 999 calls by a tenant with mental health illness, but included legitimate calls due to a dispute between the landlady and a previous tenant.

Occupants of HMOs and Offenders

Data from the council tax database was provided, with information on 159 addresses of the 265 identified (where council tax is paid and the occupant is listed). Approximately 85% of those residing in HMOs were British born. HMOs were more likely to house males, where data was available it showed predominantly those under 30 – just 33% of occupiers were female.

The list of names was cross-referenced with crime records where a named suspect was identified. There were 27 occupants in HMOs who had been suspected of at least one crime in the previous 12-months, cumulatively these tenants had been suspected of 45 offences in the previous 12-months. The highest proportion were for violence/domestic violence (17 persons), followed by theft and serious acquisitive crimes (4 persons), drugs offences (4 persons) and criminal damage (3 persons).

Proportionately, these 27 occupants made up 1.1% of all persons accused of crime in the previous 12-months in Havering. There was no particular concentration of occupants suspected of crimes in any single area of Havering. A breakdown by area found Romford (RM1, RM7) and Rainham (RM13) had the highest volume with 8 people each. This was followed by Hornchurch (RM11, RM12) with 5, Harold Hill (RM3) with 4, and Collier Row (RM5) with 2.

Whilst these are relatively low volumes observed, it should be noted that HMOs were seven times more likely than none-HMOs to have an occupant who had been accused of crime in the previous 12-months. The aforementioned data found 27 occupants who had been suspects in offences reported to police in the last 12-months. This represents 16.8% of all occupants in HMOs. Borough-wide, the average is 2.4%. This demonstrates that a higher concentration of those with an offending history can be found in HMO accommodation, when compared to none-HMO accommodation.

This may be for legitimate reasons, such as limited access to housing for offenders and affordability. There were 6 addresses which had multiple persons with previous involvement as crime suspect's resident.

HMO and Correlation with Burglary Hotspots

Whilst the crime, ASB and noise data looked at was in relation to victimisation logged at HMO addresses, it should be noted that many of the offences (which were not domestic violence) committed by those with previous offending history (and residing in HMOs) took place against none-HMO dwellings.

There is a strong correlation between the location of HMOs and significant areas where burglary is disproportionately high in Havering. There are 25 geographical areas of the borough which were identified as containing 40% of all household burglary in the previous 12-months. These 25 areas take up just 7% of the borough physical geographical area and contain 20% of the boroughs housing stock. Within these locations are 198 of our HMO accommodation (74%).

There have been two intelligence reports which have identified two HMO accommodations as being used by persons identified as prolific burglars. Most burglaries go undetected (fewer than 10% are detected regionally) therefore it would be extremely difficult to estimate or assess the impact of such a trend and whether or not such properties were utilised by offenders for criminal purposes.

However, it is worth noting that numerous burglary studies have found rates of burglary are higher in areas of private renting and areas with multiple HMOs due to the transient nature of the population in these locations (with many residents being short term), which can enable offenders to operate with more anonymity than they might in more established communities (social organisation and informal social control are more vulnerable in transient areas). Significant concentrations of HMOs in small geographical areas may lead to elevated levels of crimes such as household burglary and vehicle crime (more cars per dwelling – see Bottoms and Wiles 1988; Henson and Stone 1999; Bernasco and Luykx 2003; Tilley et al 2004).

Appendix 13 – Average Score of Deprivation in Havering by ward

The figures above clearly demonstrate that the worst two wards in respect to levels of deprivation are Gooshays and Heaton respectively, this evidence supports that seen above. Whilst Romford Town rates quite high in other statistical analyses within this appendix, it falls out of the highest top 5 for deprivation scoring. As a statistical group, Brooklands, Gooshays and Heaton have the highest combine rate of deprivation, over double that of any single ward. The area selection of these three wards for selective licensing could be expected to have the greatest impact of resolving levels of deprivation on a wider scale. Both South Hornchurch and Havering Park are too big (in terms of the PRS dwellings and proportion of total dwellings) to be considered as a statistical group, they would bring the figure over too close to surpassing the 20% figure for selective licensing area designation.

Deprivation in Havering (2007-2010)			
	Average Score		
Names	2007	2010	rank (2010)
Gooshays	32.17	34.08	2
Heaton	29	32.1	3
South Hornchurch	23.53	22.59	4
Havering Park	21.51	21.92	5
Brooklands	17.81	19.52	6
Romford Town	18.9	18.91	7
Harold Wood	16.26	17.32	8
Rainham and Wennington	16.56	17.16	9
Mawneys	16.28	16.58	10
Elm Park	16.73	16.4	11
St. Andrew's	13.7	13.13	12
Hylands	11.03	11.18	13
Squirrel's Heath	11.22	10.99	14
Pettits	9.78	10.95	16
Hacton	9.97	10.32	16
Emerson Park	8.76	9.84	17
Cranham	7.61	7.73	18
Upminster	6.75	5.98	19
Total (all wards)	287.57	296.7	
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton	78.98	85.71	1

The ward level measures in this file are the results of calculations undertaken by the Greater London Authority, based on the Lower Layer Super Output Area (SOA) level Indices of Deprivation 2007 and 2010 from the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Appendix 14 – Geographical size of wards in Havering

The geographic distribution and size of wards in the borough is key when considering the selective licensing 20% area designation rule for having to obtain Secretary of State Approval for any introduction within the local authority.

Local authorities will be required to obtain confirmation from the Secretary of State for any selective licensing scheme which would cover more than 20% of their geographical area or would affect more than 20% of privately rented homes in the local authority area. As a cluster on average Brooklands, Gooshays and Heaton have some of the highest statistical representations in the characteristics analysed within appendices 3-14. Whilst South Hornchurch and Romford Town Rainham and Wennington do also come up within the top 5 scoring, their combination would be hard to achieve as a statistical grouping combined with other highly scored wards that would also fall below the 20% rules. In the context of the consideration of selective licensing, any introduction would have the greatest impact in terms of geographical scope and resolving issues within the private rented sector if introduced as a statistical group.

Geographical Ward Composition in Havering 2011			
Names	Hectares	Square Kilometres	Geographical size of the borough % ward breakdown
Brooklands	420.1	4.2	3.67%
Cranham	655.6	6.6	5.76%
Elm Park	366.7	3.7	3.23%
Emerson Park	463.9	4.6	4.02%
Gooshays	776.1	7.8	6.81%
Hacton	246.1	2.5	2.18%
Harold Wood	759.6	7.6	6.64%
Havering Park	978.8	9.8	8.56%
Heaton	341.5	3.4	2.97%
Hylands	290.2	2.9	2.53%
Mawneys	304.9	3	2.62%
Pettits	395.3	4	3.49%
Rainham and Wennington	1690	16.9	14.76%
Romford Town	286.6	2.9	2.53%
St. Andrew's	268.7	2.7	2.36%
South Hornchurch	684.7	6.8	5.94%
Squirrel's Heath	264.6	2.6	2.27%
Upminster	2253.4	22.5	19.65%
Total (all wards)			100.0%
Brooklands + Gooshays + Heaton	1537.7	15.4	13.45%

- Source – Census 2011

