

Decent homes in the West Midlands

1. Introduction

This paper summarises the definition and targets for the achievement of the decent homes standard. It also presents data on the extent of the problem of non-decent homes in the West Midlands, the proposed sub-regions and individual local authorities. Detailed data at local authority (and thus sub regional) level has proved difficult to assemble. HIP returns, email enquiries to individual local authorities and, in the case of the private sector the use of the ODPM 'Ready Reckoner' have been key sources of information. Some summary data for housing associations has been provided by the Housing Corporation. Checks with ODPM and GOWM have shown that there are no additional data sets that might have been used. (But see section 6)

The paper also provides some brief comments on the extent and variation of the problem of non-decent homes by tenure and location. The implications for the regional housing strategy and the allocation strategy are summarised.

2. Definition and Targets

ODPM guidance states that a decent home meets four criteria:

1. It meets the current statutory minimum standard for housing. Dwellings below this standard are unfit.
2. It is in a reasonable state of repair.
3. It has reasonably modern facilities and services.
4. It provides a reasonable degree of thermal comfort.

Each of these four criteria is set out in detail by ODPM.

(ODPM, 2004).

According to the English House Condition Survey, 2001, one third of all homes fail to meet the decent homes standard. 38% of all social housing fails to meet the standard and 32% of all private sector homes fail to meet the standard.

The government has set the following targets:

1. All social housing (owned by local authorities and housing associations) should meet the decent homes standard by 2010.
2. The proportion of vulnerable households in the private sector living in decent homes should increase year by year. This should be 65% by 2006, 70% by 2010 and 75% by 2020. Precise targets have not been set at either a regional or local authority level.

A detailed definition of vulnerable households has been provided by ODPM. The definition embraces households in receipt of at least one of the principal means tested or disability related benefits including specified tax credits (ODPM, 2004).

All social landlords and local authorities are required to establish a baseline position and monitor progress towards the relevant targets. (See “Measuring the baseline position and monitoring progress” pp 21-25, in “A decent home - the definition and guidance for implementation”, ODPM, February, 2004).

3. The West Midlands in regional context

Table 1 shows that with 38.5% of all dwellings failing the decent homes standard the West Midlands had, according to the English House Condition Survey, 2001, a higher proportion of the housing stock estimated to be non-decent than any other region.

In the private sector with over 37% of homes failing the standard (Table 2) the region had a higher proportion of non-decent homes than any other region. In the social sector the West Midlands had the second highest proportion of homes failing the standard. At over 42% of the stock (Table 3) this was notably higher than the proportion for England as a whole.

Taking tables 1, 2 and 3 together, it can be seen that 620,000 of the estimated 828,000 homes in the region failing the decent homes standard were in the private sector.

4. Non-decent homes in the West Midlands: Local Authority Housing

Data on non-decent homes owned by local authorities has been obtained from the Housing Investment Programme, Housing Strategy Statistical Appendix, 2004, for each authority. This has been supplied by GOWM. Summary data is presented in Table 4 with each local authority placed in one of the four proposed sub-regions. The number of non-decent dwellings for each authority is based on estimates at 1/04/2004. The total number of non-decent homes, the proportion of local authority stock that is non-decent, the total cost of making decent and the average cost per dwelling are shown in Table 4 for each local authority and each sub-region.

Seventeen authorities have transferred all their stock and thus data is not shown in their HIP returns. These authorities are shown as LSVT authorities in Table 4.

Stafford has been granted a place on the 2004 transfer programme. Solihull has set up an ALMO under the Round 3 programme and Sandwell and Wolverhampton have been offered places on Round 4 of the ALMO programme. The outcomes of these processes

and pending optional appraisals (OA) are uncertain but they will have impacts on the means by which improvements to achieve the decent homes standards are to be funded.

ODPM guidance states that in order to address the problem of non-decency local investment strategies need to take account of the flows of stock into and out of non-decency. This requires estimates of the number of dwellings that will become non-decent without requisite expenditures as well as those that are currently non-decent. It also requires estimates of the costs to prevent homes becoming non-decent as well as expenditure to make dwellings decent. (ODPM, 2004, "A decent home - the definition and guidance for implementation", February, 2004, paras 5.6-5.15). In each "HIP Business Plans Statistical Appendix-Future Plans" local authorities set out their planned capital expenditures on 'making dwellings decent' and 'preventing dwellings from becoming non-decent.' The regional allocation strategy should take account of these future plans.

It should be noted that:

- ODPM has undertaken some work to establish the amount each local authority is to receive for decent homes work.
- Ministers have accepted that the allocations to LAs should be based on actual figures agreed in their OAs rather than on a national basis.
- Final figures will not be known until OA sign off but an assessment where necessary is to be sought from GOs.

ODPM advice is that LAs should be asked to provide GOs with the figure they are assuming for on-going RHP funding for LA decent homes and the basis on which they have calculated this, that LAs to be reminded of the 'no extra RHP funding position' and that LAs should be advised that the figure provided will be looked at in the light of data the LA has provided of spend and sources of finance in recent years and may be the subject of discussion where their assumed figure appears higher than indicated by the recent data."

(Linda Salmon, Sustainable Communities and Planning team, GOWM, email 30th November 2004.)

The allocation strategy will need to take account of this on-going work involving the local authorities, GOWM and ODPM.

5. Unfit and non-decent homes in the West Midlands: Private housing

As stated in section two, decent homes meet several criteria of which meeting the current fitness standard is but one criterion. Unfit homes are non-decent but making homes fit will not necessarily make them decent. They may additionally require further repairs, improved facilities and improved “thermal comfort” or insulation. In the private sector the data on unfitness is much more complete than data on decent homes and the occupancy of non-decent homes by vulnerable households. In this section, data on unfitness is presented first and then the very limited data on vulnerable households in non-decent homes in the private sector is set out. Both the extent and the cost of addressing non-decent homes in the private sector will be significantly greater than addressing the problem of non-compliance with the current fitness standard.

Data has been assembled for private sector unfit dwellings (Table 5) and private sector vulnerable households in non-decent homes (Table 6). The data in Table 5 is derived from HIP returns in 2004. The extent of unfitness varies considerably with location. Whilst nearly 7% of the private sector stock is estimated to be unfit in the North sub-region, less than 3% is unfit in the South sub-region. Nearly 59,000 of the regional total of nearly 92,000 unfit private dwellings are in the Central sub-region. The variations within each sub-region are wide. Sandwell in the Central sub-region records over 14% of its private stock as unfit whilst six Central authorities record less than 3% as unfit. In the North the variation is from nearly 12% unfit stock Stoke-on Trent to less than 1% in the Staffordshire Moorlands. In the South sub-region, Worcester with nearly 6% unfit contrasts with Bromsgrove at less than 1%. The variation in the West sub-region is less marked but the range is nevertheless, from around 5 1/2% to around 2 1/4% of the private sector stock unfit.

The data in Table 6 has been computed by using the ODPM ‘Ready Reckoner’ to estimate the number of vulnerable households in non-decent homes. Use of the Ready Reckoner requires information on the age structure of the private sector housing stock in each local authority and the ‘deprivation group’ to which each district has been obtained directly from an email questionnaire to each local authority. The questionnaire also asked for estimates of the cost of making decent those private sector homes occupied by vulnerable households. In some cases local authorities have used the Ready Reckoner themselves and where they have responded to the email with their full results these have been used.

ODPM guidance stresses that the Ready Reckoner gives only an indication of the likely magnitude of the problem district level: “The Ready Reckoner is *not* a substitute for local authorities using surveys and other sources of information to establish their own estimates. It is not sensitive to the wide range and complexity of local circumstances that determine the actual size of the problem in a specific district.”

The very limited number of authorities for which data is available means that comments on Table 6 must be treated with caution. However it is clear that the wider definition of decent homes compared with unfit dwellings considerably extends the number of

dwellings affected and the cost of the required improvements. The picture is complicated, of course, by the degree of association between non-decent dwellings and deprivation. In some localities the association is likely to be higher than others. In Birmingham the number of vulnerable households in non-decent homes is estimated to be more than twice the number of unfit dwellings and the proportion of the private stock affected rises from around 5% to 11%. In Worcester nearly 35,000 vulnerable households are estimated to occupy non-decent homes in the private sector and the proportion of the private sector affected rises from under 6% to over 18%. Costs unsurprisingly also rise significantly. Birmingham's bill for dealing with unfit private sector housing is £137 million but the cost of making decent the private sector dwellings occupied by vulnerable households is £253 million. Comparable figures for Worcester are £5.6 million and £26 million.

ODPM state that

“We have recently provided to GOs our modeled estimates of proportion of vulnerable households in non-decent based on the Ready Reckoner model. As these are modeled and are based on estimates of private sector stock we have provided to GOs as an indicator, some LAs may have better estimates. Therefore we have advised that they might want to use their local knowledge to validate our estimates.”

(Email from Maxime Twitchen, Research, Analysis and Evaluation Division, ODPM, 30th November 2004.)

Data based on this modeled information is presented in Table 7. This data has not been based on detailed stock condition surveys (unlike the data in Table 6) but has depended on estimates based on a 1999 stock model, updated to the 2001 position through survey estimates including new build and demolitions. In some cases the numbers in the two tables are similar, e.g. Birmingham (32,620, Table 6 cf 32,818 Table 7) but in other cases are very different e.g. Worcester (6,480 cf 1999). Both sets of data involve broad estimates. A good deal more work would have to be done both through detailed stock condition surveys and the identification of vulnerable households to have data that was accepted as being significantly more reliable. Even when this work has been done there will be room for debate. Bromsgrove provides an interesting example of a comparison between LA survey information and ready reckoner results. The data for Bromsgrove is very similar in Table 6 and 7 (1046 cf 1153) where Table 6 uses the ready reckoner with age structure of the stock estimates based on the local authority's own 2004 survey. However, Bromsgrove has commissioned its own estimates of the number of vulnerable households in the private sector. The result is between 12,530 and 13,201 households.

On the basis of Table 7 the region appears to have nearly 140,000 vulnerable households on non-decent homes, with much of the need for improvement concentrated in the Central and North regions. The need indicators produced by ODPM sometimes vary markedly depending on whether absolute numbers or percentages of vulnerable households are the basis of the criterion. For example Sandwell is in the highest category of need based on absolute numbers but the lowest based on the percentage of vulnerable households affected. South Shropshire is in the lowest need category based on absolute

numbers but the highest based on the percentage of vulnerable households affected. All local authorities in with the greatest need in terms of absolute numbers are in the Central and North sub regions (although 12 out of 20 authorities in these sub-regions have low absolute needs). In the South and West sub-regions all but one local authority is in the lowest absolute need category.

An allocation strategy should be dependent on improved, verified and agreed information. It should also take account of the wide range on initiatives that will impact on the problem including housing market renewal work that is planned.

6. Non-decent homes in the RSL sector

The Housing Corporation has produced a set of bespoke data on associations registered in the West Midlands and the number of homes failing the decent homes standard. This is shown in Table 8. This suggests a total of 44,004 homes failing the standard. The Housing Corporation has not been able to provide estimates of the cost of making decent. The data in Table 8 is of limited use because other associations, registered outside of the West Midlands will also hold stock within the West Midlands. Cross checking using the Housing Corporation's Public Register of Social Landlords shows however that almost all the stock held by the associations listed in Table 8 is in the West Midlands.

7. Housing Strategy and Allocation Implications

Working towards achieving the decent homes standard must be a very important aspect of the regional housing strategy. This is especially so given that no other region has a more severe problem of non-decent homes. The strategy needs to articulate a vision of significant improvements in the quality of the housing stock in all tenures. However, the means by which improvements will be achieved and the associated funding vary from sector to sector.

ALMO authorities will receive additional borrowing allocations to tackle decent homes objectives from their ALMO investment allocations.

Funding from the RHP for local authorities that do not transfer their stock or establish an ALMO will be very limited. The outcome will depend on ongoing verification of data and discussions involving ODPM, GOWM and individual authorities.

No Single Housing Pot (SHP) funds are required for RSL dwellings. The allocation strategy needs to stress that RSLs have to fund improvements themselves.

SHP funding to achieve decent homes is thus required for local authority housing (subject to the provisos set out in section 4) and for private sector housing.

It is likely that significant SHP funding will go towards tackling non-decent homes in the private sector. It is clear that this will be a major issue for the West Midlands. However, both the extent of the problem and the possible funding mechanisms require clarification. The number of vulnerable households, the proportion of the housing stock involved and the associated costs of improvement are large but further data verification at a local authority level should underpin allocations. The allocation strategy needs to consider all possible sorts of funding sources including non-SHP resources in order to establish the most effective means of obtaining sustainable improvements.

ODPM guidance stresses the importance of linking an overall private sector renewal strategy with achieving decent homes at the local level. In the private sector “Achieving the decent homes standard will only be achieved by adapting a combination of policies which will involve a range of assistance, advice and encouragement for homeowners and using enforcement powers only as a last resort”

The role of home improvement agencies, the Defra ‘Warm Front’ grant programme and the place of loans and equity release are all expected to be considered (ODPM, 2004 paras 4.21-4.24.)

Delivering decent homes is expected to link to objectives such as improving health and education outcomes, renewing failing housing markets and tackling poverty. The delivering of decent homes is expected to be linked to community strategies and local neighbourhood renewal strategies and with other regeneration activities such as low demand measures. (ODPM, 2004, paras 6.1-6.5.) It will be important to develop a co-ordinated funding strategy which ensures that money spent on decent homes ties in with wider renewal and supporting people strategies as well taking into account other regeneration and renewal activity (including demolitions). It will also be important to ensure that initiatives to tackle decent homes in the social and private sector are planned and executed in harmony.

Reference

ODPM (2004) “A decent home - the definition and guidance for implementation”, February, 2004.

Table 1 Dwellings not meeting the Decent Homes standard (All dwellings)

| Region | Dwellings (000's) | Proportion (%) |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| North East | 284 | 26.5 |
| North West | 1,042 | 35.7 |
| Yorks and Humber | 826 | 37.4 |
| East Midlands | 538 | 29.2 |
| West Midlands | 828 | 38.5 (1) |
| East of England | 655 | 28.1 |
| London | 1,114 | 36.2 |
| South East | 988 | 28.8 |
| South West | 718 | 33.9 |
| ENGLAND | 6,993 | 33.1 |

Source: English House Condition Survey 2001 (Figure in bracket denotes ranked position).

Table 2 Dwellings not meeting the Decent Homes standard (Private sector)

| Region | Dwellings (000's) | Proportion (%) |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| North East | 204 | 25.9 |
| North West | 810 | 35.4 |
| Yorks and Humber | 616 | 35.8 |
| East Midlands | 424 | 28.1 |
| West Midlands | 620 | 37.4 (1) |
| East of England | 528 | 27.2 |
| London | 789 | 34.7 |
| South East | 834 | 28.1 |
| South West | 593 | 32.6 |
| ENGLAND | 5,419 | 31.9 |

Source: English House Condition Survey 2001 (Figure in bracket denotes ranked position).

Table 3 Dwellings not meeting the Decent Homes standard (Social sector)

| Region | Dwellings (000's) | Proportion (%) |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| North East | 81 | 28.2 |
| North West | 232 | 36.8 |
| Yorks and Humber | 210 | 43.5 |
| East Midlands | 114 | 34.3 |
| West Midlands | 209 | 42.3 (2) |
| East of England | 126 | 32.4 |
| London | 324 | 40.7 |
| South East | 153 | 33.0 |
| South West | 125 | 41.4 |
| ENGLAND | 1,574 | 37.7 |

Source: English House Condition Survey 2001 (Figure in bracket denotes ranked position).

Table 4: Local Authorities 2004 data

| LOCAL AUTHORITIES | Total No of LA Dwellings | No. Non-Decent LA Dwellings | Percentage of the (LA) Stock | Total cost of Non-Decent Dwellings ((£'000) | Average cost per Non-Decent LA Dwelling (£) |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| CENTRAL | | | | | |
| Birmingham | 72,925 | 49,260 | 61.5 | 163,947 | 3,328 |
| Cannock Chase | 6,019 | 3,973 | 66 | No data available | |
| Coventry | LSVT | | | | |
| Dudley | 24,543 | 6,338 | 25.8 | 23,875 | 3,767 |
| Lichfield | LSVT | | | | |
| North Warwickshire | 2,911 | 2,056 | 70.6 | 24,254 | 11,797 |
| Nuneaton and Bedworth | 6,462 | 1,948 | 30.1 | 1,820 | 934 |
| Rugby | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sandwell (Round 4 ALMO) | 33,589 | 22,116 | 65.8 | 258,020 | 11,667 |
| Solihull (Round 3 ALMO) | 11,258 | 4,254 | 31.8 | 91,000 | 21,392 |
| South Staffordshire | LSVT | | | | |
| Tamworth | 4,891 | 1,996 | 40.8 | 4,379 | 2,194 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| Telford and Wrekin | LSVT | | | | |
| Walsall | LSVT | | | | |
| Wolverhampton (Round 4 ALMO) | 26,149 | 13,733 | 52.5 | 43,425 | 3,162 |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 188,747 | 103,726 | 54.9 | 608,900 | 5,870 |
| SUB REGIONAL TOTALS MINUS Sandwell, Solihull & Wolv'hampton | 117,751 | 63,623 | 54.03 | 216,455 | 3,402 |
| | | | | | |
| NORTH | | | | | |
| East Staffordshire | LSVT | | | | |
| Newcastle-under-Lyme | LSVT | | | | |
| Stafford (LSVT 2004)* | 5,830 | 3,316 | 56.9 | 31,974 | 3,642 |
| Staffordshire Moorlands | LSVT | | | | |
| Stoke on Trent* | 21,043 | 9,929 | 47.2 | 17,587 | 1,771 |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 26,873 | 13,245 | 49.3 | 49,561 | 3,741 |
| SUB REGIONAL TOTALS MINUS Stafford | 21,043 | 9,929 | 47.2 | 17,587 | 1,771 |
| | | | | | |
| SOUTH | | | | | |
| Bromsgrove | LSVT | | | | |
| Malvern Hills | LSVT | | | | |
| Redditch | 6,439 | 13 | 0.2 | 59 | 4,538 |
| Stratford upon Avon | LSVT | | | | |
| Warwick | 5,779 | 1,970 | 34.1 | 6,510 | 3,305 |
| Worcester | LSVT | | | | |
| Wychavon | LSVT | | | | |
| Wyre Forest | LSVT | | | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 12,218 | 1,983 | 16.23 | 6,569 | 3,313 |
| | | | | | |
| WEST | | | | | |
| Bridgnorth | 2,439 | 791 | 32.4 | 1,520 | 1,922 |
| Herefordshire | LSVT | | | | |
| Oswestry | 1,988 | 201 | 10.1 | 769 | 3826 |
| North Shropshire | 2,367 | 666 | 28.1 | 2869 | 4308 |
| Shrewsbury and Atcham | LSVT | | | | |
| South Shropshire | LSVT | | | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 6,794 | 992 | 14.6 | 2,289 | 2,307 |
| | | | | | |
| REGIONAL TOTAL | 234,632 | 119,946 | 51.1 | 667,319 | 5,563 |
| REGIONAL TOTAL (LESS ALMOs and 2004 LSVTs) | 157,806 | 76,527 | 48.5 | 242,900 | 3,174 |

Source: HIP Returns 2004

* Data for Stafford and Stoke on Trent taken at 1st April 2003.

Table 5: Private Sector Unfit Dwellings 2004

| LOCAL AUTHORITIES | Total dwelling stock in the Private Sector | No. Unfit dwellings in the Private Sector | Percentage of Unfit Dwellings | Estimated Cost of making fit the Unfit Private Sector Dwellings (£'000s) | Survey Date for Cost estimate |
|---------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| CENTRAL | | | | | |
| Birmingham | 296,943 | 15,263 | 5.14 | 137,000 | 2001 |
| Cannock Chase | 32,359 | 715 | 2.2 | 5,985 | 2003 |
| Coventry | 103,808 | 5,771 | 5.55 | 53,000 | 2001 |
| Dudley | 100,883 | 4,982 | 4.93 | 28,000 | 2001 |
| Lichfield | 35,495 | 784 | 2.2 | 10,820 | 2003 |
| North Warwickshire | 22,372 | 760 | 3.39 | 3,200 | 1999 |
| Nuneaton and Bedworth | 43,506 | 2,933 | 6.74 | 21,000 | |
| Rugby | 33,694 | 943 | 2.79 | 4,000 | 1997 |
| Sandwell | 76,877 | 11,122 | 14.46 | 75,180 | 2001 |
| Solihull | 71,750 | 1,392 | 1.94 | 18,000 | 2004 |
| South Staffordshire | 37,618 | 1,775 | 4.71 | 13,312 | 1998 |
| Tamworth | 24,838 | 286 | 1.15 | 720 | 2001 |
| Telford and Wrekin | 49,906 | 1,200 | 2.4 | 7,500 | 2003 |
| Walsall | 78,835 | 4,364 | 5.53 | 27,970 | 2003 |
| Wolverhampton | 71,220 | 6,644 | 9.32 | 39,800 | 1998 |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 1,080,104 | 58,934 | 5.46 | 1,232,267 | |
| | | | | | |
| NORTH | | | | | |
| East Staffordshire | 38,991 | 2,004 | 5.13 | 8,610 | 2002 |
| Newcastle-under-Lyme | 42,314 | 1,579 | 3.73 | 21,000 | 2002 |
| Stafford | 44,615 | 3,570 | 8.08 | 35,200 | |
| Staffordshire Moorlands | 37,868 | 124 | 0.32 | 1,611 | 2003 |
| Stoke on Trent | 82,284 | 9,859 | 11.98 | 102,560 | 2004 |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 246,072 | 17,136 | 6.96 | 168,981 | |
| | | | | | |
| SOUTH | | | | | |
| Bromsgrove | 33,466 | 55 | 0.16 | 550 | 2000 |
| Malvern Hills | 27,811 | 1,250 | 4.49 | 8,000 | 2001 |
| Redditch | 25,604 | 710 | 2.77 | 12,900 | 2004 |
| Stratford upon Avon | 44,370 | 1,288 | 2.9 | 17,000 | 2003 |
| Warwick | 50,984 | 901 | 1.76 | 10,390 | 2003 |
| Worcester | 34,610 | 1,999 | 5.77 | 5,600 | 2004 |
| Wychavon | 42,469 | 748 | 1.76 | 6,000 | 2004 |
| Wyre Forest | 35,988 | 811 | 2.25 | 5,000 | 2001 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|------|
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 295,302 | 7,762 | 2.63 | 1,225,990 | |
| WEST | | | | | |
| Bridgnorth | 19,200 | 728 | 3.79 | 5,000 | 2001 |
| Herefordshire | 65,825 | 3,650 | 5.54 | 2,000 | 2000 |
| Oswestry | 13,980 | 318 | 2.27 | 6,000 | 2002 |
| North Shropshire | 21,765 | 870 | 3.99 | 9,000 | 2000 |
| Shrewsbury and Atcham | 36,038 | 1,696 | 4.7 | 1,794 | 2000 |
| South Shropshire | 17,029 | 759 | 4.45 | 8,294 | 1998 |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | 173,837 | 8,021 | 4.61 | 923,088 | |
| REGIONAL TOTAL | 1,795,315 | 91,853 | 5.12 | 3,550,326 | |

Sources: HIP Returns 2004

Table 6: Private Sector: Vulnerable Households in Non-Decent Homes

| LOCAL AUTHORITIES | Number of Vulnerable Households in Non-Decent Homes | % Private Sector Stock | Average cost of making Decent Private Sector Homes | Total cost of making Decent Private Sector Homes (£ '000s) |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------|--|--|
| CENTRAL | | | | |
| Birmingham | 32,620 | 10.98 | 7,756 | 253,000 |
| Cannock Chase | | | | |
| Coventry | | | | |
| Dudley | | | | |
| Lichfield | | | | |
| North Warwickshire | 1,347 | 6.02 | | |
| Nuneaton and Bedworth | 2,925 | 6.72 | | |
| Rugby | | | | |
| Sandwell | | | | |
| Solihull | | | | |
| South Staffordshire | | | | |
| Tamworth | | | | |
| Telford and Wrekin | | | | |
| Walsall | 6,484 | | | |
| Wolverhampton | | | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | | | | |
| NORTH | | | | |
| East Staffordshire | | | | |
| Newcastle-under-Lyme | 3,850 | 9.09 | | |
| Stafford | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Staffordshire Moorlands | | | | |
| Stoke on Trent | 9,536 | 11.58 | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | | | | |
| | | | | |
| SOUTH | | | | |
| Bromsgrove | 1046 | | 2153 | 26286 |
| Malvern Hills | | | | |
| Redditch | 4,065 | 15.87 | 9,100 | 37,000 |
| Stratford upon Avon | | | | |
| Warwick | | | | |
| Worcester | 6,480 | 18.72 | 4,000 | 25,920 |
| Wychavon | 3100 | | | |
| Wyre Forest | * | | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | | | | |
| | | | | |
| WEST | | | | |
| Bridgnorth | | | | |
| Herefordshire | | | | |
| Oswestry | | | | |
| North Shropshire | | | | |
| Shrewsbury and Atcham | * | | | |
| South Shropshire | 1,226 | 3.28 | | |
| SUB-REGIONAL TOTAL | | | | |
| | | | | |
| REGIONAL TOTAL | | | | |

Sources: ODPM 'Ready Reckoner' and NTU e-mail survey of local authorities

* have email reply but insufficient stock data to use ready reckoner and no LA own estimates.

**Table 7 Private Sector: Vulnerable Households in Non-Decent Homes: ODPM
Estimates of Severity of Problem**

| DISTRICT | Number of vulnerable households in non decent homes | Need: Absolute Number | Need: % Vulnerable Households | Traffic Light |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| LOCAL AUTHORITIES | | | | |
| CENTRAL | | | | |
| Birmingham | 32818 | 1 | 1 | Amber Red |
| Cannock Chase | 1998 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Coventry | 10008 | 1 | 3 | Red Amber |
| Dudley | 6951 | 2 | 5 | Green |
| Lichfield | 1372 | 5 | 5 | Amber |
| North Warwickshire | 1294 | 5 | 4 | Green |
| Nuneaton and Bedworth | 2970 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Rugby | 1858 | 5 | 3 | Amber |
| Sandwell | 8188 | 1 | 4 | Amber Red |
| Solihull | 3425 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| South Staffordshire | 1494 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Tamworth | 1389 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Telford and Wrekin | 2988 | 5 | 5 | Amber |
| Walsall | 6803 | 2 | 4 | Amber Green |
| Wolverhampton | 7243 | 1 | 3 | Red Amber |
| SUB REGIONAL | | | | |
| TOTAL | 90798 | | | |
| NORTH | | | | |
| East Staffordshire | 2742 | 5 | 3 | Amber |
| Newcastle-under-Lyme | 6946 | 3 | 3 | Amber Green |
| Stafford | 1921 | 5 | 4 | Amber |
| Staffordshire Moorlands | 2423 | 5 | 4 | Amber |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|------------|
| Stoke-on-Trent | 8969 | 1 | 2 | Red |
| SUB REGIONAL TOTAL | 23001 | | | |

| DISTRICT | Number of vulnerable households in non decent homes | Need: Absolute Number | Need: % Vulnerable Households | Traffic Light |
|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| SOUTH | | | | |
| Bromsgrove | 1153 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Malvern Hills | 1420 | 5 | 2 | Green |
| Redditch | 1143 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Stratford-on-Avon | 1638 | 5 | 4 | Green |
| Warwick | 2570 | 5 | 4 | Green |
| Worcester | 1999 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Wychavon | 1724 | 5 | 5 | Green |
| Wyre Forest | 2328 | 5 | 4 | Green |
| SUB REGIONAL TOTAL | 13976 | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--------------------|
| WEST | | | | |
| Bridgnorth | 947 | 5 | 2 | Green |
| Herefordshire | 4120 | 3 | 3 | Amber Green |
| Oswestry | 1057 | 5 | 3 | Green |
| North Shropshire | 1467 | 5 | 3 | Amber |
| Shrewsbury and Atcham | 1955 | 5 | 4 | Green |
| South Shropshire | 1337 | 5 | 1 | Red |
| SUB REGIONAL TOTAL | 10883 | | | |

REGIONAL TOTAL 138658

KEY

Red: high need low spend

Red Amber: high need - moderate to low spend

| |
|---|
| Amber red: high need - high spend |
| Amber: moderate to low need - high spend |
| Amber green: moderate to low need - moderate to high spend |
| Green: low need low spend |

| Band level of Need | Based on estimated numbers of vulnerable households living in non-decent homes | Based on estimated % of vulnerable households living in non-decent homes |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | over 7000 | over 50% |
| 2 | 6001-7000 | 47.5% - 50% |
| 3 | 5001-6000 | 45% - 47.5% |
| 4 | 4001-5000 | 40% - 45% |
| 5 | Below 4001 | below 40% |

Table 8 Housing Association Dwellings

| Name of RSL | Number failing |
|--|-----------------------|
| Optima Community Association | 3 |
| Bromsgrove District Housing Trust | 1790 |
| Whitefriars Homes South Limited | 3934 |
| Whitefriars Services Limited | |
| Whitefriars Homes North Limited | 3600 |
| Trent & Dove Housing Limited | 1053 |
| Herefordshire Housing Limited | 8 |
| Marches Housing Association Limited | 40 |
| Homezone Housing Limited | 1531 |
| Elgar Housing Association Limited | 826 |
| Aspire Housing Limited | 1346 |
| Sevenside Housing | 2636 |
| South Shropshire Housing Association Limited | 71 |
| South Staffordshire Housing Association Limited | 360 |
| Moorlands Housing | 1278 |
| Bentilee Community Housing Limited | 79 |
| South Warwickshire Housing Association Limited | 133 |
| Willenhall Housing Trust Limited | 2667 |
| Walsall Housing Trust Limited | |
| Beechdale Community Housing Association Limited | 511 |
| WATMOS Housing Co-operative Limited | 1527 |
| Bloxwich Housing Trust Limited | 4191 |
| Aldridge & Brownhills Housing Trust Limited | 3622 |
| Central Walsall Housing Trust Limited | 3160 |
| Darlaston Housing Trust Limited | 2642 |
| Worcester Community Housing Limited | 2819 |
| Evesham and Pershore Housing Association Limited | 978 |
| Spa Housing Association Limited | 413 |
| Wyre Forest Community Housing Limited | 242 |
| The Wrekin Housing Trust Limited | 3444 |
| TOTAL | 44,904 |

Source: Housing Corporation bespoke data