



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**HOUSING MANAGEMENT  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
ADDENDUM**

**3.00PM, MONDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2009**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
21. PUBLIC QUESTIONS	1 - 2



**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

**(a) John Melson (Chair, High Rise Action Group)**  
**Surrender of Secure Tenancies as a Condition of Addiction Rehabilitation**

A concern is raised by the above policy.

Once the Rehabilitation and Aftercare course is completed successfully why aren't the clients passported seamlessly to a new Secure Tenancy at the end of the process without the need to go through Homemove?

The security engendered by a Secure Tenancy may be a major factor in a client's ability to undertake the rehabilitation process successfully and to undermine that by putting them back into Temporary accommodation may be a contributory cause of relapse into the former, or alternative, addiction.

It appears to be a negative approach to pursue such a policy, with a potential for wastage of the time and funding already invested in the client and a potential for future loss of the client, the funding and the time involved.

Can this matter be brought as an Agenda item for discussion to HMCC please?

**(b) Tom Whiting (Chair, Sheltered Housing Action Group)**

This is a question to the Housing Management Consultative Committee concerning a further provision to Agenda item 13 of 22nd June 2009, *Local Lettings Plan for Sheltered Housing*, at clause 3.5 "*Prevention of Anti-Social Behaviour, Risk management and Meeting Support Needs in Sheltered Housing*".

The kind of difficulties that have been identified regarding existing Sheltered tenants or tenants newly arrived are not addressed by the regulation referred to above. This will continue to cause grave problems unless addressed at a policy level. In the absence of such prescribed procedures, expediency can lead to inappropriate decisions that cause problems to the sheltered scheme community as a whole while also failing to address the core of the issue for individuals who have developing or recurrent difficulties.

"We are now asking if additional wording can be included in the regulation to read:

*Where the inability to meet support needs of any kind poses a risk to the health, safety, security and welfare of other residents, positive action should be taken to re-house individuals concerned more appropriately?"*

