October 2025 FOI Responses

FOI-25-51:

1. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 16-17 year olds presented themselves as homeless, or at risk of homelessness, as a main applicant?
   This does not include general housing advice. By presenting we mean all who presented themselves as homeless even if they were not subsequently assessed. This includes individuals who presented before 56 days of becoming homeless, or at risk of homelessness, believed they were homeless but did not meet requirement, presented but were not eligible for homelessness assistance

Response: 9

2. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 16-17 year olds were assessed:
   a - For Prevention and/or Relief duty under part 7 of the Housing Act?
   b - For further support under the Children's Act?
   While this assessment is a new duty brought in by the HRA, it is a duty under part 7 of the Housing Act as amended by the HRA.
   Please answer Q3-7 for those under 2a only.

Response:

A: 4

B: 0

3. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 16-17 year olds received an initial decision of being owed:
   a - Prevention duty under HRA
   b - Relief duty under HRA

Response:

A: 3

B: 1

4. Prevention duty ended:

a - With accommodation secured
   b - Leading to relief duty
   c - Any other reason

Response:

A: 2

B: 1

C: 0

5. Relief ended:

a - With accommodation secured
b - for any other reason (not including those who progress to an assessment under the Housing Act 1996)

Response:

A: 2

B: 0

6. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 16-17 year olds were assessed for a statutory main housing duty under part 7 of the Housing Act?
   By this we mean following unsuccessful prevention and/or relief outcomes, how many young people underwent a final assessment under part 7 of the Housing Act in order to assess their eligibility for a statutory main housing duty

Response: 0

7. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 16-17 year olds were accepted as statutorily homeless and owed a statutory main housing duty under part 6 of the Housing Act 1996?
   After undergoing a final assessment, how many young people were accepted as statutorily homeless and offered a statutory main housing duty.

Response: 0

8. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 18-24 year olds presented themselves as homeless, or at risk of homelessness, as a main applicant?
   This does not include general housing advice. By presenting we mean all who presented themselves as homeless even if they were not subsequently assessed. This includes individuals who presented before 56 days of becoming homeless, or at risk of homelessness, believed they were homeless but did not

meet requirement, presented but were not eligible for homelessness assistance.

Response: 552

9. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 18-24 year olds were assessed for a Prevention and/or Relief duty under part 7 of the Housing Act?
While this assessment is a new duty brought in by the HRA, it is a duty under part 7 of the Housing Act as amended by the HRA.

Response: 461

10. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 18–24-year-olds received an initial decision of being owed:
a - Prevention duty under HRA
b - Relief duty under HRA

Response:

A. 230

B. 231

11. Prevention duty ended:

a - With accommodation secured
b - Leading to relief duty
c - Any other reason

Response:

a. 94

b. 60

c. 54

The figures do not add up to the above figure because 22 cases have had the Prevention duty extended.

12. Relief ended:

a - With accommodation secured
b - for any other reason (not including those who progress to an assessment under the Housing Act 1996)

Response:

a. 122

b. 66

13. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 18-24 year olds were assessed for a statutory main housing duty under part 7 of the Housing Act?
By this we mean following unsuccessful prevention and/or relief outcomes, how many young people underwent a final assessment under part 7 of the Housing Act in order to assess their eligibility for a statutory main housing duty

Response: 91

14. In your authority in 2024-2025, how many 18-24 year olds were accepted as statutorily homeless and owed a statutory main housing duty under part 6 of the Housing Act 1996?
After undergoing a final assessment, how many young people were accepted as statutorily homeless and offered a statutory main housing duty.

Response: 80

15. In your authority in Quarter 3 of 2024 (1st October - 31st December 2024), how many 16-24 year olds presented themselves as homeless, or at risk of homelessness, as a main applicant?
This does not include general housing advice. By presenting we mean all who presented themselves as homeless even if they were not subsequently assessed. This might include individuals who presented before 56 days of becoming homeless, or at risk of homelessness, believed they were homeless but did not meet requirement, presented but were not eligible for homelessness assistance.

Response: 150

FOI-25-53:

Your request and our response:

1. For each year, number of housing disrepair legal claims made against the council by council tenants/residents?

Response:

2025 – 71
2024 – 130
2023 – 132
2022 – 92
2021 – 23
2020 – 12
2019 – 16

2. For each year, how many of these resulted in liability being admitted by the council?

Response:

Thank you for your request for annual data relating to housing disrepair legal claims made against the Council from 2014 to June 2025. After careful consideration, we are withholding the requested information under the following exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000:

Section 36, Prejudice to the Effective Conduct of Public Affairs
Disclosure of the requested data would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to manage ongoing and future housing disrepair claims. Specifically:
Legal Strategy Risk: Releasing granular annual data on liability admissions, compensation payments, and legal outcomes may undermine the Council's legal position in current and future proceedings by revealing patterns or thresholds that could be exploited by claimants or legal representatives.
Operational Decision-Making: The data forms part of internal legal and risk management processes. Disclosure could inhibit free and frank discussion between officers and legal advisors, particularly where decisions are made about settlement thresholds, liability assessments, and resource allocation.
Management Impact: Public release may lead to misinterpretation or reputational harm, affecting the Council's ability to manage housing stock, respond proportionately to disrepair issues, and maintain trust in its complaints and legal handling procedures.
This exemption is subject to the public interest test. While we recognise the public interest in transparency and accountability, we consider that the public interest in maintaining the integrity of legal and strategic decision-making outweighs the interest in disclosure.

Section 42, Legal Professional Privilege
Some of the requested information relates directly to legal advice received and decisions made in the context of litigation. Disclosure would infringe legal professional

privilege, which protects the confidentiality of communications between the Council and its legal advisors.
This exemption is absolute and does not require a public interest test.

Section 43(2), Commercial Interests
Disclosure of detailed financial breakdowns of compensation and legal costs could prejudice the Council's commercial interests by:
Revealing settlement norms that may influence future negotiations or inflate expectations.
Undermining the Council's position in procurement or contractual discussions with legal service providers and insurers.
This exemption is also subject to the public interest test. While there is public interest in understanding how public funds are spent, we consider that disclosure would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to secure value for money and manage legal risk effectively.
If you would like to request a review of this decision, please contact the Council's Information Governance team within 40 working days. You also have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner's Office.

3. For each year, how many of these resulted in liability being admitted by the council AND damages/compensation paid?

Response:

Thank you for your request for annual data relating to housing disrepair legal claims made against the Council from 2014 to June 2025. After careful consideration, we are withholding the requested information under the following exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000:

Section 36, Prejudice to the Effective Conduct of Public Affairs
Disclosure of the requested data would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to manage ongoing and future housing disrepair claims. Specifically:
Legal Strategy Risk: Releasing granular annual data on liability admissions, compensation payments, and legal outcomes may undermine the Council's legal position in current and future proceedings by revealing patterns or thresholds that could be exploited by claimants or legal representatives.
Operational Decision-Making: The data forms part of internal legal and risk management processes. Disclosure could inhibit free and frank discussion between officers and legal advisors, particularly where decisions are made about settlement thresholds, liability assessments, and resource allocation.
Management Impact: Public release may lead to misinterpretation or reputational harm, affecting the Council's ability to manage housing stock, respond proportionately to disrepair issues, and maintain trust in its complaints and legal handling procedures.
This exemption is subject to the public interest test. While we recognise the public interest in transparency and accountability, we consider that the public interest in

maintaining the integrity of legal and strategic decision-making outweighs the interest in disclosure.

Section 42, Legal Professional Privilege
Some of the requested information relates directly to legal advice received and decisions made in the context of litigation. Disclosure would infringe legal professional privilege, which protects the confidentiality of communications between the Council and its legal advisors.
This exemption is absolute and does not require a public interest test.

Section 43(2), Commercial Interests
Disclosure of detailed financial breakdowns of compensation and legal costs could prejudice the Council's commercial interests by:
Revealing settlement norms that may influence future negotiations or inflate expectations.
Undermining the Council's position in procurement or contractual discussions with legal service providers and insurers.
This exemption is also subject to the public interest test. While there is public interest in understanding how public funds are spent, we consider that disclosure would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to secure value for money and manage legal risk effectively.
If you would like to request a review of this decision, please contact the Council's Information Governance team within 40 working days. You also have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner's Office.

4. For each year, how many found no liability for the council AND found that no works were required at all?

Response:

We do not record whether no works are required on our records, so we are unable to provide an accurate figure for this question.

5. For each year, what was the total amount paid by council for housing disrepair legal claims - broken down into amount paid to claimant (ie. damages, compensation), amount paid to claimant's lawyers (ie. costs)?

Response:

Thank you for your request for annual data relating to housing disrepair legal claims made against the Council from 2014 to June 2025. After careful consideration, we are withholding the requested information under the following exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000:

Section 36, Prejudice to the Effective Conduct of Public Affairs
Disclosure of the requested data would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to manage ongoing and future housing disrepair claims. Specifically:

Legal Strategy Risk: Releasing granular annual data on liability admissions, compensation payments, and legal outcomes may undermine the Council's legal position in current and future proceedings by revealing patterns or thresholds that could be exploited by claimants or legal representatives.
Operational Decision-Making: The data forms part of internal legal and risk management processes. Disclosure could inhibit free and frank discussion between officers and legal advisors, particularly where decisions are made about settlement thresholds, liability assessments, and resource allocation.
Management Impact: Public release may lead to misinterpretation or reputational harm, affecting the Council's ability to manage housing stock, respond proportionately to disrepair issues, and maintain trust in its complaints and legal handling procedures.
This exemption is subject to the public interest test. While we recognise the public interest in transparency and accountability, we consider that the public interest in maintaining the integrity of legal and strategic decision-making outweighs the interest in disclosure.

Section 42, Legal Professional Privilege
Some of the requested information relates directly to legal advice received and decisions made in the context of litigation. Disclosure would infringe legal professional privilege, which protects the confidentiality of communications between the Council and its legal advisors.
This exemption is absolute and does not require a public interest test.

Section 43(2), Commercial Interests
Disclosure of detailed financial breakdowns of compensation and legal costs could prejudice the Council's commercial interests by:
Revealing settlement norms that may influence future negotiations or inflate expectations.
Undermining the Council's position in procurement or contractual discussions with legal service providers and insurers.
This exemption is also subject to the public interest test. While there is public interest in understanding how public funds are spent, we consider that disclosure would be likely to prejudice the Council's ability to secure value for money and manage legal risk effectively.
If you would like to request a review of this decision, please contact the Council's Information Governance team within 40 working days. You also have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner's Office.