

## Appendix IV: Melcombe Regis Board Options Appraisal

		<b>OPTIONS</b>						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>OBJECTIVES</b>	1. To contribute to crime reduction and address criminal behaviour affecting residents of Melcombe Regis (Max score= 4)	0.33	0.44	0.56	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	2. To reduce anti-social behaviour incidents associated with residents of Melcombe Regis. (Max score= 4)	0.44	0.44	0.78	2.25	2.22	2.22	2.33
	3 To improve resident satisfaction within their home. (Max score = 4)	0.78	1.22	1.22	2.13	2.11	2.33	3.00
	4 To improve housing conditions in the Private Rented Sector (Max score= 4)	0.78	1.11	1.00	2.25	2.44	2.56	3.22
	5 To improve the proportion of successful tenancies within the Private Rented Sector. (Max score= 4)	0.56	1.11	1.33	2.13	1.89	2.11	2.44
	<b>Total All Objectives</b> (Max score= 20)	<b>2.89</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>10.75</b>	<b>10.67</b>	<b>11.22</b>	<b>13.00</b>

Each option was assessed against each objective and scored according to the following criteria:

Over 1- 5 years

## Appendix IV: Melcombe Regis Board Options Appraisal

- 0 = will not impact
- 1 = very little impact
- 2 = reasonable impact
- 3 = significant impact
- 4 = very significant impact

### **Summary of assessments**

#### Option 1 - No specific housing-based intervention (*status quo*)

The average scores for each objective were  $< 1$ , indicating that it was not likely to have any impact.

#### Option 2 - Targeted promotion of the council's loan scheme and other assistance

The average scores for the crime and ASB objectives were also  $< 1$ . The average scores for the housing and resident satisfaction objectives were  $= 1 < 2$ , indicating that it was likely to have very little impact on the objectives.

#### Option 3 - Voluntary accreditation scheme and promotion of Landlords' Forum

The average scores for the crime and ASB objectives were also  $< 1$ . The average scores for the housing and resident satisfaction objectives were  $= 1 < 2$ , indicating that it was likely to have very little impact on the objectives.

#### Option 4 - Targeted use of Management Orders

The average scores were  $= 2 < 3$  indicating that it was likely to have a reasonable impact on the objectives.

#### Option 5 - Await introduction of revised mandatory licensing of HMOs

The average scores for four of the objectives were  $= 2 < 3$  indicating that it was likely to have a reasonable impact. However the average score for improving successful tenancies was  $< 2$ , indicating very little impact is anticipated on that objective.

#### Option 6 - Introduce an 'additional licensing scheme'

This would be a discretionary licensing scheme for HMOs. The average scores were  $= 2 < 3$  indicating that it was likely to have a reasonable impact on all objectives. The group had been advised to score options 5 and 6 identically, but were not instructed to do so. Three respondents considered that a locally tailored scheme was likely to be more successful than a nationally imposed one. An implementation date for the mandatory scheme is still awaited.

#### Option 7 - Introduce a 'selective licensing scheme'

This would be a discretionary licensing scheme across the private rented sector. The average scores for objectives relating to crime, ASB and successful tenancies were  $= 2 < 3$  indicating that it was likely to

## Appendix IV: Melcombe Regis Board Options Appraisal

have a reasonable impact. For the objectives relating to housing conditions and resident satisfaction, the average scores were = 3 < 4 indicating that a significant impact would be anticipated.

### 5.2 General

Not surprisingly, the average scores indicate that the housing-based options considered are more likely to impact on housing conditions than crime or ASB within the ward. Scores of 2 or more (reasonable impact), which might be considered as a reasonable threshold for seriously considering an option, were only achieved for those options involving formal intervention.