

Homefinder Somerset - 2016 Allocation Policy Consultation Feedback

This reports sets out the results of the two consultation questionnaires that were set up to collect feedback from applicants and stakeholders.

Summary

Two surveys were created to request feedback on the proposed changes to the Homefinder Somerset Allocations Policy: an applicant survey and a stakeholder survey.

The surveys were made available from the 15th February 2016 until the 31st March 2016 – a period of 6 ½ weeks.

All Homefinder Somerset applicants were asked to complete the survey by sending them a web message to their Homefinder Somerset account, in addition those applicants that had email addresses were sent an email. In addition a web link to the survey was placed on the Homefinder Somerset website for applicants to follow.

All landlords were sent a copy of the survey and individual LA partners were asked to share the link to the stakeholder survey with all of their relevant contacts.

Applicant Survey

1116 responses were received to this survey representing 13.16% of all active applicants (as at 31.3.16).

96% of all responses to the applicant survey stated that they were currently applicants on the housing register. In addition 40% of those that responded to the applicant survey are currently living in private rented accommodation, with Housing Association and Council House tenants making up a further 34%. Only 4.5% were homeowners and a further 9.5% of applicants that responded are living with family/friends.

The majority of applicants that responded were in the 25-44 age range – 49%, with a further 22.7% in the 45 to 59 age range.

Summary of responses – Applicant Survey

Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
Q5 We propose to change the wording in the policy to make it clearer that if a friend is included on the application form, that they are usually expected to be a joint applicant. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree - 70.7% No view – 24.1%
Q6 We propose to extend the list of applicants who may be exempt from the need for a financial assessment to join the housing register. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 62.2% No view – 33%

Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
Q7 Removal of gold band underoccupation	Strongly Agree/Agree – 73.5 No view – 16.9%
Q8 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clearer that we would support a social landlord by using gold band to move an applicant who has no legal right to succession to help the landlord make best use of their housing. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 60.1% No view – 36%
Q9 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clear that if a Council Officer finds a hazard in the applicants home, the landlord must be notified in order for the applicant to be placed in gold band for disrepair. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 81% No view – 15.3%
Q10 We propose to make it clear within the revised policy that silver band other homeless will be awarded to applicants two months in advance of the expiry date of the valid notice to quit Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 62.3% No view – 35.7%
Q11 Removal of Silver band - children in flats	Strongly Agree/Agree – 53.3% No view – 27.3%
Q12 We have added in a new Bronze Band category to make it easier to let Sheltered Housing and Extra Care properties (which can be hard to let) by encouraging applicants without a local connection to join the register for these properties. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 59.2% No view – 29%
Q13 We propose to remove emergency banding where a surviving tenant needs to move from sheltered/adapted housing because the requirement for the specialist housing no longer exists. They will be placed within gold band for tenancy succession. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 63.5% No view – 31.4%
Q14 We propose to change the wording in the policy for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 60.4% No view – 37%
Q15 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clear that backdating for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces will only be applied once. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 57.2% No view – 39.6%
Q16 We have made a change to make it clear that there is a 28 day time limit for applicants to advise their Local Authority of any change of circumstances. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 77.7% No view – 16.7%
Q17 To help prevent social housing fraud we propose to stop applicants informing their Local Authority of change of circumstances by telephone, and confirmation will need to be either online, by e-mail or by letter. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 78.1% No view – 13.5%

Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
Q18 We propose to change the wording in the policy to give applicants, who wish to keep rent costs at a minimum, the flexibility to allow more than two children to share a bedroom. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 47.5% No view –29.3%
Q19 We propose to change the policy to make it clear that applicants with young adults away from home in full time education during term time will be entitled to an extra bedroom for that child.. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 67.9% No view –23.1%
Q20 We propose to simplify the policy to ensure that applicants with evidence of need for overnight care are given an additional bedroom without having to provide proof of a qualifying benefit. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 60.7% No view –29%
Q21 Changes to medical /welfare assessment overall approach.	Yes – 81.6%
Q22 Do you agree with the approach we are taking? Regarding medical & welfare changes	Yes - 72.4%
Q23 Medical assessment process detail	Yes – 84.1%
Q24 Do you agree with principles of medical/welfare assessment process?	Yes – 77%
Q25 Welfare detailed assessment process	Yes – 84.5%
Q26 Do you agree with the principles for assessing welfare?	Yes – 76.7%
Q27 The Government has changed the law to allow existing tenants the freedom to move for work. Therefore we propose that where an applicant has an offer of permanent work they will be able to join the register immediately Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree - 73.4% No view – 19.9%
Q28 Making clear applicants have 48 hours to view and make a decision on property	Yes – 84.1%
Q29 We propose to reduce the timescale from eight to four weeks for when a Local Authority can place an expression of interest on behalf of accepted homeless applicants who have not been proactive in seeking a permanent home. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 66.4% No view – 28.9%
Q30 When an applicant wishes to be considered for a property we ask them to make an expression of interest on that property. Previously we called this ‘making a bid’. Do you prefer ‘expression of interest’ or ‘making a bid’?	Expression of interest 54.2% Making a bid 37.4% Don’t Know 8.4%

Only question 18 regarding allowing applicants to choose to have two children share a room when the policy wouldn't allow this has a less than 50% figure for strongly agree/agree. All other questions have applicant agreement.

Stakeholder Survey

87 responses were received to this survey from a variety of organisations including landlord, local authority staff and other agencies staff (including CAB and YMCA) and councillors from both county, district and parish level (see Q2 stakeholder survey for details).

Summary of responses – Stakeholder Survey

Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
Q3 We propose to change the wording in the policy to make it clearer that if a friend is included on the application form, that they are usually expected to be a joint applicant. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 87.2% No view – 7.7%
Q4 We propose to extend the list of applicants who may be exempt from the need for a financial assessment to join the housing register. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 80.7% No view – 6.4%
Q5 Removal of gold band underoccupation	Strongly Agree/Agree – 59% No view – 10.3%
Q6 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clearer that we would support a social landlord by using gold band to move an applicant who has no legal right to succession to help the landlord make best use of their housing. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 77.6% No view – 17.1%
Q7 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clear that if a Council Officer finds a hazard in the applicants home, the landlord must be notified in order for the applicant to be placed in gold band for disrepair. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 80.6% No view – 11.7%
Q8 We propose to make it clear within the revised policy that silver band other homeless will be awarded to applicants two months in advance of the expiry date of the valid notice to quit Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 83.1% No view – 14.3%
Q9 Removal of Silver band - children in flats	Strongly Agree/Agree – 68.4% No view – 9.2%
Q10 We have added in a new Bronze Band category to make it easier to let Sheltered Housing and Extra Care properties (which can be hard to let) by encouraging applicants without a local connection to join the register for these properties. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 55.3% No view – 22.4%
Q11 We propose to remove emergency banding where a surviving tenant needs to move from sheltered/adapted housing because the requirement for the specialist housing no longer exists. They will be placed within gold band for tenancy succession. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 78.4% No view – 12.2%
Q12 We propose to change the wording in the policy for applicants currently serving or former members of the	Strongly Agree/Agree – 67.6% No view – 31.1%

Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
armed forces. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?	
Q13 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clear that backdating for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces will only be applied once. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 81.1% No view –16.2%
Q14 We have made a change to make it clear that there is a 28 day time limit for applicants to advise their Local Authority of any change of circumstances. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 82.4% No view –8.1%
Q15 To help prevent social housing fraud we propose to stop applicants informing their Local Authority of change of circumstances by telephone, and confirmation will need to be either online, by e-mail or by letter. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 82.4% No view –5.4%
Q16 We propose to change the wording in the policy to give applicants, who wish to keep rent costs at a minimum, the flexibility to allow more than two children to share a bedroom. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 54.8% No view –18.9%
Q17 We propose to change the policy to make it clear that applicants with young adults away from home in full time education during term time will be entitled to an extra bedroom for that child.. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 75.3% No view –17.8%
Q18 We propose to simplify the policy to ensure that applicants with evidence of need for overnight care are given an additional bedroom without having to provide proof of a qualifying benefit. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 64.4% No view –15.1%
Q19 Changes to medical /welfare assessment overall approach.	Yes – 94.4%
Q20 Do you agree with the approach we are taking? Regarding medical & welfare changes	Yes – 85.7%
Q21 Medical assessment process detail	Yes – 98.6%
Q22 Do you agree with principles of medical/welfare assessment process?	Yes – 94.3%
Q23 Welfare detailed assessment process	Yes - 93%
Q24 Do you agree with the principles for assessing welfare?	Yes – 85.7%
Q25 The Government has changed the law to allow existing tenants the freedom to move for work. Therefore we propose that where an applicant has an offer of permanent work they will be able to join the register immediately Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree - 87% No view – 7.2%
Q26 Making clear applicants have 48 hours to view and make a decision on property	Yes – 91.3%


Question	Percentage of Applicants that Strongly Agree/Agree or have No View
Q27 We propose to reduce the timescale from eight to four weeks for when a Local Authority can place an expression of interest on behalf of accepted homeless applicants who have not been proactive in seeking a permanent home. Do you agree with this change?	Strongly Agree/Agree – 85.5% No view – 10.1%
Q28 When an applicant wishes to be considered for a property we ask them to make an expression of interest on that property. Previously we called this ‘making a bid’. Do you prefer ‘expression of interest’ or ‘making a bid’?	Expression of interest 59.4% Making a bid 30.4% Don’t Know 10.1%

Stakeholders that responded to the survey have on all occasions agreed with the changes being put forward.

Applicant Survey Detailed Feedback

Q1 Which Local Authority area do you live in?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Mendip	15.9%	178
Sedgemoor	20.6%	230
South Somerset	22.1%	247
Taunton Deane	28.7%	320
West Somerset	7.1%	79
Outside of Homefinder Somerset Area	4.5%	50
Don't know	1.1%	12
<i>answered question</i>		1116
<i>skipped question</i>		0




Q2 Are you currently an applicant on the Homefinder Somerset housing list?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	95.9%	1070
No	4.1%	46
<i>answered question</i>		1116
<i>skipped question</i>		0


Q3 Select the option which best describes your current living situation:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Private Tenant	39.9%	445
Housing Association Tenant	21.5%	240
Local Authority (Council) Tenant	12.6%	141
Homeowner / buying your home	4.5%	50
Shared ownership	0.5%	6
Living with family/friends	9.3%	104
Lodger/House share	1.8%	20
Short term supported housing	1.3%	14
Sheltered scheme	1.1%	12
Holiday let	0.1%	1
Tied Housing	0.6%	7
Mobile Home/Caravan/Boat	1.1%	12
Temporary Accommodation	1.8%	20
Hostel/Refuge	0.3%	3
Leasehold Property	0.3%	3
Care Leaver	0.1%	1
No Fixed Abode	1.8%	20
I don't know	1.5%	17
<i>answered question</i>		1116
<i>skipped question</i>		0




Q4 Please tell us your age.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
15 to 24	9.9%	111
25 to 44	49.0%	547
45 to 59	22.7%	253
60 to 64	5.1%	57
65 to 74	10.2%	114
Over 75	2.3%	26
Prefer not to say	0.7%	8
<i>answered question</i>		1116
<i>skipped question</i>		0



Q5 We propose to change the wording in the policy to make it clearer that if a friend is included on the application form, that they are usually expected to be a joint applicant. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	19.3%	197
Agree	51.4%	525
No View	24.1%	246
Disagree	3.4%	35
Strongly Disagree	1.8%	18
If you disagree please tell us why		38
<i>answered question</i>		1021
<i>skipped question</i>		95




Comments from those that disagreed:

No.	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q5
1	What would happen in the event of friends falling out though? Would support be given to re-house one of them?
2	There are cases where vulnerable tenants may be best served by having the tenancy in their own names rather than with a current partner. Particularly where a property has been adapted for that particular tenant.
3	You need to add something to reflect the position of equal rights, such as seek housing advice because in examples of domestic abuse or mate crime the victim loses out
4	I don't see why a friend should be expected to be a joint applicant as this would tend to jeopardise the applicants chances of obtaining independent accommodation.
5	Because I've been waiting for ages for my own place and that I will b homeless very soon.
6	A friend shouldn't be classed the same as a partner
7	A friend is not always a joint tenant. So shouldn't be assumed. There should be a choice or an option.
8	If it was a change to clarify what you mean, then it was needed, as current wording doesn't make that clear. However, if a person makes an application and chooses not to include friends or a partner that may live with them as a joint applicant, this should be respected, in my view.
9	The reason I disagree is some people might be in shared housing, might be friends because they love in the same household however have no other connection or responsible for each others financed.
10	It is way too complicated for joe blow

No.	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q5
11	I dont agree in regards to a friend being added to be part of a joint applicant. I think it is better to be individually named.
12	it should be just for the family members: mum , dad and children, and grandpartens.
13	What if the FRIENDS fall out?
14	why you allow to include anyone on the application??, this help should be just for familys not for friends
15	Somebody may be living with someone who doesn't have anywhere to live that's why they are there. Sometimes they are just good mates and let them stay there
16	clear enough now
17	no i dont think that is right because that friend could only be living there as a temporary measure and only being a friend should/could fall out easily and wouldnt be able to get them out of your house.
18	I disagree if this harms the main applicant finding a resolution to the housing situation.
19	I'm the tenant of my home, not a friend who has moved in with me, I would not expect to be granted immediate joint tenancy just because I had moved in with friend, if I'm on the list as other person residing in property that's fine, if you are married or moved in together as husband and wife, then you have joint tennancy, let's not blur lines,
20	You would have two different circumstances
21	Friends can disappear very quickly
22	I don't feel that friends if not in a relationship should be tied into a joint tenancy
23	well if you have a friend on the form and you have a fall out you have to start again.
24	Because I live with my Ex Partner and wouldn't want him joining my application.
25	because if you moved in with a friend and took a joint tenancy on, then the friend moved out you would be left to take on a tenancy on your own and you would not have a choice about it even if it was too expensive for you to take on.
26	If the friendship breaks down, which is a common occurrence then being a joint tenant makes the housing situation more complicated to re-structure and gives unecassary power to the Freind, which could be abused.
27	But what happens if one falls out and one has to move out if both on application .
28	Just because they are a friend should not entitle them to you're own house.
29	I thought that social housing was for families or parents and children maybe extended relatives. Since when do you live with a "friend". Unless you were house sharing,then rent private.
30	I do not want to share my tenancy in case i were to stop being friends with that person.
31	this could lead to passing the property on which i do not agree with
32	Was a little confusing when selected preferable area to live
33	Neither wording seems very clear.
34	this will leave the door open for loads of eu people to get housing this is not fair leave as it is me and my wife have been on the list for 8 years and not ever been offer a house and we know of eu people that have come here and got a house with in 8 weeks NOT FAIR

Q6 We propose to extend the list of applicants who may be exempt from the need for a financial assessment to join the housing register. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	12.7%	130
Agree	49.5%	505
Neither Agree nor disagree	33.0%	337
Disagree	2.4%	25
Strongly disagree	2.4%	24
If you disagree please tell us why		32
	<i>answered question</i>	1021
	<i>skipped question</i>	95




Comments from those that disagreed:

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q6
1	Very unclear language for the ordinary person to understand. What on earth is 'decanted from a property'.
2	Social housing are a rare commodity - and if someone has the financial ability not to have to rely on social housing they should not be taking this commodity over those who have no other options.
3	i think no-one should be exempt.
4	We feel very strongly about this. The local authority should be there to help those in trouble with their accommodation NOT to credit check and cherry-pick tenant profiles. We are credit worthy and want to downgrade from a 4 bed high private rent to a smaller 2 bed. We were dismissed by Yarlington housing group because we have just started a new business - as encouraged by the government and the jobcentre by the way. It seems as though you need to be able to qualify for a mortgage before you can get a council or local housing group property. This is disgusting - what on earth is going on? We cannot even downgrade now that most of our children have left home.
5	People will always do the best for themselves, you and me, everyone. Financial assessment is a baseline that all applicants must provide you with, in my view. It may well be that you email applicants every 3 months and ask them to confirm that everything is as it was: i.e., no change. Financial assessment in my view is key. HOWEVER If you are asking me whether I would back social housing projects that expand rentals to people that are not social housing candidates, I would say yes, please do, as mixed communities are heather for everyone, ghettos and segregation, in my

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q6
	view, are not great: BUT then I have always lived in very pleasant and safe neighbourhoods, and paid the market rate for them: BUT I believe social housing landlords could do this. That isn t the question you are asking me, I do know.
6	Social housing is for vulnerable people.
7	The wording is confusing. When does anybody use 'decanting', what is the difference between 'extra care' and 'sheltered'; and what is 'partner landlord property type'?
8	What does decanted mean?
9	People with drug and alcohol problems should not be supported.
10	However the final bullet point where a tenant dies, it seems to mean that anyone left in the property will have nice, that can be very distressing for the surviving person.
11	I do not see how you can make a decision on financial assessment with regards to if the person is sick????
12	they may have money but they want to get a cheaper accommodation. The financial situation should be always checked.
13	Basic common sense,if they have enough money to rent private or buy,why should they get social housing?
14	One rule for one one rule for another
15	Not plain English. What is a "decanted" applicant?
16	Single people in underoccupied situations should be subjected to financial assessment. It is not right under the current allocation plans that they can keep their larger houses whilst single persons and have to settle for 1 bedroom properties.
17	As a single parent struggling to pay rent a friend who has income not included may be fast tracked into a council house and someone with less income still struggling
18	It's only fair that everyone is treated equal
19	Because some people need to move ASAP... and they should put a payment plan in place when getting the property
20	Those in financial comfort can pick and choose their medical remedies,
21	All should have financial assessments
22	It depends on what the financial assessment involves really and who it effects
23	Financial assessment should not be affected by medical need, I don't see the connection
24	I dont believe it's fair.
25	I dont agree that when someone dies they should have to leave the property i think its disgusting i do agree they may have more room than needed so id propose a time frame to stay in the property of a couple of years instead.
26	Do not like the word "decanted". It is undignified and impersonal. Please consider changing this.
27	The last, qualifying sentence of the Proposed Wording, should read in bold: These exemptions will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
28	I think that everybody should have a financial assessment to be able to join the register.
29	All applicants should have a financial assessment regardless
30	social housing is what it says, social housing, where would this lead to i,e wealthy people living in council housing
31	I believe everyone should be assessed there are some waiting for accommodation yet working full time and driving expensive cars....abusing the system and honesty of those who really do need help.
32	THERE ARE PEOPLE OUT THERE THAT KNOW HOW TO CON YOU

Q7 Removal of Gold Band Under Occupation

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	26.3%	256
Agree	47.2%	460
No View	16.9%	165
Disagree	4.8%	47
Strongly Disagree	4.7%	46
If you disagree please say why		79
<i>answered question</i>		974
<i>skipped question</i>		142



Comments from those that disagreed:

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q7
1	Given the bedroom tax and other changes to welfare those looking to downsize need to be given the highest priority. If the only reason for not doing this is because it affects your figures somehow this is not a good enough reason. In fact the need to downsize and financial hardship does mean they are in 'high housing need' and should remain in the gold band. Remember that there are cases nationwide of eole in just such circumstances committing suicide or suffering extreme ill health in consequence of not being able to move when subjected to the bedroom tax and other benefit cuts. Reducing such applicants to silver grade is to deny their real need.
2	it will not help to free up larger properties
3	I disagree because the change is being made to make the Gold band figures look better statistically, but it does not help anyone in this bracket, infact it means further administration and red tape for someone who, if they are in this situation, probably needs a lot of support with this process anyway.
4	For those who do want to downsize, it makes it more difficult for them to find the home of their choice if they are put into a lower band, which further ties up larger family homes they occupy if they cannot move. I feel it is a manipulation of figures to water down high housing needs true figures.

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q7
5	with bedroom tax making me have to choose between being warm or being fed in winter cause there is no where for me to move to (been trying to downsize for three years!) i strongly believe gold band for those in dire financial need of moving is imperative.
6	Without Gold band it would make it very difficult for under-occupiers to hand back properties, and the social landlords to make full use of their stock.
7	It should be a priority to free up homes that are under occupied if residents wish to move.
8	I think that people who need to downsize because of high medical need and in financial hardship should remain in gold banding. Particularly if this is supported with an OT report.
9	They will not have the encouragement to move if they are placed in a lower banding because being in a lower banding can take a lot longer and we need the system to speed up.
10	Being in gold gives them more choice and then their larger home may become available to someone else sooner.
11	Why change it for so low a number. 640 out of 9300! A waste of time and money. Plus some will then need to complete a change of circumstances form online. More waste of time and money. All just to make the impression of the number of people in the gold band is less? But they will be making the numbers in silver and bronze higher by 640 instead so whats the point?.
12	Whilst many do not bid (waiting for the right property/specific scheme) you are removing a valid tool for housing officers. Can you really justify the statement that there is no demand for larger units, perhaps you should review this justification and reword to reflect there is now a higher demand for smaller units instead. Even if this policy only freed up one larger unit a year, then it is at least two further applicants that can be helped. Don't tie up officers hands.
13	i am now unemployed and will take longer for me to down size ive been trying for 3yrs to down size and going down a band will make it harder
14	Gold banding for under-occupying residents should be available, as some of the genuinely want to move. The banding should be reviewed after a reasonable period of time and if the individual has made no effort to express any interest in available properties, they should be downgraded to the bronze band.
15	i already made my point in the housing office , and it clearly didn't mean a dam thing , the understanding of the banding , clearly go's a miss , when trying to them who are in the office , being put in gold and then silver after 2 years later on the same reasons as before , is a wrong band and wrong actions of home finders
16	Some of these tenants are elderly people often with a number of illnesses. I feel it is wrong and heartless to expect these residents to move at this time in their lives, many have also lived in this one residence for 50-60 or more years
17	if they do not wish to move, then why are they on the housing register - this does not make sense. Everybody should be given a fair chance for any bids they make by moving bands this decreases the chances of making a successful bid.
18	all under-occupying tenants should have a policy put in place where they are legal made to move to a smaller accommodation where they would have less financial hardship and this would also mean more families that are crying out for homes would have less time waiting to be housed
19	The person on the waiting list should have the difference paid until a suitable house comes along.
20	Housing stock has to work hard: over occupation is felt as lack of occupation elsewhere, by others.
21	If there are people on the list, but not interested in moving why are they even on it. My family wish to down size for reasons to do with my son who has Autism. Every week when the properties go on at midnight im logged in straight away to see if there are any properties that come up suitable for us. We are desperate to move and i myself would be in great distress if our banding were to be changed it makes me feel sick to even think about it and i am stressing about it already. It may apply to some people but not all.


No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q7
22	unfair on tenants who DO wish to move
23	They might not be able to find a place that quickly
24	Any household under occupying should be forced to move regardless of whether they want too! Those houses should be used for larger families in need.
25	However where does that leave those in bronze band currently!
26	has to be a case by case investigated
27	I think that under-occupying tenants should continue to be moved to or remain in gold band, encouraging them to downsize, since the houses they occupy should be made available to those tenants that truly require them.
28	I think the should be kept as high priority in order to make way for tenants who need a larger home.
29	At the moment I'm one of those tenants in this band .for under occupation .I went on home finder so I can move and to date only been allowed to bid on 2 properties in an area close to family.(reason to move is due to health) If I'm put on a lower band I feel that the chance of me finding a property close to family will not happen ,
30	For some applicants they may need an extra room for careers to help when applicant is ill
31	Will under occupiers be eligible to apply for accommodation of similar size for any other reason or restricted to smaller properties?
32	Care must be taken where the Home has been a Family Home & the Tenants are elderly.
33	If a hardship application is successful then silver banding would be o.k, but if not then a tenants could be stuck in the silver band with little chance of moving, and in financial difficulty.
34	If they are in financial difficulties then I don't agree with putting them down to silver band, depending on how hard there financial circumstances are. I think this needs to be assessed case for case to see how hard their individual circumstances are. Maybe there should be another band type for these tenants.
35	I think all residents in a house too large for them should be made to move to a smaller property unless under exceptional circumstances as i need a bigger property and can never find one it took us 10 years to move to the property we are in know which the council said wad temp untill they built us a 5 bed that wad 5 years ago.
36	I am DESPERATE to move into something smaller and more affordable,i am trying hard to find a 1 bed and release this 2 bed for a family or 3 people. Totally wrong stupid idea. Is this what a 30k a year housing officer does with no housing stock to justify job? PATHETIC.
37	We have been forced by government to downsize due to bed tax being charged which was to release homes too large and therefore losing £15-18 pw of benefit.This should still be classed as a higher priority as this isn't our choice but choice made by government not the tenant.
38	under-occupiers
39	Disagree only as much as, I would not want any one to be made anxious or insecure by this change.
40	I think it's stupid to lesson people's housing need to bronze when there are families in need of bigger homes. the gold banding enables them to be in a position to move quickly and it seems like a step backwards to remove that ability.
41	why should people like myself who work full time made to make things harder as its difficult to get a house now so with the more people coming into the bronze band that do not need it then they should stay in the band they are in. Also people who have a bigger property than they need should be MADE to move
42	I don't see how this would benefit anyone? It could just potentially keep someone in a house that's too large for them instead of freeing it up for someone who actually needs the extra space.
43	The under-occupying tenant needs to give up the property. Particularly if they are in financial hardship, and claiming benefits . The change in policy, should be about letting a family having appropriate accommodation, not what colour box an under occupying tenant should be put in.

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q7
44	i did not know that you placed people with bigger houses to move to another property in gold and i dont think this will help them as they will only move if they want to.
45	Get them paying bedroom tax till they move I live private rented been on bronze for years 2 adults 3 kids and a dog in a 2 bed! Make you laugh really
46	get couples out of 3 bedroom homes!!!
47	Under occupiers should still be encouraged to move, regardless of financial situation. If this only affects less than 10% of the figures it is not greatly misrepresenting the housing need
48	They should be forced to move to smaller properties to ease the housing problem.
49	If someone does not wish to move surely they will remove themselves from the register, therefore leaving those in need of smaller accommodation.
50	I am in bronze as I am single and have no children. I am supposedly in bronze as my need is deemed low. This doesn't help my situation at all as I think it should be done on a first come first served basis.
51	i have 3 kids and 2 boys and 1 girl this why i need bit bigger house like 3 bedroom house
52	I'm in a 2 bed waiting for two years to down size there's nothing out there a lack of one beds I would be very angry to be down graded to silver band after waiting two years some of us want to down size with no property's available you can only wait
53	Why should they get priority over people needing housing when they can do an exchange
54	It works fine as it is
55	can I just say not everyone go's online ie the older people
56	Because this will put more people in the bronze band and as it is people like myself who have to rent in the private sector at higher rents have an even harder time to get properties
57	If they don't want to move they wouldn't have applied to the register. This seems more a proposal to improve figures rather than help people that need recouping. Bedroom tax can cause extreme financial hardship and mental stress.
58	Depending on circumstances some people due to frailty etc. Should not be penalised when there is a need to be moved to a 1 bedroom ground floor property
59	because then you are taking people away from the top band
60	People who can move should be priority to less bedroomed property to allow others waiting to occupy that property
61	Why don't these tenants want to move surly it's should be a case by case banding???
62	I think everyone should have chance even live somewhere else in UK. Chance new start if life
63	They should be gold banded to help them find smaller accommodation quicker and it frees up larger properties quicker
64	We were under occupying and wished to downsize.....that's why we were on the register. Why would you put your name on register if you did not have a housing need? I believe if anyone has gone to the trouble to apply, they have a need.
65	Because they me need a career to stay or help with their medical needs
66	that will mean that under occupied houses will not become available so often
67	You really do not understand what it is like do you?
68	it is more likely they will move with gold status
69	I think that people that work should be put to the top of the housing list
70	Some of those under occupying might want to move, why not have a band for that, or exemptions to the under occupying part. If they wish to move then stay in gold and the same for financial hardship.
71	In a way I do agree with this, but I feel that under-occupiers should be regularly assessed by the housing associations as I don't feel that they should be allowed to under-occupy their property just because 'they don't want to move house'. The housing associations should have something written in their contracts which enables the resident to be moved when they under-occupy a property for a certain period of time.

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q7
	This is why people like me and my family are stuck in an area we can't manage in, because there is limited availability in the area we need to live and houses there are being taken by individuals living in 2/3 bed houses.....
72	its madness to have some one living on there own,in a house,what could be used for a family
73	will It will make the bronze band pool bigger?
74	tenants under-occupying housing who are claiming benifits should be forced to move to a smaller property. other countrys operate this policy
75	This will make them less likely to bid for smaller properties
76	under occupancy should be a priority to free up the larger properties.
77	I've been waiting for a suitable property for nearly 6 years. Removal from the gold band will delay my move even further
78	No because the would be no way that they would be able to move down size, and would have hassle of housing.
79	THATS GOOD IN SOME WAY BUT THE PEOPLE ON THE LOWER BANDS LOSE OUT CAUSE THERE WILL BE MORE ON THERE BANDS LEAVE ALONE

Q8 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clearer that we would support a social landlord by using gold band to move an applicant who has no legal right to succession to help the landlord make best use of their housing. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.7%	143
Agree	45.4%	441
No View	36.0%	350
Disagree	2.8%	27
Strongly Disagree	1.0%	10
If you disagree please say why		22
<i>answered question</i>		971
<i>skipped question</i>		145




Comments from those that disagreed:

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q8
1	dont understand the question.
2	This is acceptable as long as the applicant is not disabled in any form having lived with a parent/s as a protection from being homeless and left homeless if they pass away.
3	I do agree, but why the difference between a succession right and a joint wish/need decision to move, as per point above. Does it really need a death to implement a gold banding to make best use of stock, consider the choice issue and making a planned informed decision to move.
4	Dont understand.
5	I read question a number of times and I don't fully understand the question - are you saying that if someone lives with their parents (and has cared for them) or who through circumstances moves back in with them will not be entitled to stay in the property. Personally I don't agree with this policy.
6	thats being biased and unfair

No	Comments on why applicants disagreed with Q8
	Social housing has to work hard...as above.
7	It is about community, sustainability, not, in my view, private profit.
8	I don't think people should be given a better band to help out landlords as there is bigger need then theirs. Unless the tenant would find themselves in extra hardship I don't think they should automatically be given gold and it should be case by case.
9	The applicant may not currently live in area but desperately need help of someone that does or may need to flea violence etc
10	Disagree only as much as, I would not want any one to be made anxious or insecure by this change.
11	Im unsure what this means
12	Hard to understand
13	This proposal isn't that much different than the proposal above! With no idea of how many applicants will be affected each year. Unable to make a clear decision!
14	not sure about this
15	If that means 1 occupant owner is moved from more than a 1 bedroom end property then fine but individuals circumstances should be the main priority not the landlords
16	Not fair
17	because if a person has lived in their house for a lot of years i do not think its fair to just say "you got to move" as we need this property for someone else with more needs than you.
18	If they have no legal right why should they be priority?!
19	Don't understand your wording
20	If your a tenant, it should be for life, this rule is open to abuse in the landlords favour
21	Don't believe putting a tenant into a gold tier for this purpose is correct, it should primarily be in the tenants need not the landlord
22	AGAIN IT WILL CAUSE THE SAME PROBLEM AS ABOVE LEAVE ALONE

Q9 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clear that if a Council Officer finds a hazard in the applicants home, the landlord must be notified in order for the applicant to be placed in gold band for disrepair. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	27.2%	260
Agree	53.8%	514
No View	15.3%	146
Disagree	2.4%	23
Strongly Disagree	1.3%	12
If you disagree please tell us why		24
<i>answered question</i>		955
<i>skipped question</i>		161




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Depends on the hazard. The landlords have to put the hazard safe by doing the repair even. Tenants may cause the hazard to jump the housing list.
2	Yes, I think landlords (Private) get away with a lot of disrepair as they are fully aware of the housing shortage and the desperation of some tenants. More needs to be done to clamp down on this.
3	its up to the landlord to take action and find suitable temporary accom. found while action is taken then tenant put back in their home
4	the landlord may then take it out on the tenant.
5	The Landlord should be made to do ALL repairs and be charged for renting out houses/flats etc that are in disrepair.
6	There needs to be a clearer definition of the hazard and who is responsible for the hazard
7	Maybe a couple of visits to see if the situation is better the 2nd time?
8	Is an applicant someone in social housing or not? Insisting that a private tenant inform their landlord of a hazard does risk eviction. I think this should be done on a case by case basis. If previous requests for repairs have not been heeded, it would be risky and probably pointless to ask for more repairs. Landlord may feel better to have a tenant who won't complain. Short supply of housing = plenty of people who will put up with damp. A landlord can only evict for certain reasons, but the fact is, they do not have to give a reason. Tenants are in a sticky situation. Tehy may feel it's better to live in a house with hazards, than have no house at all.
9	Especially when I had ceiling in my living room fell down in 2015

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
10	I feel this would slow the process of moving for the occupant if it all comes down to the landlord signing off on the tenants banding. They have a conflict of interest as always want a secure income.
11	But would want the landlord to take immediate steps to rectify hazard so tenant not left with no option to move and living in unhealthy conditions
12	It would depend on the individual case.
13	Depends if hazard is fixable and doesn't affect health. People have been trying for so long to get good band and live in many hazardous
14	unclear what this means
15	i do not agree that someone should have to give up their home permanently for repairs to be done.
16	Depends how bad the disrepair is, if it's life threatening then yes gold band but if not then silver
17	I agree with your proposed sentence, however, I think it might be prudent also to relieve the tenant of the responsibility for the notification: make it clear that it is the determination of the Officer. Some landlords would resent such a notification and would unfairly project that resentment onto the tenant.
18	Tenants worry about us contacting landlord, as they worry landlord will ask them to leave, just for complaining.
19	I have plenty of hazard in my home with toddler, which is no way near suitable for a toddler
20	People could purposely create this hazard ..
21	Delays in the system could cause a person to remain in gold band longer than the actual hazard repairs ,
22	Again this feels misuse of banding for this purpose
23	It would be the same for a joint couple. What makes these people more in need? It should be the landlords responsibility to fix these needs and not the council's job to place people on gold band without it being the council's fault. Plus your just discriminating friends that two people should automatically go on gold band. Not one person with a hazard that's the landlords job to deal with.
24	????? WHY JUST MAKE THE LANDLORD FIX IT HE GETTING THE RENT

Q10 We propose to make it clear within the revised policy that silver band other homeless will be awarded to applicants two months in advance of the expiry date of the valid notice to quit Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	15.2%	145
Agree	47.1%	450
No View	35.7%	341
Disagree	1.4%	13
Strongly Disagree	0.6%	6
If you disagree please tell us why		18
<i>answered question</i>		955
<i>skipped question</i>		161




No	If you disagree please tell us why
1	I feel they should be in GOLD band if they have been given two months notice to quit.
2	This question is not very clear.
3	the sentence dosnt make sense!..."that silver band other homeless"...????
4	You are asking some excellent questions. Glad a I sat to complete this feedback for you.
5	Don't even understand the Question, so how can I answer!
6	If the notice to quit is because of ASB then no new housing should be offered
7	I do not understand this question.
8	as long as they really homeless and not just seeking refuge I agree. but if this is given to others who think they can just jump in and get housing then I disagree.
9	Should all get a fair chance
10	Because they would still have 8 weeks to find somewhere to live. In those 8 weeks other tenancys may become avialible to people that are homeless at that time. Not in the future
11	as i do not understand this question
12	Should be emergency band straight away!
13	Any help that the Councils can give to people in peril of homelessness, should be given immediately.
14	Having been in that situation and been told to wait until court order of eviction (By TDC) then I agree if they have to quit extra help needs to be given earlier (assuming thats what it says)
15	Complicated and unclear wording

No	If you disagree please tell us why
16	If a tenant is going to be homeless in 2 months surely this should warrant a gold band status? Especially where children are involved.
17	This question doesn't make sense
18	THATS GOOD

Q11 Silver band - children in flats was introduced when the policy was first agreed back in 2007. Circumstances have since changed and it is now felt reasonable for applicants with children under 10 to be housed in flats and should therefore not be given priority on the housing register if they are currently living above the ground floor in a flat. This change could affect approximately 325 applicants who are currently in this band reason. All these applicants will re-assessed for other housing needs. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.9%	140
Agree	38.4%	360
No View	27.3%	256
Disagree	9.4%	88
Strongly Disagree	9.9%	93
If you disagree please tell us why		120
	<i>answered question</i>	937
	<i>skipped question</i>	179



No	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Parents with Children under 10 should not be housed in flats above the first floor.
2	upzzled by what you mean by 'circumstances have since changed'. If it was bad for applicants with children to be housed above the ground floor in 2007 what has changed to make it reasonable now.... just your view or is there new research and evidence to support the change in viewpoint.
3	Applicants with children under 10 should have the opportunity to bid for above 1st floor flats, however perhaps prioritizing with an effective date may be the answer rather than band in silver.
4	kids make a lot of noise is not ok for people flat below causes disputes between neighbours
5	No children under the age of 5 should be in a flat !

No	If you disagree please tell us why
6	Children need their own, secure outside space to play and be healthy. Many people have gardens they can not manage and priority should be given to young families. Children in flats are too restricted in their play.
7	No i strongly disagree, we are current tenants who are seriously affected by this. Living in a 1st floor flat with tenants above, when we first moved in it was under the no children under 10 above ground floor rule, since it has changed we have had children living above who run around constantly thumping like a herd of elephants and they is nothing we can do about it. With a housebound resident who can not get away from it which has lead to a deterioration in health. I do believe this policy should be looked at again or at least check on vulnerable tenants before other tenants with young children are moved in. Of course this would be an ideal world and whats happened to us is par the course, can't help everyone. So although I disagree with it, it does make more sense for the wider housing need.
8	Due to the safety factor of descending and acending stairs with one or more children and a lack of outside space which people without children don't need.
9	its not easy with pushchairs, babies and shopping to navigate stairs,or be without outside spaces/gardens for young children.
10	a) children need monitoring when playing outside: this would be more effectively and efficiently done from ground floor level. b) Tenants above, below and beside flats where children live may be adversely effected by noise, etc.
11	I do not agree with this due to the potential risks to young children (windows) living above the first floor. Also no access to garden, if above first floor which is necessary really for normal development in children. Children in flats could generate more noise for neighbours living in surrounding flats than in general needs houses.
12	For so few people affected it is not worth changing policy. Having children in a flat above ground floor level is not really suitable. I disagree with the change as I believe a silver banding is more appropriate.
13	A flat is no place for a child especially if there is no access to a lift and no access to outside space that they can play in and also is not safe if it is an open living situation
14	What priority is awarded after the age of 10?
15	I am one of these tenants and my son and I struggle day to day living in a flat. I think it's awful making families with a child/children live in flats on any floor at all (due to noise pollution daily alone) but with higher floor flats, no lifts and multiple flights of stairs (before you factor in the child, change/school bags, shopping etc) is a very hard task. Add that to the fact you have no private access to a garden that doesn't have a properties windows facing onto it. Just terrible decision making here.
16	Because im a mum and my nearly 2 year old needs a garden somewhere to feel safe and doesnt have to hear doors being slammed when in bed and gets woken up. Also children over 10 should be in flats as they can got to the park all of the ones under need a garden where parents can watch them and there safe
17	This policy is not in the Best Interests of the Child to expect them to live in flats. "it is now felt reasonable"? Can you evidence this statement? Who feels is it now reasonable?
18	children under 10 should have access to a garden.
19	there are three semi detached 3 bed family homes in a row next to me. two of them occupied by couples and one is occupied by a single lady! it is unacceptable to leave young children in upstairs flats whilst single people enjoy family homes with large gardens. make people move out of houses they do not need then there would be no need to change the banding of these applicants.
20	kids needs a space to play like a garden even if small .
21	I think its unsafe for children to be in flats.
22	Children need somewhere to play outside like a garden as playgrounds are not always local and are often frequented by undesirables. Safety is also a concern, if there is no lift in the property, how would a mother of a toddler and a new born be expected to safely get her children up and down the stairs.
23	Children under 10 should not be made to live in a flat above ground floor level. Children need fresh air and places to play ect.
24	Children should NOT live in flats. Especially if there are no play facilities immediately outside.

No	If you disagree please tell us why
25	Children need access to fresh air.
26	Children should be able to access a garden safely and securely, this is not possible if they need to go down stairs or exit the property to gain access.
27	Children should have a garden to play in
28	There is a reason this was created and that kids shouldn't live in high buildings.... Not even worth the risk just waiting for something bad to happen.
29	Children in flats are at danger. Eg. Fire.... We're can they go. Can't jump out of Windows. Windows also need locks. I was refused. I put my own lock on my door at top of stairs to stop my children opening and falling as no way to put in a stair gate.
30	in My opinion this is not right every should be treat on this same right.for example one child ground floor with one bed size flat on this moment have to wait for moving longer and another child living in two bed room on top flat can moved early ??where is sens and fair treat?
31	Not nice for children in flats
32	Children should not be in flats. It is not a good environment for them.
33	I'm a mother to a seven month old and I'm 17 living above the ground floor. It's completely over crowded. Even if I didn't have my daughter it would still be over crowded and I'd still want to move out. They should be rated on circumstances not age. It needs to be re thought of cause at the end of the day it could be mental health at stake or anything else.
34	Children should not be in flats if possible to avoid
35	When you live such as I in ground floor and the flat above has children the noise is unbearable and children will make noise you can not hush them and expect them to sit still all day and night
36	Children should have access to a enclosed garden where they can play safely
37	small children should have access to a garden to play and learn. it is also comfortable for parents to be outside with children any time of the day not to prepare them to go just for an hour to the park. Children are also more safe to play in their own garden and they can have pets. it helps them to learn be responsible. they can also plant with parents, make BBQ, play with friends and be a family. why they need to wait until they are 11? bigger children prefer to hang out with their friends.
38	Because they might have more than one of two children
39	Dangerous for children
40	This should also depend on if the applicant is disabled, or has a health condition whereby living in ground floor properties is adequate.
41	children need a garden to play in
42	If anything children under 10 need a garden & away from stairs more than over 10. Stairs can be dangerous & gardens are more necessary for excitable young children.
43	Small children need access to a garden if at all possible.
44	This could cause great anxiety and fear I feel.
45	No. When I moved into my flat the pvc windows were such a design that they required no key to open them and there were no latches or locks to prevent the window being opened fully. My challenging child almost fell out several times as a young child. Window catches were fitted when I enquired. The other problem being that most flats aren't sound proof, I had 9 years of hell with my downstairs neighbour who moved in after me. Just because of daily living noise/walking about in my flat. 9 years of abuse and harassment from downstairs effected my health. I disagree with the above, placing children in flats does no good for either set of tenants and generates a high level of complaints.
46	Young children should not be bought up in enclosed flats! It is difficult and dangerous to carry all the stuff upstairs, children cannot get fresh air because it's difficult to carry everything up and down! Also, the smell of smoke and weed in the communal areas!!
47	It's impossible to get child's pram or car seat up flights of stairs with shopping etc


No	If you disagree please tell us why
48	Children should be in flats above ground floor it is too dangerous for any amount of reasons for a child to be housed above ground level unless in a house even though hard all children should have access to a garden that is secure for them.
49	Just don't think it's fair to have young children in high rise flats. These should be given to people with no children..children need to be able to play in the safety of their own garden
50	Need gardens and crying noise may upset other people in the flats.
51	I think people with kids should be housed in houses.
52	I think in the first couple years they should have priority its hard carrying shopping a pram then a baby up stairs and could be potentially dangerous.
53	Tenants with children under 10 should not be in flats above ground floor
54	My son needs the freedom of going out in the garden, under our supervision. Would not let my child to go out there if it was a shared garden as do not trust people to share my child freedom.
55	Families with children should be given priority when it comes to houses with gardens. Gardens are very important to children. People with no children should be in flats.
56	People with children should be given priority to properties with a garden....play areas are few and far between and streets are not safe for children under 10.
57	yes i definitely agree as i am in a 4th floor flat with 3 kids a double pushchair and a lift that breaks and cannot carry them downstairs on my own when my partner is at work!
58	It's very hard to get around with shopping in and out with children when your one a 1st floor and above flat. So if this change comes in all parents in 1st floor and above flats will become stuck.
59	im disgusted at this proposal, my daughter has been living in a second floor flat since i gained full custody when she was 10 months old , she has never had access to a garden ,no bath , no pets , no washing line ,tenants who leave rubbish in communal areas despite my many complaints , FIRE HAZARD , tenants who smoke in the doorway meaning the smoke drifts up into my flat if my windows are open HEALTH HAZARD , the main door lock left off the latch SECURITY HAZARD , in an area that has witnessed violence ,drunken behaviour ,bomb scares and drug needles next to the communal bin area !!!! , i will fight this proposal if it has an adverse effect on my banding
60	Every child deserves a garden if possible
61	Having a young child myself living in a 3rd floor apartment I feel having a house with a garden would be beneficial to younger children as well as the over 10's.
62	I don't think it is right for young children to be in flats.
63	I disagree because it is unsafe for young children. To live above the ground floor with the stairs accidents can happen.
64	I live on the 1st floor I didn't notice that I have got any priority. I'm on bronze band.
65	Children shouldn't be in flats.
66	Children shouldn't be above ground floor for safety reasons
67	Because it's a struggle with pushchairs up the stairs
68	Children need gardens
69	Well if you get a child under 10 in a top floor flat its not safe apart from the fact you got to lugg everything upstairs .
70	I feel that children need space to play as some children don't have that in flats. And don't have places to go
71	I don't believe children should be housed in flats
72	not sure about this
73	This should only be implemented if the children are of school age and can cope with stairs. A parent with small children needing to carry children and pushchair down stairs could be left almost housebound.
74	Children should not be above 2nd floor for safety reasons
75	Need a garden for children to play
76	children under ten should not be in flats, they need gardens and to grow up in houses. This is just an excuse because councils do not have the housing available.

No	If you disagree please tell us why
77	If there are lifts then fine but completely unacceptable for a mum with a baby to have to deal with stairs, buggy, car seat, shopping etc.
78	As lifts are often out of order or parents have to lift prams, etc up flights of stairs then it is unfair to put such families in flats.
79	no children should be put in flats above ground level.its dangerous have to haul prams and pushchairs and infants up stairs .there is no where to hang washing and not ideal for childless couples in blocks of where there are many parents trying to keep there children from screaming and running around.so as not to annoy neighbours .
80	I myself have a toddler and live in a flat we want a house as we think it's important to have an area (garden) of our own for her to enjoy her all her years to relax
81	High rise properties are too small to home young active children. They make a lot of noises affecting those living underneath or above. It poses a health and safety risk with the height/windows/balcony with children playing. Children need to have access to a garden as they grow, to play, feel safe and in a secure place, with room to run and exercise. We are currently in a small 2 bed flat and there is simply not enough room for our 3 year old to grow. Upstairs runs around and is extremely noisy and makes our room shake. Older children have the opportunity to go out, but all children under 13 should have access to a garden. Also pushchair and stairs do not go, especially newborn babies, having to lug everything up and down stairs. Women post caesarian are at risk.
82	I have a 2 year old and currently live in a first floor property with no access to a garden. I feel that for safety reasons it would be better to have access to ground floor accommodation and outside space which is safe for my child.
83	Adequate storage space is required for pushchairs and buggys as leaving a child unattended in a flat above ground level could cause accidents
84	I think it should depend on circumstances, some people with children under 10 are happy to be placed in a flat where as others have no choice but to accept a flat otherwise they may become homeless but they will still want a house in the long run. I think if people can be under occupied in house when they could be in a flat but don't move then parents with children shouldn't be forced to stay in a flat.
85	Small children require lots of equipment, including prams/pushchairs. Ground floor makes sense for under 10 year olds
86	I feel that children under 10 could benefit from a garden to keep them off the streets causing trouble and away from possible danger. E.g 7-8 year old may want to go out to play but not safe to do so and also may have no garden i feel that's cruel.
87	Young children should not have to live in flats, too many safety issues, windows, doors, close areas etc
88	It will be difficult for parents with young children in Prams pushchairs to get in and out of above ground floor
89	ALL children need a garden
90	Being a mother who had lived in a first floor flat with no pushchair storage it's very hard to complete daily tasks and ensure my child had regular fresh air due to difficulties in getting the pushchair in and out
91	Buggys are impossible on stairs and children need gardens to help their development!!!
92	I live in a top floor flat and find it VERY difficult carrying a child, a buggy and sometimes shopping up the stairs(no lift available) I also don't feel comfortable letting my little in the garden because of the other tenants and you never know what's on the ground because it isn't just your space. I think families with children under the age of 10 SHOULD be giving priority when it comes to houses or even ground floor flat with the possibility of a private garden.
93	Once again people with kids should not be in flats
94	I believe children should have access to a secure garden
95	I have been waiting for over 2 years to be moved out of my flat as my son needs a garden, if I'm put in to bronze band I may as well give up bidding , i have no chance
96	For safety, health & practicality reasons, I regard it as unreasonable to suggest that families with children should not have some priority for social housing relocation, if they are currently housed in an above-ground floor level flat.
97	Children need room to play, if there is no communal garden space they need a house.

No	If you disagree please tell us why
98	I live in a 1st floor flat with a 6 week old baby and cannot leave the the building very often as i cannot get the push chair up and down the stairs. It brings me to tears.
99	never had kids have you? and kids living above you is a nightmare too
100	You try SAFELY carrying a baby, the obligatory (rather large) baby-changing/food bag, and the push chair down many flights of stairs. In a house, or ground-floor flat, the push chair would be by the front door anyway. That can't be done in a flat above the ground floor. I don't think this would be as much of a safety issue once the toddler can walk, because you wouldn't be carrying the push chair any more.
101	Kids under ten shouldnt be in flats especially if therea more than one kids need a safe environment and a garden is a must
102	It is harder to get up and down a flight of stairs when you have a pram if your child is a baby.
103	The council need to take into account ALL circumstances before making a decision on banding ,physical health, for example, unable to use stairs because of a disability? health condition.
104	It's not safe for children under ten to live above ground level they need a garden to.play in
105	Children should not be in flats!
106	Children need gardens
107	Currently pregnant and with back problems I will find it so difficult to be on for example a 3rd floor flat , with a pram and new born baby if I go shopping. I will feel like I cannot go out as I will be stuck in my flat.
108	If you have children I think it's more acceptable to have a house, flats are impossible with children, no garden space and most flats have no lifts
109	My flat has stairs which are unsafe
110	No I live in flat with dangerous stairs that are extremely wide gap and no door! And a windowsill right next to it witch my toddler could climb and get over. Flats are small no room for the child! No garden for children! Neighbours hate the noise that children make! Dangerous open plans! This is popostrious!
111	Individuals with children need a garden and a proper family home.
112	Children should not be in flats children under 10 need to be in houses bungalows or ground floor flats.to much noiss is created by children in flats running around etc and this is not anti social behaviour merely a child playing .
113	i think all familes with kids should not be in flats
114	Its not fair move people with kids to a flat where is no outdoor they can play and Give priority to those one with kids above 10 or non kids
115	If a person has a child under the age of 10 there are hazards such as stairs and top floor windows that children can easily be in danger with! People with children under the age of ten should have the opportunity to have a ground floor flat or a house so it is safer for the child.
116	Even at nearly ten, some children, especially when in a new property may need a significant period of time to adjust to their new surroundings particularly at night and being upstairs places them at an unnecessary risk
117	Children need a garden
118	It is very heavy and unsafe to carry an infant/toddler plus a car seat and pram with shopping all the way up or down stairways. In addition, as a single parent I don't have people to help me lift these items and I can't leave items on the street outside either.
119	GOOD
120	everyone with children should be treated equally no matter what age the child is .

Q12 We have added in a new Bronze Band category to make it easier to let Sheltered Housing and Extra Care properties (which can be hard to let) by encouraging applicants without a local connection to join the register for these properties. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	13.3%	125
Agree	45.9%	430
No View	29.0%	272
Disagree	8.0%	75
Strongly Disagree	3.7%	35
If you disagree please tell us why		64
<i>answered question</i>		937
<i>skipped question</i>		179




No	If you disagree please tell us why
1	I see the benefit of doing this for hard to let properties, but aren't we opening ourselves up to challenge checking everyone's eligibility and LC and then allowing some on the register who have no LC- would this be seen as double standards?
2	U cannot expect people to move to a area tbwy dont know with no connections
3	as underoccupying a property with no smaller one being suitable for three years , and being a resident of the area for over 25yrs i dont feel its fair to let these to folk without a connection when theres been none available to myself for three years, and i pay extortionate rate of bedroom tax i can ill afford. so no. locals should have priority.
4	If these properties are so hard to let, why not let younger people from within the area rent them?
5	their are a lot of people over the age of 60 in this area waiting to be housed on such properties
6	Some local people may be unaware that they are eligible to apply for this type of housing. Priority should always be given to local people.
7	It would be better to lower the age limit to applicants to fill these harder to let properties. A need for Sheltered Housing or Extra Care is not all about age but about health/support. Also the second applicant's age alone can keep a person in need out of housing that would be better for the main applicant.

No	If you disagree please tell us why
	<p>These people may be ideal for this housing if given the chance.</p> <p>And these tenants need a local connection to help.</p> <p>Pity the poor tenant with a Sheltered Housing or Extra Care need with no family nearby.</p>
8	I have been waiting for an extra care property in Mendip District Council for approaching 2 years now. I appreciate I am disabled and require wheelchair access. However, I would regard people who do not have a local connection getting a property before me as a form of discrimination.
9	local people should come first.
10	If you have no local connection you should not be encouraged in to any property
11	people without local connection should not join the register there is numerous families with local connection who are on register who have been on for ages housing lists need to be made smaller not bigger
12	It is my belief that Sheltered Housing properties are often Bungalows. By letting "outsiders" to join the register it will cut the number of properties for local people therefore putting more pressure on local authorities.
13	Would it be worth trailing this in the area on bronze prior to opening it up to no local connection?
14	Bronze band applicants wait years for a property, adding a new banding is pointless. People should be allowed to join a housing register in any region where they wish to live.
15	Any such space would be used up very quickly and then local people with care needs would not be housed near their families and friends.
16	I feel you should work harder to meet local need: and work out what is the barrier to letting each property that is hard to let.
17	I think local applicants should have preferential treatment.
18	There should be a local connection for all applicants.
19	But if u have no local co section or are a couple of mo the out of the local connection period u are not considered for a property but u can bid, its a piss take.
20	I think this should only happen if there is a need as could be taken advantage of
21	Local housing should go to local people if possible
22	I agree for hard to let properties, as long as it is the last consideration, and doesn't stop people in the area being offered a place.
23	I only agree for applicants without a local connection to be allowed to bid for these properties if they are not bidden on my local applicants as there are a lot of people locally on the list and they should be priority.
24	Local housing should be given first choice to local people.
25	It takes long enough to get a place through bidding where I live in the Taunton but someone outside of town could get a place ahead of me & my partner, is not right. Just want a place of our own to settle down in Taunton.
26	It is extremely hard to find a local property on the sheltered housing property list. Feel anyone should be free to apply but priority be given to those with family and friends initially
27	I believe that people in the local area need to be housed first before outsiders.
28	Offer them to people who are on the list but don't need extra care
29	This might fill up the system too much, and people should not be encouraged to the area to no other reason than housing. They might be forced out of their own area.
30	the wait list for properties is long enough as it is without allowing others to join
31	if a person from another country then no it's not right or fair...someone from the next county is more local than anyone from another country
32	In this area there are too many families on the list for months/years without any hope of a property becoming available. I don't think a house whether it be sheltered or otherwise should be let to people without a strong local connection. If a family in the area needs it then it should be let straight away. Not saved just in case
33	they have no connection to the area

No	If you disagree please tell us why
34	I have been bidding for months in bronze band and am getting nowhere, if more people are added it will be horrendous! I've already been living with terrible noise nuisance for over 2 years now with no signs of escape!
35	Sort out your own locals with needs for property's before anyone else
36	No I think properties should be for Somerset people only
37	There is not enough sheltered housing around for those of us that need it. My OT says my husband really needs sheltered housing but there is non available near me
38	It would make it harder for locals to find housing
39	There is currently a lack of provision for young adults with special needs, priority should be given to look at using these properties for these applicants
40	think there is enough people in this area without taking people from outside area
41	We have enough of our own in the area without bringing in from outside
42	Because I've bidded on two houses in east huntspill and I've got local connection to the village and got no where so I'm sorry I disagree
43	i do not agree because this means that there would be less properties for people who have the local connection and are on the register.
44	i think there should be a local connection
45	As long as priority has been given to locals
46	they should always be offered to people who live in the area.places which are hard to let im sure if people want a property hard enough they will accept anything offered.
47	Local housing, local people. Simple as that. No more social engineering.
48	I'm sure all properties could be let locally. Lets face it we have a housing shortage. I think more help should be given to applicants to help them bid for these properties.
49	Homefinder Somerset should only be used by people with connections to Somerset
50	There's not enough of these properties for local people.I think they should keep theses for local people so people on lower banding have a good chance of being rehoused instead of bed and breakfast hostels ect which costs tax payers a fortune.
51	I am disabled and a bronze and cannot get a bungalow for love nor money I have local connections!! WHY should other people be given more priority??
52	should be kept for locals
53	If people without a local connection get to apply it cuts down the offer for those who have that connection already
54	As one on the silver band "local connection for help and support" register for a long while, I would find it disagreeable to lose out to someone with no connection.
55	In my (local) experience, such properties are at a premium: in West Somerset we have an increasing population of elder citizens. In my experience, the waiting list for such properties can be a long one.
56	The local connection policy should stand, otherwise it will create confusion among customers.
57	We have elderly still waiting on the list for these properties
58	this change would open the door to who knows who, you must keep the present policy
59	There just isn't enough properties for local people anyway so I think that the properties should be let out to local people who may not be in the sheltered housing band before being offered to people from outside the area.
60	We should always prioritise people with a local connection
61	I am struggling to be housed WITH a local connection, don't need to add more people to be given higher priority over those who are actually from the area!
62	everyone should have a local connection
63	These properties should be for local people
64	NO WAY WE HAVE LIVED AND WORKED IN THE LOCAL AREA WITH CONNECTIONS AND STILL CANT GET A HOUSE IF YOU LET MORE IN WITH OUT CONNECTIONS IF WILL MAKE IT WORST FOR ME NO WAY DO NOT DO THIS ITS NOT FAIR

Q13 We propose to remove emergency banding where a surviving tenant needs to move from sheltered/adapted housing because the requirement for the specialist housing no longer exists. They will be placed within gold band for tenancy succession. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	12.2%	112
Agree	51.3%	469
Neither agree nor disagree	31.4%	287
Disagree	2.8%	26
Strongly disagree	2.3%	21
If you disagree please tell us why		30
<i>answered question</i>		915
<i>skipped question</i>		201




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	depends om how long they have been a tenant
2	I've never know this band to be used for this reason.
	If a surviving tenant WANTS to move then emergency banding is better to let them move on with their life. But if these properties are harder to rent and the surviving tenant has just has a bereavement and most likely is elderly and in poor health themselves it would be hard to force a surviving tenant to give up their home if they should wish to stay even if the housing is sheltered or adapted.
3	A younger or fitter surviving tenant would most likely.not wish to stay in inappropriate housing and would want to move asap..
4	Should sheltered housing be dealt with by a separate list
5	I feel their case should be looked at in an individual basis and firstly determine whether they need help being housed themselves at all. If they have the means to source housing themselves etc then they will not need to take up a banding space.
6	Do not need emergency band for this sort of thing - they are not under any threat of homelessness
7	Again this seems wrong to me. If a married couple in their 70's or 80's are living in Sheltered housing and one of them dies surely by their age at least they should be allowed to stay. Who's to say that those same facilities won't be needed by the surviving spouse in the not too distant future.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
8	Please work with Social Services to assist the elderly for whom bereavement is a life threatening condition, quite often: publicise what you hope to achieve and why with your communities, forewarned is forearmed, always.
9	As long as the surviving tenant is awarded enancy succession, then it should be no different.
10	Properties with adaptations that are no longer needed by the existing tenant should obviously be offered to someone on the homefinder register as quickly as possible therefore rehousing the existing tenant is a priority
11	it depends on individual needs of these tenants. families with children shouldn't live in a sheltered or shared housing.
12	They may need to move closer for family, career support and in such desprate need for this help that they don't mind if they have to move out of sheltered housing as the support they need is more important
13	It's not there fault
14	Disagree only as much as, I would not want any one to be made anxious or insecure by this change.
15	Again can't see why you would limit someone's ability to move when adapted properties are hard to find anyway, surely it makes more sense to give them a alternative property as quickly as possible and return the adapted one to the housing stock ready for someone who needs it desperately
16	As long as its gold band
17	Am awaiting to get onto emergency band as currently having to live in emergency accommodation due to my own safety
18	i think that should stay the same because that will make too many people in gold banding and find it harder for people to get somewhere in gold. if someone in emergency needs somewhere that badly they should take what is out there and gold should have more of a choice
19	No make them wait their turn just like us single child free people have to. This whole system is very very unfair to genuine single people like myself.
20	i do not think its right to make someone move from what has been their home for a long time and rehouse them just because they do not fit the category of sheltered housing. i believe you can ask the person but not force them.
21	These people are usually unpaid carers and need support as well
22	They should be put in silver
23	To be respectful, there needs to be a significant period of time before this proposed rule change is enforced upon individual tenants. Announce the policy change, but accompany it with an 18month period of grace. Some bereaved tenants would move relatively quickly to free up wanted accommodation for others in need: otherwise, it would be known that in time, a change of occupation would occur - and would be practically supported by the local authority and help given to facilitate that change.
24	(I agree) BUT should the priority not depend on whether someone is in need of the sheltered/adapted residence? (eg. if someone needs that place, then make it emergency, and gold otherwise?)
25	old age is a disability, Home Finder makes it to hard for a tenant to move from sheltered housing to general needs housing
26	Because if their house needs adapting then that's not the tenants fault.
27	Not making best use of specialist housing. These tenants should be moved asap so that a tenant desperately waiting for that type of accommodation can get it asap.
28	it should be kept the same
29	You should have a separate band for people with emergencys or people who have special requirements instead of just chucking them on gold band as there are going to be so many people on gold band it's just going to get harder for the people that have worked to get onto gold band to get housing.
30	????

Q14 We propose to change the wording in the policy for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.2%	130
Agree	46.2%	423
Neither Agree nor disagree	37.0%	339
Disagree	1.3%	12
Strongly disagree	1.2%	11
If you disagree please tell us why		16
<i>answered question</i>		915
<i>skipped question</i>		201




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Unnecessary duplication of section (a)
2	The armed forces staff have subsidised accommodation. Arrangements to save during this period and earn credits against shared ownership (equity purchase) similar to pension savings might be a good way to go.
3	The armed forces covenant doesn't apply a date range to armed forces veterans for social housing therefore stipulating within the last five years goes against the covenant that Somerset County council and sedgemoor district council have signed up for and therefore needs to be removed from the policy
4	I agree if it actually makes it easier for serving or former members of the armed forces.
5	It is doubtful if this category should be a blanket policy - why should someone choosing to leave the service/job be given any priority? Often they are given financial reward when leaving - this should be used for rehousing
6	I totally disagree with point (a) and also disagree with it being backdated for 2 years. Existing tenants nor do people trying to get on to Council / Social housing lists don't get these privileges.
7	The effects of military service for your country lasts forever. Why on earth is there a five year limit? This 2 year backdating award is a laughable insult to military veterans. They should have priority over all newcomers if found to be in need - just like in most other countries - including south America and even Russia.
8	There should be no special treatment for armed forces applicants. It's their choice to pursue this career.
9	They should be treated the same as everyone else and have to look for private rent first

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
10	In para (c) it is difficult to understand why bereaved spouses/partners will receive additional priority for housing only if the death in service is linked wholly or partly to their service. Death in any circumstance would seem to be more humane.
11	Those who have served for this country should be a priority when it comes to housing...
12	because this would move people off the housing register as a priority to give servicemen and women priority and just the fact we have not got enough housing to go round this is not fair. i also think that persons coming out of the services these days should not be expecting to get housed from council housing or housing association.
13	Why should they be prioritised at all? Whilst in the forces they have free accomodation.
14	I'm very confused about all of this: Does the military not assist members of the armed forces? If they are currently serving, would they not have more than enough money to be able to afford their own house and not need the assistance of social housing? Why would the application be backdated two years from the date of the application? I assume that my application for housing wouldn't be processed this way....
15	I have been out for 7 years and just miss it and am not even close to renting a place and still have to live with my parent.
16	YES

Q15 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clear that backdating for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces will only be applied once. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	11.4%	103
Agree	45.8%	413
No View	39.6%	357
Disagree	2.2%	20
Strongly Disagree	1.0%	9
If you disagree please tell us why		16
<i>answered question</i>		902
<i>skipped question</i>		214



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	I disagree because I don't understand the thinking behind this.
2	Although I do believe it should be the MOD, not local councils that should take care of injured soldiers. Especially if they were injured in combat.
3	See previous statement regarding the Armed Forces Convanant
4	already stated this in last answer
5	why should members of the armed forces get special treatment to be housed before others who families work
6	I agree with this statement but not them having applications backdated.
7	As previous comment.
8	I think it should depend on whether or not they have had further issues since having to move. As when you are grieving you are in no fit state to make big decisions. With illness and disability symptoms could worsen also.
9	Because circumstance always change and if some one has served there country then their needs are important
10	they should be given priority housing,its given to refugees its not fair
11	as i do not understand this question
12	But don't agree that it should happen at all.
13	That policy should be waived if extenuating circumstances can be demonstrated: on a case by case basis.
14	If it has to be applied (I still don't understand why it's 2 years backdated from the date of application), yes, only once.
15	Should be able to apply for back dating however many times the individual wishes
16	Armed Services personnel and their families deserve as much help and support as they can get, nit to be bound up in bureaucratic red tape

Q16 We have made a change to make it clear that there is a 28 day time limit for applicants to advise their Local Authority of any change of circumstances. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	15.7%	142
Agree	62.0%	559
No View	16.7%	151
Disagree	3.9%	35
Strongly Disagree	1.7%	15
If you disagree please tell us why		32
	answered question	902
	skipped question	214




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	If i was unwell with my disability then 28 days may not be enough time for me to get organised. If i relied on others to help they may have higher priorities for my care than advising you of changes. So i guess i'm saying 28 days under normal circumstances is ok, but if health or compassionate issues are involved there may need to be discretion applied.
2	injury and its long term effects dont always become apparent until all surgery options have had time to complete the healing process
3	<p>28 days is very short.</p> <p>Maybe the change of circumstances could be a death or serious illness or traumatic event and 28 would be harsh.</p> <p>Also some people may not be aware which changes of circumstances need to be advised to the Local Authority and may miss the 28 day time limit in error.</p> <p>Some tenants may find it hard be so quick off the mark as to advice a change of circumstances without advice and getting advice can take time.</p> <p>Getting appointments to get advice takes time too if you take into account that not many work bank holidays and weekends.</p> <p>A time limit is good.</p>

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
	Maybe 56 days..
4	Add an appeals process should it take longer than this. Moving is very stressful and someone with a support need might not get through all their paperwork in time
5	This might not be possible for the tenant for personal reasons; and could force tenants into a financially difficult situation. I believe a less rigid approach must be sought after
6	I think a time limit could be extended dependant on the change of circumstances
7	Not long enough in some instances
8	I agree but the local housing authority needs to apply this change in circumstances within a reasonable amount of time that it does not affect the applicant for the next bidding cycle
9	Should be longer. People have very busy lives today.
10	Regular email contact or text contact should, ideally, be achieved.
11	not everyone can always do this on time or forget
12	if major life upheaval happens to a person/family there may be better considerations for them within those 28 days. make it twice as long to give people breathing space
13	28 days can fly quickly and if you really busy with new baby or moving, or you need to travel somewhere then 28 days is really short time sometimes...
14	Applicants may have other priorities & omit to notify LA in a timely manner. Agree that it is reasonable to expect prompt notification but each case is different and should be some leniency.
15	I agree but if there is a valid reason the applicant could not notify in the time limit this should be overlooked.
16	Depends on when this 28 day time limit starts? People have busy lives and things can get missed or forgotten
17	Disagree only as much as, I would not want any one to be made anxious or insecure by this change.
18	Communicating with local authority is difficult
19	If there has been a change in circumstances ie death of one party or the move to a home, the person concerned may be too distressed to think clearly and in such circumstances 28 days is too short a time to go through the stresses of trying to find somewhere to live and lose all the memories associated with their home.
20	some people may not be able to notify within the time frame, due to a medical condition.
21	some times it may take longer to inform the proper authorities to any change?
22	because a lot of the times it can take longer provide change of circumstance especially if you have medical issues and needs because you have to wait for reports, and also people can be much slower when they have medical needs.
23	Should be longer
24	In can take me 28 days or more just to accept a change, let alone notify somebody of it
25	If someone is ill they cannot interact or think about the changes to applications This is only one change of circumstances How ever if the reason for change of circumstances is financial then this should be declared in this time limit.
26	People may not realise or need more time. Circumstances may be difficult for some people
27	Some people may not realise or forget (in the instance of a new baby perhaps) to notify within 28 days, i think this is too short a time limit
28	Excepting if extenuating circumstances can be proven (medical reasons, bereavement, for example).
29	its difficult enough for those with out internet access
30	If the move does not make a change to their circumstances why is this necessary? There are many reasons why applicants may not report this. It should be encouraged but not a reason to take them off their existing banding/date. I find this discriminating.
31	A change in circumstances can be a big spectrum and take a long period of time like 2 months I.E letters which I gave had a problem with myself and there is no proof of the arrival dates on the letters! We should have a longer period of time!
32	Some changes of circumstances need more that 28 days to take account of

Q17 To help prevent social housing fraud we propose to stop applicants informing their Local Authority of change of circumstances by telephone, and confirmation will need to be either online, by e-mail or by letter. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	24.9%	224
Agree	53.2%	478
No View	13.5%	121
Disagree	5.7%	51
Strongly Disagree	2.7%	24
If you disagree please tell us why		60
<i>answered question</i>		898
<i>skipped question</i>		218




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	You need to offer the full range of options for people reporting a change in order to facilitate ease of reportage. It is well known that letters go astray in large organisations and many would not be able to afford the cost of recorded delivery. They would then have to ring to check you have received the letter. It adds complexity and confusion to the whole process for the tenant. I can't see how it would reduce fraud. Tenants intent on fraud will just insist they sent the letter anyway!
2	sometimes easier to make a quick call to inform of any changes which can then be logged instead of having to confirm it all in writing
3	To prevent fraud a physical meeting is needed where documents and information can be viewed and copied as needed
4	It's not always easy or possible to give details in writing or online, so changes should be able to be mad by phone with a password/security question.
5	Not everyone can write well and can be daunted by writing. Letters and emails can just as easily be fraudulent. Phone calls can be much easier and would help comply with the 28 day policy of notification. You should be able to complete enough data protection questions over the phone to cover yourselves against fraud. Most people have phones already and so would be more likely to want to contact you that way. Email/Online needs data charges and writing means purchasing writing materials. All more work than a phone call.
6	If you want to stop fraud, the housing officer should visit the tenants property in person
7	IN PERSON , not email or phone or letter , they can be fraud , applicants doing any change , should be done in person , with having the right paperwork and id with them .

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
8	They're may be problems for sime applicants who are of no fixed abode and/or have disabilities that could mean accessing online facilities or writing a letter could cause difficulties.
9	i think this may harm people such as house bound ill that may not have email at the time. as a hold yes its ok but needs to be a case by case thing
10	Phone is the easiest way for most people.
11	Post can sometimes be lost
12	one of the ways to avoid fraud is to see applicants and the paperwork face to face..
13	Sometimes emails get sent to junk box, letters are miss handled and lost, online could be too difficult for people who are a bit slow or cannot get access to it. It could be done in person or phone to ask for someone to come over if house bond and not able to get online or write a letter.
14	Or in person should still be an option
15	Sometimes things are harder to portray just in writing and this will take out the 'compassion' factor of being listened to.
16	Speaking to a person can be beneficial if any other questions need to be asked
17	there is no difference in proof of each accepted communication
18	It would be useful to know how telephone apposed to other forms of communication brings greater ability to defraud. however regardless of this some of your most vulnerable clients may very well have literacy issues and this brings greater stress when dealing with complicated forms or avoidance where a phone call where they can explain to a real human is easier and less anxious, some will not have access to the internet prohibiting online action- or only use in public libraries which is hardly a secure environment to display your details on a screen. For these reason i disagree
19	I do not see what difference, phoning a change in circumstance is to emailing or writing.
20	I think if done. BY telephone to still be put In. Writing as then its on paper and cannot be said that they did not receive the call!
21	What about disabled people that simply can't read I've poor eyesight or too ill to write let alone know how to use a computer. Things shouldn't be made harder for the ill
22	Not enyone has use of a computer?internet, or understand /feel comfortable with using one, for example an elderly person, or someone with mental health issues, learning difficulties. This needs to be taken into account.
23	I do not see why applicants can't inform any changes over the phone if enough security questions are set in place.
24	Not everyone is happy using computers
25	What if the applicant doesn't have a computer or can't read or write? How about going to the local authority in person could be another option.
26	I have been a victim of a neighbour sending unsolicited mail to me and even writing to the Council, claiming to be me, informing them of a personal change of circumstances which was untrue.
27	A person should also be able to do this in person at reception
28	Telephone conversation is often useful, u may always ask a question if u need any information
29	i dont think younger people will bother with email or letters and wont bother even informing the housing about the change as they cant be bothered. it is much easier to make a phone call.
30	Not helpful creates a further barrier
31	As long as some form of password is in place I cannot see a problem with telephoning - it is an immediate action to take
32	Not everyone always has available access to a computer.
33	How about a phone call followed by a letter or email
34	Some tenants are not on line!
35	it should be done in person .
36	Depends on change if simple should beagle on phone then should determine whether should be in writing
37	why not by telephone??

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
38	for some people they do not have a computer,also some have dyslexia,sme can` t write, .plus for some of the older people it is a form of contact.
39	Not everybody has access
40	not every one has email/on line and oldler people may prefer to speak to a human. Council has already security questions in place
41	i disagree because letters informing you of this will take longer and also not everybody has a computer to go online or email.
42	How does sending an email prove anything?!
43	For some people I think using phone can be very important as they may have a disability that stops them or makes it hard to write letter or have no internet and don't use email
44	Although some people are not able to read or write which maybbe why they ring instead ifnthey cant do anybof these then it may take them longer than 28days. Therefore get into trouble due to not being able to read or write.
45	I think you should be told by any form of communication, not everyone (especially older people) have the Internet or can write a letter etc, I respect my elders and there opinion should count
46	I think it is much easier to talk on the phone and explain your change of circumstances. And maybe each applicant has to set up a password to stop the fraud?
47	Can you also add - in person with ID
48	For some persons in a situation of upheaval or uncertainty, it would be unreasonable to refuse change of circumstance information by telephone in the first instance. It would be reasonable to accept telephone information with subsequent written confirmation within a stipulated period of time.
49	As long as the email address is readily available and a confirmation of the council recieving it can be sent back to the applicant.
50	People with mental health conditions and some older people do not have a computer and do not understand how to use one, even trying can be upsetting for some people .There needs to be extra help/ support and understanding for people in this category.
51	Not everyone will have access to be able to email or be loterate enough to write an email or letter. Some people prefer to telephone to notify of changes
52	I don't really like putting my personal details on the Internet and plus post can always get lost or put to one side and forgotten about.
53	It is sometimes easier for people to do this over the phone. Not everyone has access to the Internet.
54	An extra contact option is good. And phonecalls are sometimes quicker and easier
55	I think speaking to someone direct is much better!
56	They should have to do this in person , this will give them more responsibility and make it a deterrent to commit fraud
57	The tenant is still making a declaration by phone and such recorded calls would incriminate a fraudster surely , and thereby does not remove facility to applicants wishing to call
58	unnecessary. Not everyone has access to, or is able to use the Internet. Not everyone can afford the cost of stamps. There are many checks in place to stop fraud. This is disc rinsing for above reasons.
59	If you are illiterate, how can you do this?
60	THATS GOOD WILL STOP ALL THE CONS

Q18 We propose to change the wording in the policy to give applicants, who wish to keep rent costs at a minimum, the flexibility to allow more than two children to share a bedroom. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	9.2%	83
Agree	38.3%	344
No View	29.3%	263
Disagree	16.1%	145
Strongly Disagree	7.0%	63
If you disagree please tell us why		127
<i>answered question</i>		898
<i>skipped question</i>		218



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Encouraging overcrowding! Really this is a terrible idea. Research shows the effect of overcrowding on children is severe in terms of their development, success at school etc. This should only exist as an option as a short term and temporary measure.
2	might be too many people in one room if kids were older
3	No more than 2 children should be in a room
4	overcrowding and lack of personal space could cause problems
5	Leaves the interpretation of more than two children open to abuse. Could imply 4,5,6 . . etc able to share, which takes us back to decades gone by when disease n squallor were rife.
6	The children's welfare is at stake having more then two children sharing a space designed for either a single or double occupancy.
7	no no no! going back to the victorian practice of overcrowding will be bad for health and wellbeing of children
8	Overcrowded should not be an option as it is irresponsible.
9	I believe 2 children in one bedroom should be the maximum.
10	Agree with the proviso that the bedrooms are considered suitably large enough for more than 2 children. We slept 5 to a room but the room was big enough for us all to stand and get dressed for school at the same time, so it was ok.
11	All depends on the age and sex of the children
12	Unless space is taken into consideration. The smaller the house generally the smaller the bedrooms. It could be considered for very young children but not as a permanent thing for older children who should be allowed their own space.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
13	because children need to have space to play
14	If the bedrooms were big enough yes but this is wrong on so many levels!
15	More than two children sharing is wrong. Help should be given to tenants that can't afford suitable housing. Allow tenants to move into a bigger property at the smaller properties rent. UNLESS a tenant has a huge family intending to work the system.
16	it is impossible to put more than two children in one room i struggle with the size flat i have as they can hardly move about in there room so ideally i think we should allow our children different sex to have there own rooms.. if people have the same sex they should be able to share rooms as they dont need the privacy of what the oppsite sex does
17	Housing officers have to deal with the longer term consequences and the lack of ability and priority to move tenants in the future
18	Children of certain ages need their own space so don't agree with this
19	For the welfare of the children you should not be allowed to have more than two per bedroom
20	Children under 10 yes but over no and the same sex yes
21	the need a have a room
22	only if the applicant wishes to have more than two children sharing, not the rule that the bedroom allocation is reduced to make more children share.
23	That isn't fair, I've got a daughter that needs a dark and quiet bedroom due to migraines, where she is sick. Whilst my other daughter (a lady) has to share a bedroom with her twin brothers, and step brother who comes in school holidays and every other weekend.
24	the understanding of LAW , as far as I know , states that you can have 2 children of the same sex in the one bedroom , till the age of 10 years . and 2 children of both sex till the age of 5 years , and should not be more then 2 in anyone 1 room .
25	that is fine if it is a choice and not expected to keep three children in one room
26	two children and if they are boy and girl its complicate they need her/his space
27	Common sense should prevail - which I am sure it does in private rental property and home ownership.
28	it is u to families if they want more than 2 children to share a room a majority of rooms would be cramped if more than 2 children but that is up to them if they happy to others are willing to pay that extra rent for extra space to live comfortably this wording may jeopadise families that want extra room
29	Same sex children should share bedrooms however opposite should never share a bedroom after the age of 7
30	Three is too many. Also the council does not make the same allowances for those who need more space for micellaneous reasons.
31	children need personal space
32	Open to abuse by bad parents
33	This is going backwards, isn't this how people lived in the 1900s?
34	Children need some sort of space to play over crowding in bedrooms is bad for health
35	Housing should be provided so that no more than 2 children share a bedroom especially if older.
36	I fill there should be no more than 2 children sharing a bedroom due to there are some small properties out there however same sex children could share but only for a minimum time
37	Unfair for more than 2 children to share a room.
38	will they then be classed as overcrowded?
39	two children is more than enough for sharing
40	Overcrowding a bedroom is bad for the development of a child and younger siblings
41	Can see when this could be used and manipulated by the council against people, fine if not but could be the cause of a lit of upset if abused.
42	Unless the 1 bedroom is much larger than I double no I do not agree
43	More than two children to a room is ridiculous. This is not Victorian Britain.


Number	If you disagree please tell us why
44	If they are the opposite sex they shouldn't be sharing a bedroom it's wrong :/
45	This will only lead to complaints of overcrowding, and surely this is not acceptable for quality of child growth , this should be down to the council to find appropriate accomadtion at a cost the tenant can afford , stop excessive private rent beyond inflation
46	i would agree only if they are the same sex and under the age of 11 years old
47	Wrong because the room may be too small as the position we are now in, private rented and the property too small for the amount of people living here
48	This is just going to lead to overcrowding
49	You can not reasonably or morally expect 2 children to share up until the age of 10. Especially not when there is a brother and sister. This is just a plan to force parents out of council housing to meet the moral needs of their family and quite frankly I am ashamed that somebody even had the idea.
50	This depends on the size of the property age and sex of children
51	Is depends who is share room, how big room is and age difference, I think is absolutely not fair girl sharing room with boy of any age... That's just not working
52	depends on age of children
53	siblings are likely to be different sex, different ages, therefore if they share it would be morally wrong. Also how many bedrooms in a house have the room to accommodate 3 or more Children with enough sensible living space. I know we have a housing crisis but this is not a Developing world country.
54	Rooms are not big enough to allow space for this idea, when children are crammed together it causes arguments and so will disrupt the family and cause issues with the neighbours
55	I agree if their ages are appropiaate
56	Surely this is overcrowding, and would lead to other health issues?
57	I think it depends on the children's ages. My two boys are 6 and 13 and I don't agree with them sharing a bedroom as my oldest is going through puberty and my youngest does not sleep well as he suffers with asthma which keeps him awake with coughing. And my oldest needs his space.
58	I don't believe more than 2 children should hav 2 share a bedroom.
59	2 children to share while they are young is not a problem as they get older they need there own space more than 2 is not right
60	Rooms are packed with two in one room sometimes.
61	Not sure about this one because I cannot begin to imagine more than two children in one bedroom in this day and age.
62	On the whole I disagree, some properties I've visited on home finder have bedrooms so small that you can only fit a bed with no room for a wardrobe or chest of drawers. This would only work if the rooms in question were all doubles.
63	It is unhealthy for more than two children to share a bedroom
64	Every one needs there own space, even children, if people chose to allow more then 2 children to share a room that's their choice but it shouldn't be made a rule
65	Up to what age? each child needs there own space especially if you are in a small flat or small bedroomed house
66	Some families may be unable to allow more than 2 children to share a room, re wording it then makes it applicable that ALL families are to let there 3 children share
67	Not if there is a big age gap or different sexes.
68	I think that when a child is 8 and over they should have their own room
69	I don't think it's healthy to have more than 2 children sharing a room
70	More than 2 children shouldn't share a bedroom.
71	Children need space to grow and develop as individuals.
72	Bedrooms are often small and it make them overcrowded
73	not healthy for more than 2 children to share a room. could be sleeping in cramped conditions.
74	i would say that is down to the applicant
74	It is so wrong to have two or move children sharing a room.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
75	overcrowding different sex of the children and health problems disabilities children may have issues with 2 or more children sharing a room 2 is fine if they have no health problems etc but any more than 2 is hardly enough space!
76	Disagree with this especially if there is a very big age gap with the children. A 16 year old and 3 year old should not be expected to share a room.
77	As long as this does not mean that others who do not want to let their children share a bedroom will be expected to do so.
78	Is it going to reduce space for childrens? I don't like this.
79	Not appropriate to pile children into a room for cost reasons. Just because they don't have a voice.
80	Children should have there own rooms.
81	Think children should be given independence and once 7years old given there own privacy. Human rights
82	Sometimes a child needs their own room, and not idea to share.
83	There isn't always room for more than two children to share a room and I strongly think boys and girls shouldn't share a room from the age of 11!
84	agree as long as it is same sex
85	house are to small for that to happen .
86	more one bed accommodation needs to be built in this area to free up larger properties for families.
87	This depends on the age of the child it would not be appropriate for two teenagers of different sexes to share.
88	houses now a days have little rooms.. which will be a very tight squeeze for more than 2 children sharing!
89	There aren't properties with big enough bedrooms to allow more than 2 children to share!
90	Children should not share bedrooms, there is risks involved like siblings fighting and arguing, abuse issues from being made to share a room with your brother or sister.
91	Is that so you can reduce the waiting list and push more people into fewer rooms?!
92	A slippery slope to it being the norm! Rents should be affordable, not so expensive that people have to live in crowdped properties!!!!
93	3 children in one room??? Depends on case to case circumstances surly??
94	I think it depends on the individual families situtation
95	Sizes of rooms are too small to allow more than 2 children in 1 room. Children need there own space to grow and learn, more than 2 children will create a 'slum'. Too much noise, not enough space to play or for clothes. Anti social behaviour from older children unable to get there own space as they develop. Development of children is a scary thing for a child to go through, with hormones. Space for them is needed.
96	I feel I could have been housed month's ago If I had this option. Some people don't want a big house they would like one less bedroom as some children don't like there own room. It also extra expense. But don't move thm down banding!!
97	No more than 2 children in a room as rooms will be overcrowded no room for such things as wardrobes, desks ect
98	This is all dependant on the size of bedrooms, too many people in the one room encourages mould and damp and in the country we live in it is not possible to have windows open at certain times of the year. This increases heating costs
99	ITS AT THE LEAST UNHYGENIC
100	Depends on the sex of the children
101	More then 2 children to share a room is not acceptable in this day and age no matter how cheap you want the rent to be.
102	in some circumstances if one child has health issues and needs night time care the other siblings routine would be severely altered
103	Agree as long as it is customer led and not a requirement or a ruse to not provide more suuitable housing
104	I have three children in one room every weekend, This is very stressful. I would rather pay the bedroom tax for under occupying.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
105	This is disrespectful of the rights of children, preferring to place finance above their wellbeing.
106	assuming its an agreement and doesn't mean they will be graded as lower need. Depends on the size of the house.
107	council should provide decent living space
108	So long as the children do not mind, and the amount of bedrooms in their residence isn't too sought after - like 2 bed houses seem to be at the moment.
109	I live in a two bed private rented house and there is no room with three kids
110	Invading personal space!
111	More than two children in one bedroom would be overcrowding that room and would be unfair on the children.
112	surely this is overcrowding?
113	If the bedroom is large enough, there is no reason why 3 children could not share.
114	children need as much personal space as an adult, cramming them all into one room to save money is unfair and cruel.
115	No more than two children should share a room!
116	Personally I don't think children should have to share a a room
117	unfair on children of different ages to share
118	No if that tenancy says for a certain member of people then that it what it should be, it's there for health and safety, and the council should work better to find bigger homes regardless the extra rent! No more than 2 in a bed room!
119	Children need their own space and bedrooms these days are exceptionally small. I think 2 children is more than enough in one room.
120	Might encourage overcrowding
121	Not good for children to have to share to this extent. They need privacy and their own space.
122	I'm sure this contravenes with UK law?
123	More than two children in one bedroom is not a good reflection as they grow and their needs change.
124	Children should not share bedrooms if same sex.no more than two children per room
125	There is a risk of over crowding and psychologically damaging. And physiology shows that children and adults need there own space to grow naturally with their environment. If it's over crowd they will have no space to grow or develop!
126	It's cramped enough stuffing two children into your average social house
127	This will depend on the age and sex of the children. If it is children of the same sex then I agree, if of opposite sexes I disagree.

Q19 We propose to change the policy to make it clear that applicants with young adults away from home in full time education during term time will be entitled to an extra bedroom for that child.. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	18.0%	160
Agree	49.9%	444
No View	23.1%	206
Disagree	6.0%	53
Strongly Disagree	3.0%	27
If you disagree please tell us why		39
	<i>answered question</i>	890
	<i>skipped question</i>	226




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Most students in university rent their own properties and have housing allowances within their student funding. Government would effectively be funding these young people twice.
2	Young adults need a home base when back from uni. Rent is high, especially for young adults. This is a good idea and keeps young adults with in the support network of the family.
3	May be open to abuse. Another need, such as LD, MH and individual assessment
4	That wouldn't be fair, why should they have an empty bedroom, for weeks on end. When others are struggling for space.
5	There should be a time limit on this. It is not unreasonable for a child to sleep on an air mattress should the need arise
6	hard one only thing is when child leaves home for good ie job or getting partner may not be declared and applicants having extra unused room when another family would benefit from bigger property
7	If not there full time no extra bedroom should be allowed.if parents with access to children on weekends can't then they shouldn't either
8	If young children have to share a bedroom then older ones should as well
9	If they are not living at home full time why should they have a room that I uninhabited.
10	No, that is a room that is tied up when not in use for the majority of the year. Could be better used.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
	There is opportunity for the tenant to sublet this unused room to earn illegal money.
11	teeneger should have the same right like adults.
12	an unused room!!!
13	Why should they. You want children to share when they live there full time but it's ok for an older child to come back and have a room sitting empty for 6 months plus per year
14	I am not sure if there is a reason for this. students sometimes visit their parents ones a few months.
15	They are home for 6 weeks max. There is certain families that are in a 1 bedroom home struggling to have space for their child
16	Because people who have occasional family to stay, or parents with restricted access to their kids do NOT qualify for a property with extra bedrooms b, ythey are only allowed what they personally need . We need extra room for a carer to stay 2/3 nights a week sometimes but we are not eligible for anything more than the 2 bedrooms we need for ouractual family
17	that is taking up the room in the time that a family with kids could be using up!
18	if the young adults stay away from home there is clearly a reason there are far too many people waiting on the housing list for a extra bedroom for children young adults with disabilities etc proving that they need it more than young adults that are in full time education and when they come back they should adjust in to the home rather than having their own space
19	The child may not come home during holidays. Essentially the child has moved out.
20	Seems unfair that family's needing bugger homes Are being used up
21	You don't allow single dads an extra room for their children or take into account step families who have their children regularly so why should this be any different?!
22	If they are away majority of time then they don't need their own Room in my opinion
23	If older children have funding and entitlement for a bedroom in another house they are more than likely going to stay there and only occasionally come home so I don't think they should have a bedroom entitlement.
24	i donnt feel they really need a room although what happens when they have finished college/uni they could apply for housing themselves.
25	It doesn't make sense to provide a 'full time room' for a part time child.
26	Because the people that need housing you don't help quick enough but I'm sure you'd give someone an extra bedroom straight away even though the adult isn't even living there.
27	I have two extra children every week end and I am made to make all three of them share one room. They should be made to do this too!
28	Why should they be entitled to an extra bedroom when they would be there for approximately 12 weeks a year yet when i split from my husband and still had my 2 children for 26 weeks of the year i wasnt entitled to an extra bedroom as i wasnt receiving the child benefit. I think this is disgusting.
29	I've got two kids that live with there mum and I'm not aload another room for when they come over so no if they they don't live there then no room
30	But if they move out permanently then they should notify and consider moving....
31	Why should they have a larger house for an adult who doesn't live at home and clearly has accommodation elsewhere, what happens to that spare room the rest of the time? This house could be allocated to a larger family with CHILDREN not an adult
32	Disagree in partiall due to if they are away they must be living and are dependent on there own terms why cant they support themselves when they return by way of part- time/casual jobs in the local community.
33	Students do not always return home during uni holidays and often do not return home to live after leaving uni. If student does return home, bedroom may only be used for a limited time.
34	They should not be entitled to an extra bedroom which will sit unoccupied for more than half the year!
35	If they are not around for 40+ weeks of the year, they do not need a bedroom n
36	This is not essential ,and it takes 2 bedroom housing away from genuine cases
37	They don't need a spare bedroom purely for their children during half term!

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
38	Full time education/ students should be as independent as term time families will.welcome them home regardless or bedrooms.
39	NO WAY NOT FAIR IF THEY ARE AWAY FOR 3 OR 4OR 5YEARS WHY SHOULD THEY GET A BETTER HOUSE WHEN THEY DONT NEEDED IT

Q20 We propose to simplify the policy to ensure that applicants with evidence of need for overnight care are given an additional bedroom without having to provide proof of a qualifying benefit. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	18.0%	160
Agree	42.7%	380
No View	29.0%	258
Disagree	6.6%	59
Strongly Disagree	3.7%	33
If you disagree please tell us why		53
	<i>answered question</i>	890
	<i>skipped question</i>	226




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	open to fraud. if they need that much care they would be entitled to a disability benefit
2	open to fraud
3	Should provide positive evidence for this, and not just take someone's word.
4	every policy should be provided evidence for no matter for what reason , in a persons benefits
5	needs to provide a proof of qualifying
6	This will be totally abused by applicants and misinterpreted by those banding applications. Might as well allow all to have an extra bedroom!
7	I believe they need to provide proof of qualifying benefit. Everyone else has to provide proof for everything why should it be different to applicants who need care as a carer myself there are a handful of applicants who need overnight care 7 days a week to those families who need an extra room 7 nights a week and will be occupied every night

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
8	proof should be required in all cases
9	Proof should be needed or anyone could say they need it
	There are vulnerable adults who have 24/7 care and or support needs met by society YET their parents claim for an additional room when this room is only used perhaps for 14 days in every year, if that: so, please be vigilant:
10	care slips into dependency and being on the make a little too easily open to fraud
11	
12	Proof is necessary to avoid fraud.
13	I agree with this but it should be extended to allow a room if someone has a large amount of medical equipment they need to store
14	I have come across people who have lied about needing the extra bedroom because of a partner s health problems.and they have used the bedroom for another purpose. Is office ,storage.
15	Medical proof should be given so this isn't abused
16	I feel they need to show evidence to show they need overnight care ad i know somebody who said they do just to keep there extra bedroom.
17	I feel people will abuse this notion. And use the extra bedroom for a family member or for a child
18	Without proof people will try it on to get extra bedroom
19	Proof needs to be provided, as people will take advantage.
20	Proof of need for a carer to stay overnight should be given in official documents to prevent fraudulent claims for gaining an extra bedroom
21	U find a lot of people blagging it
22	could be a loophole to get an extra bedroom.
23	otherwise they could just say i need overnight care but not actually have the care and not actually need the extra bedroom
24	Anyone can do this with out proof
25	This could be abused if no evidence is required
26	If they have evidence of need they should also be receiving the relevant benefits. So proof of this should also be shown regardless of other evidence.
27	evidence should be submitted
28	Everyone should give some proofs. It's against equality.
29	It leaves the system open to fraud unfortunately
30	You should have to provide proof
31	surely if they need a carer then that carer should be awake all night and wouldn't need a bedroom?
32	No they should give proof of what they get and need
33	without benefit proof, that would mean you only had to get medical proof but doctors these days do not want to become a social worker by having to write letters of this sort for their patients, It also easier for a council/housing department to get information from a benefit department within its own council than getting a doctor to write letters.
34	Proof should always be provided to stop any fraud
35	I believe you should have prove or anyone will be trying it
36	Proof of need is essential, otherwise its too easy to circumvent the system
37	All qualifying proof must be shown so no fraud is possible.
38	If over night care is legitimate, there will be some benefit being paid. It is right & proper to check this to prevent fraudulent extra room claims
39	This should be proven and also evidence of benefits should be provided due to dishonest people
40	Have to provide proof for everything, this should be no exception

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
41	Feel that proof should be required as circumstances change all the time.
42	Cause it not one night that's where people have partners living there with out telling you and get all rent and stuff payed
43	They should have to provide evidence that they need the overnight support.
44	If client cannot prove, it could create fraud.
45	must provide proof, other wise every one will be at it
46	They should have to provide proof that they are getting this benefit and most overnight carers do waking nights. They do not need an extra bedroom.
47	Of course they need to provide proof! Do you want everyone claiming they need a extra bedroom for a carer they probably don't have!
48	Need to show evidence
49	They should prove this to make completely sure
50	Everything should have to be proved!
51	They do need a spare bed room, but if their need was that high they should be in a residential care home especially if they can't fend for themselves over night
52	Because anyone can say they need overnight care. Prroof should be shown.
53	WILL OPEN THE DOORS FOR MORE PROBLEMS DONT DO IT

Q21 We have reviewed the medical and welfare assessment process and are proposing to add additional wording to the policy to explain how applicants are awarded medical/welfare banding. Medical & Welfare Assessment(For the purposes of the medical and welfare assessments the applicant or the member of the household affected will be referred to as the individual). 14.1 The approach when banding under medical and welfare is to focus on how the individual's medical and welfare issues and their general well-being could be improved by a move to alternative accommodation. Account will be taken of: (i) The individual's medical or welfare condition; (ii) The affect the current property / environment has on the individuals medical or welfare condition; and (iii) How moving to an alternative property would help the individual's medical or welfare issues or improve their general well-being. 14.2. The Homefinder Somerset schemes reserves the right to request supporting evidence when banding under the medical or welfare criteria. Evidence from a third party is mandatory when considering the award of Gold or Emergency band. Any evidence submitted should be from a professional person who has first-hand knowledge of the individual and the environment they live in. The professional should advise of the individual's medical or welfare condition and give their professional opinion on the affect the current property / environment has on the individuals medical or welfare condition. From reading the above paragraphs do you understand the approach that will be used when assessing medical and welfare banding?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	81.6%	700
No	2.7%	23
Don't know	15.7%	135
If you answered no please tell us why?		16
	<i>answered question</i>	858
	<i>skipped question</i>	258



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	there needs to be more consistency across the county has to the levels of medical need and how they fit within the banding. At present tenants in Taunton are given lower bandings then they would be in West Somerset or South Somerset.
2	Still not clear enough. I agree that a medical person should submit evidence but not all would have first-hand knowledge of environment and a non medical professional (do you mean support worker) would not have the same first hand medical or welfare knowledge of a doctor. I don't understand WHO you mean by a professional and WHAT you mean by first-hand. A lot of doctors don't KNOW their patients or have ever been in their house.
3	you clearly don't read everything your handed on issues of a persons medical problems , and clearly in repect of me and my wife , I feel we were banded wrongly .
4	Look, I think so. TOO MANY WORDS. Consultation too long. Getting tired now - and I am not Learning Disabled. Suggest you get all your documentation out as Easy Read, as that helps everyone, not just the LD Community,
5	I don't have the time to read it. So no view.
6	It should be according to the welfare need. Drug users and alcoholics should get no special treatment.
7	Be ause like I was told by the council if u have or GI e a letter from ur doctor it goes in the bin, I have a heart condition I live in a place where a person drinks a lot and can get violent, but who cares not you bloody lot.
8	Evidence from a third party professional such as a doctor is not straight forward as you seem to think it is. The doctor always says that they are not supposed to write letters in support of their patients medical conditions, and they always charge a fee for doing this
9	However, the council should be taking all medical evidence into account, including GP letters.
10	In part ii change affect to effect
11	But you also have to make sure they are happy moving, no everyone wants to move and it could make them worse by moving them.
12	Complicated
13	I thought my banding would of changed from bronze to silver as I'm on collation and my dose is now 60g which used to be 40g,suffer from anxiety attacks and trying to move on with my life away from my husband. Account no 1092201. Mrs j boon
14	Confusing
15	This should also include reference to the individual's wishes, assuming capacity: make it plain that the individual is part of the process and not subject to it.
16	However, some medical evidence supplied has no effect on applicants' current award, and are kept in their current banding despite evidence being submitted, to the council.

Q22 Do you agree with the approach we are taking? Regarding medical & welfare changes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	72.4%	616
No	1.1%	9
Don't know	24.4%	208
If you answered no please tell us why?	2.1%	18
<i>answered question</i>		851
<i>skipped question</i>		265




Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	I dont agree that evidence from a third party is MANDATORY .
2	about time! the house im in created pts i have evidence going back to 2008 which has been ignored by council and aster staff for 8years now!!!!
3	I don't !
4	Consultative Proactive. YES
5	I don't have the time to read it. So no view.
6	I'm in favour of this approach. Having a medical professional submitting first hand knowledge is essential.
7	What's the point you never listen
8	If the council does go ahead with this approach,then surely all evidence from medical professionals needs to be taken into account.
9	Don't arrgree
10	It's not clear. It;s look like before elections something has to be done. Why now?
11	I don't really understand these questions, I've answered some.
12	More property needs to be built
13	I only agree with some of the changes. You need to consider the negative impact of some of the changes will to peoples quality of life m
14	i do not like being termed as individual, because we are all human and if we are in a two person relationship we should be called couples otherwise in the future i could see that using

Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
	the term individual could raise issues around the other person in the relationship keeping their entitlement to the property when their partner/husband/wife dies or goes into care.
15	5
16	direct evidence not always possible to obtain-also time might have passed but the need is still there.
17	In its present, draft format, is this a policy to be implemented for someone's own good, and if necessary, without their cooperation? If so (and I can understand how some circumstances may appear to necessitate such an approach) think again about ways to involve the individual in the process.
18	WONT WORK WILL CAUSE YOU MORE PROBLEMS AND YOU WILL GET MORE CONS

Q23 The medical and, or welfare issues of any individual can be assessed as follows:
Medical (i)Physical condition/illness: An assessment will be made taking account of the information provided by the applicant and any medical professional who has knowledge of the individual, their conditions and the effect the current property is having on their conditions. **(ii)Mental Health** An assessment will be made taking into account the information provided by the applicant and any professional worker who has knowledge of the individual, their mental health conditions and the effect the current property or local environment is having on their mental health. From the paragraphs above do you understand the medical assessment process?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.1%	722
No	2.0%	17
Don't know	13.9%	119
If you answered no please tell us why		5
<i>answered question</i>		858
<i>skipped question</i>		258



Number	If you answered no please tell us why
1	Again - I am too tired to do any more of this: Easy Read is the answer.
2	I don't have the time to read it. So no view.
3	For medical conditions you need to go to a doctor so see question 21 above
4	yes, please read the comments in the two previous questions.
5	Any professional worker is vague

Q24 Do you agree with the principles of the medical process?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.0%	658
No	1.1%	9
Don't know	20.4%	174
If you answered no please tell us why?	1.5%	13
<i>answered question</i>		854
<i>skipped question</i>		262



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	The process does not take in to account the financial pressures of high private rents when assessing mental health problems. Financial hardship and whether someone can afford their private rent is never taken in to account even though this can have a serious effect on mental health problems.
2	Too many words.
3	I don't have the time to read it. So no view.
4	I only don't agree because I worry it would become like an ATOS process and consultant/Dr/Medical evidence should be sufficient
5	I think there is a need to run these ideas by the doctors
6	K
7	J
8	When diagnosed with a lifetime condition than hospital assessments and doctor assessments should be enough without additional assessments being done.
9	i understand the reasoning but you must be flexible and realize it is not always strictly possible
10	Again, find an element by which the individual (assuming capacity) can also contribute to the process.
11	Don't make work for yourselves; a similar assessment may have already been made by another department, such as DWP for ESA, which they may be claiming.
12	All evidence needs to be taken into consideration.
13	NOT FAIR

Q25 Welfare (i)General Welfare An assessment of the property and the local environment the individual is currently living in will be made to establish whether the individual has access to reasonably comfortable, affordable and secure living standard based on the information provided by the applicant and any professional worker who has knowledge of the individual and the environment the individual is living in. Consideration of the general housing circumstances in the district, the availability of facilities, resources and services in the property and the local environment where the individual lives in will be taken into account as well as the ability of the individual to access them. **(ii)Financial hardship** A full assessment of the household's income and expenditure will be undertaken to determine if the cost of the current accommodation is affordable or if it is creating financial hardship that cannot be resolved within a reasonable period of time. From the paragraphs above do you understand the welfare assessment process?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.5%	708
No	2.1%	18
Don't know	13.4%	112
If you answered no please tell us why?		4
	<i>answered question</i>	838
	<i>skipped question</i>	278



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	How do you determine financial hardship and make it consistent for all applicants. One applicants perception of financial hardship may be different to another and that also may be the case for banding officers.
2	Don't understand what it means.
3	Too many words. Easy read and use pics, please This Consultation is too long: you are not going to hear from the people you most need to hear from, I suspect.
4	I answer Yes - kinda... (but I selected no to elaborate here) (ii) Financial hardship: See if the tenant is currently claiming Housing Benefit and/or Council Tax Rebate, as you will have the necessary info there if they are, and perhaps suggest looking into other benefits they may be eligible for If they are not, and are eligible, perhaps suggest them along with any other benefits they may be eligible for?

Q26 Do you agree with the principles for assessing welfare?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	76.7%	641
No	1.7%	14
Don't know	20.5%	171
If you answered no please tell us why?	1.2%	10
answered question		836
skipped question		280



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	Financial assesment should be on the person applying for housing and their partner/spouse, I dont feel financial assesment should include the income of any children i.e young working adults within the household .
2	Some rural areas would automatically be seen as negative for someones general welfare due to transport links
3	welfare -is very not objective as write above
4	because everybody's financial circumstance could change overnight, because a person could lose his/her job, have overtime reduced, hours cut, you could be made redundant, sacked,you could have ill health and become terminally ill, your partner, wife, husband could become ill and you would have to give up work to care for them. I believe that a grace period of a month to allow a person to have a chance to sort out there life.
5	I
6	This is not entirely factually-based: some opinion will be involved in the assessment. It is fair to include the opinion of the individual also (assuming capacity).
7	So long as that assessment hasn't already been done by another department, Yes.
8	I
9	Fair way of approaching things
10	Debt from credit cards should not be taken into consideration as this is their personal debt and should not be used to help a case

Q27 The Government has changed the law to allow existing tenants the freedom to move for work. Therefore we propose that where an applicant has an offer of permanent work they will be able to join the register immediately Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	23.6%	195
Agree	49.8%	411
No View	19.9%	164
Disagree	4.4%	36
Strongly Disagree	2.4%	20
If you disagree please tell us why		36
<i>answered question</i>		826
<i>skipped question</i>		290




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	As long as this is proven, however they should not be given priority over other applicants and be awarded band according to housing need.
2	a local person with health issues or who is just local should take priority to an incomer who may have a job offer that in fact a local person could do, support local people first.
3	We should all be equal there for we should all have the same rights
4	There shouldn't be an automatic right to housing because of a job offer the applicant should go on the register as everyone else and not be entitled to special treatment
5	a good example, holiday camps rarely employ local staff, most of the edf jobs will be outside contractors. not only are locals missing out on jobs but this will see them waiting even longer for housing too.
6	Priority should be given to those already living here, not someone who likes the idea of living here
7	I disagree because there are people on the register who have permanent work there is more public transport ie taxi bus train than there are houses to go round we need to reduce the housing register list but a job should not make them join register they may play the system then leave job when housed a job is not permanent but family connections are
8	local people with local connection, e.g people that has lived in an arrear most of there lives should have first priority
9	Important that people can take up offers of work with minimal issues
10	This should of happened ages ago. My daughter will have employment and university 70 miles away and is finding it difficult to move!
11	Local communities need to be sustained before allocating houses to people moving in. It is incredibly easier to fake a job offer to get a more desirable place to live.
12	Our area already has local people who have been on the register for years , local applicants should always be given priority.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
13	It's a hard one, because whereas people in work with crap wages need somewhere to live. So do people who can't work due to individual circumstances. I don't think there should be any difference between the two.
14	need to take every case individually, depending on applicants circumstances and how it might let down other applicants in great need.
15	Other council do not let this happen as I work in Bristol and asked to join another council and was denied
16	i think a time of NO LESS than 3 months trial of the new job should be undertaken first, some jobs will end after a trial period of 12 weeks.
17	Should be the same rule for everyone
18	no .i have been on regiister for 6 years and no help of soacial housing .if they want to move then they find their own accomodation
19	no because they should move house first and then look for another job if they want to live in that area.
20	Local people are desperate for housing, so allowing outsiders, especially people who aren't from the uk is completely wrong
21	there are people in dire need of rehousing.if someone finds work in another area then they should be removed from the register.
22	Depends what banding they are given. As long as it's low priority it's fine but they must not be allowed to jump to the high banding. They must sort other arrangements like the rest of us in bronze who are not important have to.
23	As previously stated
24	As a small village there's not enough property's for locals if someone from out side the village got a job on buttlins I don't think that intitles them to go on the housing list and get a property before locales
25	If there are local people in need of housing I feel that they should take priority.
26	i understand if you have a job you need accomodation but i do not think that the person should take a priority as if you have been on the register waiting for a property, then they would take priority over you. They should have their own seperate banding where they can take priority over other people who have jobs.
27	if you are going to make exceptions for that then why not for other circumstances too? it is still a created situation so should not get higher priority
28	I'm waiting (for years) and have a permanent job - so why should somebody with an offer of work, which brings them into the same situation as me, have a priority over me?
29	I think a family link to an area should always take precedence over a work link
30	Just because someone has finally got a job shouldn't mean that they get rehoused straight away. Other people have jobs and have to travel to them so why can't they?
31	Because it really is unfair for you to expect people that have been waiting years for a property to suddenly be made less of a priority !
32	An offer of employment, but not come to fruition.
33	That house can be used for people who would actually use the house!
34	I'm in full time work and feel like we get skipped or over seen as it seems cos we work we can afford private rent. This is not the case as I was a student and have for example student debts therefore I am paying back those current debts but I am still in long term pernment work and just want to be in a good financial position for my future
35	They should be in the job at least 6 months before they are given permanent residence in that area
36	If it's a tenant from Taunton Deane I agree but not if they are from another area. There's little enough housing for Taunton tenants

Q28 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clearer to applicants the importance of a quick response to landlord of the property. Current Wording Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy Discrepancies in your application will be referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding. Each applicant will be given the opportunity to view the property before making a final decision on whether to accept or refuse. Proposed Wording %Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy Discrepancies in your application will be referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding. Each applicant will be given the opportunity to view the property before making a final decision on whether to accept or refuse. Applicants will be expected to view a property within 48 hours (following contact from the landlord) and will be expected to make a decision on any offer within 48 hours of receiving the offer. Is the new wording clearer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.1%	695
No	2.8%	23
Don't know	13.1%	108
If you answered no please tell us why		16
<i>answered question</i>		826
<i>skipped question</i>		290




Number	If you answered no please tell us why
1	i think better puncuation, its very hard to decipher, dont understand either versions!
2	Tenants with a disability will be penalised by the 48 hour timescale. Often they need to be accompanied by a carer or professional, who may not be able to discharge their other responsibilities within such a short timescale, or they may be issues with arranging transport.
3	Yes, the wording is clearer. However, I feel that people should be allowed 48 hours to make a decision after viewing the property, rather than 48 hours after the offer has been made.
4	I have on occasion had to wait more than 2 weeks from the date of being offered a property before it was available to view so how could I make a decision in 48 hours? Also for me to view a property within 48hrs of notification is not always possible as I have to arrange for suitable transport and for someone to be with me. I recently viewed a property that needed a lot of repairs, including all floors renewed and the kitchen being totally replaced. The person that showed the property did not know what repairs were to be done so I had to wait for the

Number	If you answered no please tell us why
	housing association to call me the next day with the details but they didn't know how long the repairs would take. The property needed to be almost completely gutted out and all they could tell me was that they had a completion date for 3 weeks but that due to the amount of work needed that date was likely to change. How am I supposed to make a life decision in 48hrs when I didn't even know what the property would be like once completed! As it was, this property was unsuitable due to the very long uphill slope from the car park being too much for me. Had the photo on the lettings advert been of this actual bungalow instead of showing one on level ground I would not of bothered to bid on it.
5	easy word please
6	Not sure if 18 hrs is right
7	its all long winded need to simplfy
8	Don't understand
9	48 hours it is imposible for working person sometimes to take leave. It shouldn't be such short time given.
10	If a person is away or on holiday or sick then 48hrs is an unfair time limit.
11	no because i feel that giving you 48 hours to decide on any offer and to view a property is unreasonable if you live out of the area as people who are unemployed, sick, or even if you are working you cannot just get a day off, or you cannot find the fares to see the property
12	The proposed wording makes the process clearer, also: informs applicants on what to expect from the process as well as the timeframe involved.
13	<p>1st: The applicant is given 48 hours to both view the property, AND is expected to make a decision within 48 hours. Are they the same 48 hours, or does the applicant have 96 hours in total?</p> <p>perhaps reword to say something like: Applicants will be expected to view a property within 48 hours (following contact from the landlord), and will THEN be expected to make a decision within 48 hours, on any offer GIVEN AT, OR AFTER THE VIEWING</p> <p>2nd: 48 hours? Some employers may refuse to grant an employee time off to view a property on such short notice. Also how about arranging childcare, travel (time and expense), etc? Only being given 2 days to sort everything would be fine in the property is just around the corner, or have their own transport, and the tenants have no babies/toddlers!</p>
14	Wording is more specific but takes no account of particular circumstances. I do not agree and feel discretion should be used.
15	It would make it easier for the applicants is comprehensive details and numerous photographs of the property were put on homefinder this would save a lot of wasted time viewing properties. This was also save these little authority time and money.
16	Do not agree with viewing in 48 hours. This is not always possible i.e. Working applicants unable to get that time off work so quickly or applicants living quite far away or unemployed applicants who cannot afford the public transport costs within 2 days.

Q29 We propose to reduce the timescale from eight to four weeks for when a Local Authority can place an expression of interest on behalf of accepted homeless applicants who have not been proactive in seeking a permanent home. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	17.1%	141
Agree	49.3%	407
No View	28.9%	239
Disagree	3.1%	26
Strongly Disagree	1.6%	13
If you disagree please tell us why		28
<i>answered question</i>		826
<i>skipped question</i>		290




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	if they are not being proactive then they are probably happy with there current circumstance
2	Homeless people may need a full eight weeks ,due to no permanent access to phones,computers. . etc. Mental illness such as anxiety/depression can MASSIVELY hinder a persons ability to be pro active and longer time for such people I feel is a must.
3	again dont fully understand...how do you define proactive, and where can you put folk when you have sold off housing stock and failed to build enough local affordable housing.
4	not sure i understand what the above means
5	I don't understand the question. I disagree to giving an opinion on something that I don't understand. If I don't understand the wording I expect others don't either. This makes a nonsense of this survey.
6	Do these applicants need a support worker. Is an informed consent form/process completed so that the applicants are aware of what's happening?
7	should be their choice
8	I disagree with because although applicants may be homeless I feel they should be actively seeking a permanent home
9	Four weeks can be a short time especially for someone without Internet.
10	People with children in remote areas may need 8 weeks to find a property that is near child's school and family , neighbours , friends - work and supported and having to move too far from all of these could cause isolation

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
11	If a person is not proactive in looking for a home that's down to them.
12	If they're not proactive they can't be that desperate for a home.
13	I am not sure if this 4 weeks is enough to check real behaviour of anybody.
14	Four weeks is far too short a time to find a 'home' not just a place to live in probably too far away from family friends etc.
15	Don't think it's fair to do this, why should you do this if no property is advertised in the area you want to live in. I don't think it's fair to be forced to go live anywhere you want to put them.
16	it sorts people out for need of housing a lot quicker
17	not everyone has access to a computer and you send nothing in writing anymore
18	Homeless is the easy way of getting a council property
19	I do not even understand the question.
20	Out of order!! If they were homeless then they would do anything to get a house
21	You need to take into account peoples specific needs, they may have reasons for needing a certain property or area.
22	it should remain as 8 weeks to give homeless people a chance.
23	Persons who may be traumatised by circumstances need respect, greater support and practical assistance: the wishes of the applicants must also be part of this process. I think this is a really useful policy change.
24	I do not understand the implications to make a judgement
25	If they haven't been proactive in looking for a permanent home for themselves then they should have to wait like everyone else.
26	If they aren't actively seeking, surely they aren't desperate!
27	This could very well lead to many problems. I think this contravenes with human rights. Who is to say someone has not been proactive? Perhaps they do not find the properties available suitable for whatever reason good to them.
28	The use of the phrase not been proactive is ambiguous as there may have been no suitable properties available so no bids were placed but that would appear as if no effort was made in a particular cycle

Q30 When an applicant wishes to be considered for a property we ask them to make an expression of interest on that property. Previously we called this 'making a bid'. Do you prefer 'expression of interest' or 'making a bid'?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Expression of interest	54.2%	448
Making a bid	37.4%	309
Don't know	8.4%	69
If you disagree please tell us why		12
	<i>answered question</i>	826
	<i>skipped question</i>	290



Q31 Catch all – any other comments question – general applicant comments.

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
1	Some of your questions don't seem to make sense. Perhaps you can reword them.
2	I was unsure on how to answer most of the questions in this survey. I admit, I struggle at the best of times to understand 'formal' documentation and feel I cannot answer some questions, as I feel I do not have a context by which to answer them by.
3	I think the time available to take part in this survey should be longer so that more people see it and are aware of it.
4	Na
5	My landlord is selling the house I've lived in for the last 8 yrs. more help should be offered to working families like ours who are being kicked out of their home through no fault of their own. I've been bidding for properties for over 2 months and am still bottom of the list. You won't help me until I am homeless. This is wrong. We are on minimum wage so can't find £1400 from nowhere to go private. We need help but aren't receiving it
6	i hope the changes will make it fairer and stop any discrimination from staff at aster and mendip, which i have experienced in the past, dealing with them made me ill, being ignored and treated badly defamed my character, and drove me to the brink of suicide.
7	I have been on the list for many months. Any changes you make to the wording will not prevent exploitation of a system that doesn't appear to cater for those other than completely reliant on benefits. There is no room for people in my position of being a single parent and yet working. There is never any decent opportunities for a my position to part rent /part buy etc in my area. I see people around me given a brand new home to live in etc without even trying to look for work. There is never any shared ownership availability and I am seeing no improvement in the fairness of the system. People are still abusing the benefit system as a whole and it is all too obvious and common. There are others who buy up all the help to buy properties before we have a chance, and then rent them at extortionate prices. I fall through the gap by being an honest and hardworking member of the community and yet I have no option but to live at my parents' address. This is a major issue, the system as it stands lets people like myself down and that needs serious attention and consideration.
8	no it seems very clear to me thank you
9	Because I am interested only in accommodation in Tatworth, I find it hard to navigate the Availability lists. I am no longer fully conversant with research techniques, so have to scroll through every item and read at least its location, which can be quite tiring at 79 years of age.
10	I would like to see some consideration given to bedroom allocation. In a lot of cases the dimensions of one bedroom are not big enough to accommodate both a husband and wife particularly if more space is required to store important equipment ie wheelchair breathing apparatus. Also if a disabled persons carer is in hospital or ill and needs over night care from a relative this is not possible as nowhere for the carer to sleep. This also applies to young children who need separate bedrooms due to space restrictions for furniture and for storing equipment, toys etc.
11	There should be a limited time in which housing associations should contact winning bidder, I.e. 1 week. Just to give reassurance to bidders that they know where they stand.
12	All updating of policy is good and asking for our opinion is great. Well done. But not all people are equally capable. I fear for the ones that need help in understanding the application process. Not everyone has someone they can turn to for help. These are the people that stay in the housing that is not suitable for them or is not helping their medical or welfare conditions. Filling in a form or survey is a huge task for some people. I hope by giving you my opinions that I have helped. helped.
13	I don't think that landlords should be able to refuse you a property if you have rent arrears if you have a payment plan and are sticking to it and also I don't feel that you should have to have a local connection to certain areas in order to be able to be given a property there I feel this is the council being too picky about who can live in certain housing
14	There are many typing and format errors in the policy document. These pass spell check. Section 14 has repeated paragraphs as an example
15	I have been on home finder for 3 yrs as I cannot afford the rent I am constantly in arrears and want to down size, the property I have bid on I've been skipped each time

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
16	Some people need more help than others
17	Your revised policy on banding of homeless or threatened with being homeless, seems to suggest these cases are granted automatic gold band placement. Policy Ref: 26.6. Clarification on this issue would be greatly appreciated. Many Thanks.
18	good
19	I do not agree with a spare bedroom being allowed for parents whose children are in full time education and living away from home during term time but no spare bedroom being allowed for fathers, who have their children regularly.
20	With all the homeless people around the UK, David Cameron needs to stop bringing in foreigners, and house the UK people first. We were born here!!! But they get priority, so wrong.
21	I think that those in my circumstances should be moved along the list quicker. I'm a single mum on benefits in private rent and struggle when it comes to paying towards that rent. To help myself and my child, I'd be financially better off in council instead of struggling each month to live.
22	I wish there was more feedback when I have bid on a property On why I wasn't successful on the bid And why is it always giving property that are outside my area of interest as if I was interested I would have put that down on places I wish to live
23	over all , I clearly think that some of the fields on this policy are wrong , the staff who deal with new and old applications should very much know how and to deal with any type of case , when dealing with all matters within home finders , and my point on this matter is , you don't , and clearly need more teaching on applicants at hand .
24	im on bronze band,"adequatly" housed, i dont know how you can make that judgement if youve not seen the property.
25	instead of bid, why not use choice?
26	NONE
27	I am sure that when local councils began the process of out-sourcing the letting of accommodation to private firms - it was done with the best of intentions. I am 59 and recall my Grandfather saying that local councils exist primarily to fix the roads; empty the bins and provide accommodation for those in need - but that they tended to involve themselves in everything OTHER than their core purpose. He was right. I object to the private firms cherry picking the best financial profiles - like a mortgage broker. If we were eligible for a mortgage we would take one! We desperately need to reduce our monthly outlay now our children have left home - but can't get out of a high and increasing private rent. Obviously we can pay a lower rent but are not eligible to Yarlinton apparently for three years - as we were talked into going self employed. Stephen and Julie Cockett.
28	To get the right people to give you useful feedback send specifically to individuals that have recently had their housing needs met: you will, in my view, need to do some face to face interviews as their are people without IT access, still.
29	I really think that applicants who have their children stay regularly should be considered for an extra bedroom. I don't feel that 5 children of different sexes should have to share a bedroom for 2 nights a week! In some cases parents with a one bedroom property have their children staying with them which means the front room is regularly having to be used for sleeping!
30	I would say it will be clearer and easier to understand.
31	I would like to see more on the private rental where a property is rented by an applicant but the property is in dis-repair such as damp issues causing mould and this affects family members who have an illness who visit/stay at the property
32	4 weeks is not enough time for disabled person to let you know about changes, due hospital visits, doctor appointments, operations etc
33	Thank You.
34	Yes I think it very very unfair for a single man with no money or a place to live to come up with two months rent to rent a private house. And the bond seem u have is a joke it doesn't work for me as I have debts and only works if u have good credit which is discrimination. And apart from that there is nothing else the council do to help u. For me the council is useless and don't do a thing for me when my situation is I'm sleeping on a couch in my xs house. And when I

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
	move out at the end of March I have no where to live and this means nothing to my council. They should always go that extra mile but they don't they let u down always
35	More affordable housing needed in the villages of South Somerset
36	It all sounds good. I hope it works. Good Luck..
37	how can an existing tenant stay on in a property when they have given notice they are moving, then on the last day, when the existing property has been referred to someone else, the tenant decides they won't be leaving. The tenant has shown they're no longer in need of social help and can afford to move on.
38	Homefinder should be there for applicants who are working and bring value to a community first and foremost. People with drug and alcohol problems should not be accepted.
39	Sharing bedrooms are so wrong
40	The application form needs to be a bit easier to fill out as gets confusing and i think its wrong when a family of 5 people get a property thats to big for them when 2 boys can share and there's biggef family's that lose out as the banding is different both on gold band both mediical needs but smaller family gets priority no matter what a family of 8 or more whos allocatced fir min 4 bed max 5 should be aloud to bid on all kinds of properties that are that size the system is unfair to some families
41	i qualify for a gold band home move i have been a victim of crime and violence yet john hart refuses to move my son and myself. we are stuck on silver with about 16 properties a week and only 2 of them taunton
42	I've been in the council list for ten years this may...you have done nothing to help my family needs. Any opinion the public make, makes no difference to the people who need it or deserve it!
43	Some older people like us may need a second bed room for noise and other reasons.I believe we should be allowed to bid on two bed room property with no extra banding or priority.
44	i believe people who have been on the list for a long time should be given preference over people who are new or newer to the list also there should be no internal moves as the Aster housing group currently does.
45	No
46	only that if you have been on the housing list for some time you should be able to move up a band especially when your age is getting near to retirement age as to settle in before you retire as I have been waiting now for some time .
47	No
48	I think that adding friends should not be allowed. if they decided to start a family , will their new family jon the main tenant? I would like to know the policy before applying for a Council housing because now I am not sure what the rules are and why some people can have a council help and some cannot.
49	Answering no view, just means I am unsure and is not an indication that I am not interested.
50	Why cannot there be a system where older (65 @over) applicants in private renting are given a higher banding ? Those of us in that category are fearful for our housing stability
51	In the private sector as we enter old age
51	None
52	No further comments.
53	Each partner should make clear their criteria for selecting tenants and inform applicants why their application has been unsuccessful. Explanation of 'skip' would be very helpful to understand why preference given to other applicants and own not considered!
54	As long as the client/tenant and your wording is in our favour, then you are doing the right thing, look at the French system, it is simply put, min term of 3 years, no one is ask to leave in the winter months for any reason.
55	I live in a flat with a young child myself, both me & my child have fallen down the stairs, accidentally & some of my falls have been due to my epilepsy. But the point is stairs can be more dangerous for young children ie'under 10' than children over 10 as they are less accident prone than smaller children.
56	Totally Pathetic waste of time these CHANGES,what should happen is councils that sell housing stock I.E Mendip in 2001 that sold to Flourish homes should NOT retain Housing officers on 30k plus a year when already the Housing associations have Housing officers.

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
	The Tax payer/rent payer is paying twice for the same Job. The savings could then be spent on HOUSING not unwanted ADMIN!!!!
57	I think the policy is good,I have been applying for housing for the past 13 yrs and get no where because I have my own property, we cant afford to buy anywhere bigger and get penalized by magna because of it, its just not fair. We have always worked never claimed benefits and get nothing.
58	No coments
59	When completing a form for bidding, it is asked which area the applicant prefers to live (wording may not be exact). It then should be refined to the area/town the applicant would like to live & not have other towns on the bid search. e.g I choose to bid for Taunton properties, Bridgwater or Yeovil (just an example) shouldn't appear on my eligible properties to bid for.
60	Why are local tenants not always given first priority? I live in Shapwick and needed to stay here, except, when a suitable house became available on 6 Northbrook road a family from Birmingham moved in and used another adult with them to give them over crowded status. There is now only 2 adults and two children in that three bed house as the third adult moved out once they got the property. This is fraud and should be tackled with your system.
61	I am currently living in a 3 bedroom house in Henstridge but would like to move to Bruton but am only able to bid for 1 bedroom accommodation which I feel is unfair as I would like 2 bedrooms to allow my grandchildren to stay. As the only 1 bedroom properties are either warden assisted or flats and I do not want this I cannot see me I moving anytime soon. If you would consider me having 2 bedrooms that would give me a much more incentive to move. I would value your comments on this. I have telephoned to express my thoughts on this but am met with "No that will not happen". Thankyou
62	Been struggling to find property for three years and don't seem to get anywhere. something needs sorting to make it better for people like us wanting to move to new area as we be moving from one hone to another
63	my local connection was to work in this area for 6months before I could join the housing register, if I understand it correctly it's be changed to 6 months. Will the 3months longer that I had to do be added to my waiting time on the housing register ?????
64	I don't understand why i have been put on bronze when i have 4 local connections in somerset and i used to live there. I think it os wrong to do that. And why if soon allowing young adults at university an extra room was i informed i would probably lose a room too for houses i bid on?
65	Something needs to be done to sort it out. Me and my partner have been on the exchange list for over 3 years and haven't even had ONE single offer of a property in all that time!! We are now in a 2 bedroom house with 17 and 15 year old girls and 12 and 11 year old boys. How you think we are managing is beyond us!!! Disgraceful!
66	when the bidding ends and you either get an unsuccessful or skipped you don't get a reason why it was
67	Please get us moved
68	Make sure that all the "single mothers" are checked properly if they actually a singles
69	no
70	It seems that the interest of tenants is being well looked after.I makes you feel much more human..
71	i need a 4 bed social housing .but no 4 bed arise been on list for 5 plus years and a taunton born child . if i was foreign i would have had one sooner ' i would love a forever home .
72	I have been on the register for what seems like ages. My medical condiction is very serious, but nevertheless I never seem to be awarded a home to live in. I keep bidding, but many of the homes which you have are for people with connections to that area, so in actual fact I do not qualify, so why do I get them to bid on it seems pointless. I need a home soon
73	Help local people, not foreigners
74	I have struggled so much to use the website that I have given up (I am degree educated) it's not particularly user friendly. I now live in very expensive private rental !!!
75	It's just words. Won't make a difference to people who have already been waiting for ages.
76	I don't think the bedroom tax works. Why is a single person allowed to live in a 3 bed house. Why are a couple and one child allowed to live in a 3 bed house when other families are

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
	desperate to move from a 2 bed to a 3 bed. The whole system is terrible and people should be made to downsize to give others who desperately need bigger properties the opportunity.
77	I believe question *28 regarding the 48 hours to view a property and accept or decline an offer needs to be written in more detail taking into account disabled people with appointment/therapies, who are unable to drive or are only aloud to travel under certain circumstances and people on the register who are single parents and need some sort of support or an exception on the time to arrange child care.
78	can you please send me something in writing to say you recieved my last online form,and if after years on the register my banding has changed
79	On previous occasions I have read that our chances of being offered a property is virtually nil and find this very unfair. My wife and I live in a 3 bedroom house and are renting privately. We like the house we rent but we are getting older where perhaps a bungalow would be much better for us along with my wife's health issues.
80	I've answered as best as I can, but didn't really understand on what you were asking.
81	with an ageing population I feel more properties should be made available for the elderly
82	i have been homeless in taunton for 5 yr. in and out of jail for somewhere to live. i have a young son who i barley see due to living in lindley house. i cant aford the rent but on gold band i could have my own place and rebuild my life.
83	NO
84	I appreciate the hard work that has gone into making the system clearer however I do genuinely feel an idiot at times for being in work. Having no children as I am deemed to be a very low priority. I am a human being who's need is as important as anyone else's.
85	When offered a property over the phone without viewing it shouldn't count as a lost bid if you changed your mind
86	Other than when in private rented property even though we struggle like heck just to keep a roof over our heads and have to be evicted before help arises and surely the horse has bolted by then and when we ask for help but are told you are properly housed and then keep asking for help but keep getting knocked back surely this needs to change and say we can help people who are struggling with high rent
87	Quite happy with the changes
88	how long will i have to wait to get something back from you about a house
89	I don't know if this is the right place but it would be good if there was a clear reason when you 'bid' as to why you have been unsuccessful. All the bids i have made to date have been classed as 'unsuccessful' and it would be good to see a reason why.
90	There should be a policy with regards to living with and suffering from noise nuisance renting from private landlords. Single mothers and young children should be helped and banding should be higher, ie silver and they should not be forced to suffer
91	I found it difficult to understand the question.
92	I've been on gold band for 8 months now and am still no closer to down sizing my property,8 windmill crescent,woolavington.
93	I have a concern as the whether that people like myself who have need to move due to mental health issues are looked over in favour of someone with physical problems, when in the same banding and place on the list.
94	I would like someone to 're access my banding as have medical issues.
95	Nones as all quite clear
96	I have been on home finder on and of for Meany years now , And have had no luck in getting a place we have had to go privet, And even now we are looking for a place as my daughter has moved in to home help place as she is special needs. And now we need to move to a two bed place and we put a bid in for a two bed and only one property was available. my husband is going in hospital in a few weeks for a acyls tendent transplant and will be in plaster for a few weeks and then a moon boot for 6 mouths. and we live in a 3 story 4 bed house. so you see we have lot to contend with . And our son go's to uni in September. AND we need to stay in williton. thank you that's all
97	When tenants who are in private rented accommodation the minimum contract is six months so we can only bid for properties about 4 weeks before the end of our contract so that is does limit us to what properties we can apply for,
98	local houses for local people not on the age of property or the age of new tenant

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
99	No further comments
100	just build more one beds, houses or bungalows and not flats.
101	None Known
102	I don't think some of the proposed policies take into account different circumstances, they are too general and impersonal.
103	no
104	Feel very strongly that any individual that has been waiting for sometime to move somewhere more appropriate to their needs should not now be penalised due to a new policy
105	none.
106	I find the whole system bizarre, I have been on the housing register 10 years with not the peep of a house, I'm local born and bred to the area and work full time to support my family. It seems people like me get ignored!!!
107	Nothing, thanks.
108	I feel that the council should help people more with mental health issues and offer support if they are required to and to move people who doesn't need an extra room and should still be charge for extra bedroom tax if they don't move. I feel they should provide an area check ie criminal checks on the area so it gives people an idea of what the area is like ie if it is a rough area etc.
109	oap that is in different area from children who is getting depressed because of the situation needs medicine regular forgets to take them unless reminded should be put to a gold or emergency banding
110	I do not think that a lot of this survey is fair to people cos "all people have different needs" and that needs to be understood and each person or persons needs assessed on their own merit. If you give certain groups priority like service men and women, then other groups like people with family in the area should be give priority. There is only one thing you can do as a council for people like me and that is build new council homes, not 1 bedrooms but 2 bedrooms and upwards for renting out to the poorer people of society. Also to fight for the government to stop building right to buy houses because its not curing the problem of people needing houses on the housing registers, its only giving people who can afford to buy houses the right to have a house. People also need housing association/council housing before affordable housing as people who are sick, unemployed cannot afford this type of housing.
111	No comments
112	Things should always be stated clearly so that all can understand them. No gobbledegook!
113	create an option for people wanting to swap properties both in the district and nationwide
114	No comments
115	Bit long winded
116	It would be good if someone is in employment and doesn't mind paying the extra on bedroom tax were with people on benefits to put them in housing they can afford, and that will also help with there financial hardship, and something needs to be looked into with mutual exchange on the the way it's run.
117	I think give people a chance of property like I need two bedroom house or flat by 1115204 mrs Williams
118	For me having a case worker who knows my circumstances would be brilliant. I would have someone direct to contact.
119	I think there are many reasons and differing circumstances that will find people applying for housing. It is not just people with financial difficulties...I think you are steering to far towards a situation where Social housing is just for the poor. We should be looking at how to make housing more affordable to all. Not creating another social divide judged by what kind of house you live in.
120	I do not agree with any changes suggestions made about homes with children. No room should have more than 2 children. It is not fair on any of the children or parents, due to there emotional and mental wellbeing. Children must have a garden to express and develop. Too many homes are being built with.no access to grass areas.
121	People who have a health and well being need to move should be given higher priority.
122	I'm a local person who has lived here all my life,and I feel that people from outside of the area always seem to be the one's that get the property's! Especially when some properties are meant for people with local connections.with me saying this will more then likely put me at the

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
	bottom of the list, but I felt it only right to say how I feel about it all and I don't think that I'm the only one out there that feels this way. With kind regards.
123	as am on register and currently homeless i think that the banding and how it is assessed should be made much clearer as have no home and am actively lookin on the homefinder site but have been placed in silver band and have now been bidding for 2 months and yet still end up miles down the list... a detailed explanation on how these decisions are reached would benefit most if not all people in my or similar positions.
124	no comments other than when a person has an illness which will only get worse especially when the person is elderly why do they have to fill in at regular intervals a very difficult form
125	I really strongly disagree with putting families of young children in flats, I feel it is unfair and unsafe.
126	No
127	Sometimes I would have liked to add a comment (and did so), when I agreed with a change, but each comment box was "if no, please tell us why" - that smacks of " we are right, and if you don't think so, say why" Also, there will be some (lazy, bad typists, etc) people who will just click the Don't Know, or Yes button instead of No because they can't [be bothered to] type out why they don't agree with something. Thank you for commissioning this survey; it is great to feel like I can contribute :)
128	I am disabled and I'm 29 years old and was refused a bungalow because they have an age limit of 55+ and I think it should be fairly done so people like myself have the chance to bid and live in those properties as not equally done. My age shouldn't matter as I'm disabled and would so Benefit from that type of accommodation.
129	Well done on your work. Thank you.
130	What a horrible long winded survey
131	No
132	I am single and I find the majority of rents for flats too high and its about time this is looked into as many 3 bed houses are the same rent if not cheaper. It doesn't make sense you may as well go private.
133	Good to be involved - would b helpful to have independent views on the proposals - eg shelter
134	People that work and pay there way should be put top of list and people on dss who can work should be put on bottom inless have med papers to explain why they can't work
135	I think people already on the scheme should stay in that band unless circumstances change and the new rules should apply to be applications
136	48 hours to view a property and make a decision works if you live in the immediate area. If you don't, then extra time should be allowed.
137	In the area of a property affecting the health and wellbeing of the tenants in a particular property, greater understanding and empathy into this area should also be considered.
138	Full understand all this changes but I'm bit frustrated, been waiting list long time, got lots bills, separate, if could have more affordable home be nice, often kids stay with me, got deaths to pay everything, still go work but it's hard
139	Yes, I'm currently on homefinder have been since Aug 2013 I've been in private housing since Oct 2012 I'm a lone parent who works part time and currently pay £270 towards my rent each month I'm desperatly trying to get a council house for me and my son not only for security but to financially make our lives better. I bid every week without fail for my area of taunton. My private house is currently up for sale also. <i>xxxxxxx(applicant name was supplied but has been removed)</i> Ref number 1082727
140	None thank you,
141	I feel that the bidding system sometimes fails people and the way it is done is a bit weird but some other parts of it is good
142	A very sensible survey and very much in keeping with common sense.

Number	Please tell us here if you have any other comments on the proposed policy or have any other comments to make.
143	My comment is how will I be move to next band since I have problems in finances and I am a full time student what am I supposed to do ?thank you.
144	You could speed up the process for expecting mothers, and take in to consideration that they're pregnant and need a house not a second floor flat.
145	The system is a mess, it's one rule for one and a different rule for someone else. I'm married with two children and living in a flat, I'm on bronze band, however, my friend was single with one child living in a flat and she was on silver band and has recently been moved. We also had mould problems but no one wanted to help or reband us. But people on benefits or a medical record get moved to nice 3 bedroom houses no problem. You should help young married couples with children. We really need a 3 bedroom house but the chances are slimmer then a cocktail stick
146	You should in Endeavour to simplify all processes
147	How long Im must wait?
148	Most people are unable to read or fully understand policies. They are confusing. They should be kept as simple and short as possible. Policies are open to misinterpretation so an applicant should not be penalised for the above.
149	I don't believe the system is as transparent as should be. ..those who work full time with grown and left the house children are still living in council accommodation taking several holidaya a year. surely these should be freed up for those with real.genuine needs.
150	I feel that people who have been on the Homefinder register for many years should be given priority for housing before any Newcomers or applicants that have only registered in a matter of months.
151	Im ill and homeless and cold so give me a home please
152	Your not going to take this into any consideration so it was a waste of my time! But if you do read this, there is going to be so many people on gold band if you go through with these changes it is going to a lot harder for people who are on gold band and are in need with accomidation to get a property!
153	No
154	I feel that some housing providers need to change the acceptance of a home to disabled /seriously ill applicants with the regards to them not working. . This is discriminant to them. Basically if your working we will give u a house but if ur not working and disabled/ sick we won't house you because your not working. Maybe wording and policy's should think about people that are poorly sick and there carers as well as it makes them feel like rubbish. They do not choose to be disabled / sick / poorly. They are not dosers/ and lazy! I just think there needs to be something in there for poorly sick disabled applicants
155	Think there are to many people sitting in council properties that no longer need to be there. I know many middle aged couples that are in there houses. Kids are grown up and mostly moved out. Why are they still clogging up the system while some of us with kids struggle. My mother and father in law live in a 3 bedroom council house in greenest road rockwellgrer . They have 1 child left at home who is at college and working. They are free to work as many hours as they wish. We have 2 young children, cant work as many hours as we can around school and child care. We pay hundreds more a month in rent. It's ridiculous. Sometimes we don't eat properly for God's sake. And then these others don't get forced to downsize. There sitting pretty paying hardly any rent. They had a brand-new kitchen a while back. We get excited if I've found something useful in the charity shop. It's not right the your system is backwards. People like us who work and earn are left to rot because we are providing for our family cos we have to do the best we can else we what?starve. While these others laugh in our faces.
156	The waiting list is too long, even with needs, we must wait for too long for don't get anything, and finish renting a private property yo be struggling with the money.
157	YES GIVE THE PEOPLE THAT WROK AND PAY INTO THE LOCAL COUNCILS THE 1ST CHANCE TO GET A COUNCIL HOUSE AND NOT THE EU PEOPLE THAT JUST MOVED HERE

Stakeholder Survey Detailed Feedback

Q1 We asked respondents to tell us which area they worked in and from which organisation:

	Mendip District Council Area	Sedgemoor District Council Area	South Somerset District Council Area	Taunton Deane Borough Council Area	West Somerset Somerset Area	Landlord (if you work across more than one LA area please select)
SSDC (LA)	1	0	9	0	1	0
SDC (LA)	0	4	0	0	0	0
MDC (LA)	11	0	0	0	0	0
TDBC (LA)	0	0	0	3	0	0
WSC (LA)	0	0	0	0	3	0
Somerset County Council	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parish Council	0	0	0	0	4	0
Anchor Housing Association	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affinity Sutton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aster Housing Association	4	0	0	0	0	0
Barnabas HA Ltd	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curo Housing Association	0	0	0	0	0	0
English Churches Housing Group	0	0	0	0	0	0
English Villages HA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Falcon Rural Housing Trust	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guinness	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hanover	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hastoe HA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homes in Sedgemoor	0	1	0	0	0	1
Hospital of Sir John Popham Knight	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing 21	0	0	0	0	0	0
John Grooms Housing Association	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kennet Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kilmersdon Rural Housing Associat	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knightstone HA	3	5	5	6	5	11
Magna (West Somerset)	0	0	0	0	7	4
Magna HA Ltd	0	0	0	0	0	0
Places For People	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanctuary HA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Selwood Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaftesbury Housing Group	0	0	0	0	0	0
SHAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
Signpost HA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Solon HA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spectrum Housing Association	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwestern Housing Society	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soveriegn Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonham HA	1	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewater	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taunton Association for the homele	0	1	0	3	1	1
Taunton Deane Borough Council - L	0	0	0	3	0	0
Taunton Old People's Housing Soci	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taunton Town Charity	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Abbeyfield Taunton Society	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Abbeyfield Wellington Society	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Carr- Gomm Society Limited	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twynham HA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wellington Rotary Housing Associa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyvern Rural Housing Association	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yarlington Housing Group	0	0	2	0	0	1
Other agency	5	2	1	1	1	0
Response Count	27	14	18	17	23	20

We then asked respondents to tell us what type of respondent they were:


Type of Respondent	Mendip District Council Area	Sedgemoor District Council Area	South Somerset District Council Area	Taunton Deane Borough Council Area	West Somerset Area	Landlord (if you work across more than one LA area please select)
Councillor	2	1	1	1	6	0
Local Authority Officer	10	4	9	1	3	0
Housing Association/ALMO Board Member	0	0	0	0	1	0
Support Service Agency Staff	4	2	1	2	1	0
Voluntary Agency Staff	3	1	0	0	0	0
Housing Association/ALMO staff	9	5	7	6	11	15
LA Landlord staff	0	0	0	5	0	1
Other agency staff	0	0	0	1	1	0
Total	28	13	18	16	23	16

Where respondents have stated other here are the details they provided:

Number	if you have answered other above please tell us which organisation you work for
1	Citizens Advice South Somerset
2	Citizens Advice Sedgemoor
3	Taunton Citizens Advice
4	Mendip YMCA
5	Brompton regis parish council
6	Clerk to Parish Council- Selworthy and Minehead Without
7	Mendip YMCA
8	YMCA
9	Rethink Mental Illness
10	Mendipymca
11	Councillors for Minehead Town Council- Minehead South West Somerset Council - Minehead North and Somerset County Council
12	YMCA Somerset Coast
13	YMCA Somerset Coast
14	Citizens Advice Mendip

Q2 Select the option which best describes the one you are working in:


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Housing Register/Housing Options	23.0%	20
Supported	13.8%	12
General Needs	13.8%	12
Lettings	16.1%	14
Strategic	3.4%	3
Front Line	5.7%	5
Elected Member	9.2%	8
Parish Councillor	4.6%	4
Landlord Board response	0.0%	0
Other stakeholder	1.1%	1
Other please state	9.2%	8
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		0



Number	Other please state
1	Research and Campaigns
2	Advice
3	YMCA P2i support for 16-25's
4	Customer Services
5	Resettlement Support
6	Advice Agency
7	Homeless Officer
8	Head of Housing

Q3 We propose to change the wording in the policy to make it clearer that if a friend is included on the application form, that they are usually expected to be a joint applicant. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	23.1%	18
Agree	64.1%	50
No View	7.7%	6
Disagree	3.8%	3
Strongly Disagree	1.3%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		5
<i>answered question</i>		78
<i>skipped question</i>		9



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	At least 15% of the population have trouble reading; about 25% have no qualifications. Reading/understanding documents is a problem and Making it longer/more complex is not a good idea.
2	Can understand this proposal - providers need a corresponding policy on how to deal with allocating joint tenancies when there is a relationship breakdown or if one tenant want to leave.
3	The only thing with this is that if one decides to leave it will break the tenancy agreement and they will both have to leave hence more people becoming homeless. If one can still be left in the property can look for a lodger.
4	Equality and Diversity
5	We wouldn't normally allow 'friends' to be joint tenants. Do not understand the rationale behind this.

Q4 We propose to extend the list of applicants who may be exempt from the need for a financial assessment to join the housing register. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	19.2%	15
Agree	61.5%	48
Neither Agree nor disagree	6.4%	5
Disagree	9.0%	7
Strongly disagree	3.8%	3
If you disagree please tell us why		10
	<i>answered question</i>	78
	<i>skipped question</i>	9




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	A "case by case basis tends to suggest an arbitrary and inconsistent judgement somewhere. Extra care apps do NOT register on HFS.
2	•Applicants applying for extra care housing from a Homefinder Somerset partner landlord;
3	All applicants should undergo a financial assessment to ensure that they are eligible for social housing. Knightstone would want to complete their own Income & Expenditure check regardless.
4	•Applicants applying for sheltered housing from a Homefinder Somerset partner landlord; •Applicants who have an overriding medical or support need If they have sufficient resources to secure their own housing, why should they be allocated a social property. If the demand isn't there, they should be reclassified for general needs. Pressure is applied on older people to go into sheltered accommodation so that the family can have their inheritance.
5	Applicants with financial difficulties may present with history of arrears even if they have medical or support needs, so would still need a financial assessment.
6	I think affordable social housing should be reserved for those who cannot afford market rents
7	If applicants have adequate finances to secure alternative accommodation then they should be using these avenues first
8	In exempting applicants from a financial assessment, we will only be made aware of what capital they have if they declare it. Those who are under occupying should not be exempt due to a high demand area, if they are occupying a property that is too big for their needs and they

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
	have resources and providing the provider is in a position to do so, their tenancy should not be renewed.
9	We house people with housing needs
10	the applicant should be treated as anyone else on the register - they should not be treated differently because someone has died if they have the means to provide for themselves

Q5 Social Housing tenants living in properties that are too big for their needs are currently placed in gold band to encourage them to move to something smaller. However many tenants do not wish to move, and by placing them in gold band it gives a false impression of the number of applicants in high housing need. Therefore we are proposing to remove the under-occupation category from gold band. This change is likely to affect approximately 640 applicants out of 9300 on the register. Where we know that under-occupying tenants are in financial hardship they will be moved from the gold band to the silver band. All other applicants currently in gold band for under-occupation, will be placed in bronze band and encouraged to complete a change of circumstances form online in order to have their banding reassessed. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	15.4%	12
Agree	43.6%	34
No View	10.3%	8
Disagree	20.5%	16
Strongly Disagree	10.3%	8
If you disagree please say why		25
	<i>answered question</i>	78
	<i>skipped question</i>	9




Number	If you disagree please say why
1	We understand the reason for this, but question the cost implications for those who are unable to afford the larger accommodation due to the lower housing benefit rate they would receive for their circumstances.
2	Silver banding would not enable people in financial hardship to move quickly enough. DHP is a cushion but a limited pot and delays will put pressure on this. Could restrict the time people

Number	If you disagree please say why
	be in gold - extensions to be reviewed dependant on circs. Could keep gold banding but use the freed tenancy to encourage further transfers to meet the aim of better use of the stock.
3	Many don't want to move - the others do want to - should stay in gold & be monitored if not bid within certain timeframe - banding then decreased.
4	Because they need to be helped and encouraged to downsize to free up the larger property for others
5	This will discourage movement and make it more likely that tenants will continue to underoccupy properties. This then reduces the number of bed spaces that can be used.
6	will this still allow sufficient movement to make best use of housing stock
7	I feel that those under occupying but wishing to downsize should be gold banded as it meets their need and also meets the strategic need for family housing.
8	The gold band status can be removed if they choose not to bid for a period of time.
9	No incentive to get family properties back. No options for under occupiers other than to leave social housing or continue to rely on DHP.
10	By doing this there will be no incentive for anyone to move although I understand the reflection being incorrect, it may be a need to add an additional symbol to the gold band so we know exactly that although in Gold band they have no great need. Could be cutting off our noses to spite our faces!
11	Disagree re those in financial hardship moved to silver as every opportunity needs to be made available to facilitate a move quickly. Agree those underoccupying should be in Bronze. Those not bidding should be removed from the register
12	Because keeping those who are over occupying in the gold band helps to keep some diversity within the band. Otherwise we may end up with only those with high support needs being moved, resulting in schemes with a high proportion of residents with high support needs. I feel this doesn't help to keep schemes diverse and inclusive.
13	Is this best use of housing stock? Applicants that need a 2/3 bed will be restricted to bid on fewer properties that will now be available.
14	<p>Clearly the statement "many tenants do not wish to move" is incorrect as the 640 applicants under- occupying their property went to the hassle of making a HomefinderSomerset application and by completing this step have shown an intention to move. In addition, when has gold band been about "high housing need". Under HomefinderSomerset policy those in the highest housing need, ie the homeless other group (includes rough sleepers) are allocated silver band. If Gold band is for those with the highest housing need, surely this would include the homeless?</p> <p>However, if the rationale for introducing this policy change is because there is a very limited supply of 1 and 2 beds and little demand for larger homes, then fair enough, as their inflated priority on the register would mean they get all the smaller properties ahead of the aforementioned homeless and RP's would find it difficult to let their vacant larger property, which would be tragic. I started off this question as Strongly disagree as I am confused by the reasoning given, however now have moved to strongly agree despite this for my reasoning above.</p>
15	There should just be a question about the persons preference as to whether to move or not, and another indicating whether they feel in financial hardship because of being adversely affected by the Bedroom Tax. It is wrong to, on the one hand, tell people they must move or suffer financial penalty whilst on the other placing obstacles in the way of their remedying this.
16	If clients wish to stay in their property then they can do so and not apply to Homefinder however those that have are demonstrating both a need and desire to move which should be recognised and help given to do this. There may be a greater need for 1 or 2 bed houses but that is a structural issue which should be addressed with the HA's. There is still significant need for those housed in Somerset evidenced by the waiting lists and not by the amount of people affected. Finally if they fall into rent arrears HA's currently hold this against tenants and use this to skip them which could cause increased problems for LA's if there is still a duty to rehouse
17	Households who need to downsize should be encouraged to do so and we should enable them in anyway we can to free up housing stock. Maybe a better way of dealing with this would be to contact those who are not bidding and find out why, so maybe a shorter review process for those in gold band would benefit the system

Number	If you disagree please say why
18	Though will this be making best use of stock and encouraging people to move where possible?
19	if they do not wish to move, they should not be on the register, they should remain in gold for downsizing
20	It does penalise those who are wanting to move out, the additional cost of the bedroom is crippling some people.
21	I feel that these under occupation households would not show a priority and therefore they are disadvantaged and we would not be in a position to house these households. I understand if these Gold household do not bid for a certain period of time then maybe consider de-banding them?
22	THE FACT THAT SOMEONE HAS A LIVE APPLICATION WOULD SUGGEST THAT THEY WANT TO MOVE AND THEREFORE FREE UP A FAMILY HOME. PERHAPS THE WAY TO DEAL WITH THE ISSUE IS TO IMPROVE APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS FOR THOSE NOT BIDDING?
23	Downsizing will mean they want to move to 1 or 2 bed accommodation, both of which have a huge demand and therefore bronze or silver band will in all likelihood mean they will be trapped and never get the opportunity to downsize, forcing them to remain indefinitely in financial hardship.
24	We will move such applicants on management transfer if they have no priority need on the register but need to move for hardship reasons
25	we should be encouraging residents to downsize where applicable and to allow them to do this they need a priority. We should only put applicants into gold band if they are saying they want to downsize and have applied to do so.

Q6 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clearer that we would support a social landlord by using gold band to move an applicant who has no legal right to succession to help the landlord make best use of their housing. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	26.3%	20
Agree	51.3%	39
No View	17.1%	13
Disagree	2.6%	2
Strongly Disagree	2.6%	2
If you disagree please say why		8
	<i>answered question</i>	76
	<i>skipped question</i>	11



Number	If you disagree please say why
1	See Q1 - need to keep it simple.
2	But if can warrant gold for this why not gold for underoccupation which also has aim of making best use of the housing stock?
3	Please could you clarify you term 'social landlord' would that include a private landlord who agreed to take tenant from this category? If so, then I would agree
4	I'm concerned that this broad brush approach could potentially gold band a person not in need of accommodation and would therefore detract from others who are.
5	Feel this is very fare as the goal posts keep moving for people who may once been eligible for succession rights.
6	If the applicant has no legal right to succession, they should get silver band for Threatened with homelessness (unless any other criteria apply) and a few months grace from the Landlord to find alternative accommodation (private and social). It is unfair that this person gets a higher priority than a homeless person as their housing circumstances are much better than the the homeless person. Of course if the applicant is under 35 and reliant on Housing Benefit, they will only get the shared accommodation rate in future (post 2018) and giving gold band on the register to somebody in this situation does not manage expectations as they will not get rehoused.
7	I am confused as to why you would want to give extra help to those who do don't have a succession right but want to reduce the amount of priority given to those with a tenancy who want to downsize
8	If someone has no legal right to succession why would they automatically be places in gold banding as they may not be in priority housing need

Q7 We propose to add a new sentence to the policy to make it clear that if a Council Officer finds a hazard in the applicants home, the landlord must be notified in order for the applicant to be placed in gold band for disrepair. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	35.1%	27
Agree	45.5%	35
No View	11.7%	9
Disagree	6.5%	5
Strongly Disagree	1.3%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		7
<i>answered question</i>		77
<i>skipped question</i>		10



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Competing issues - simplicity for reader versus legal.
2	Concerned that AST tenants will be at risk of eviction. New retaliatory eviction rules won't necessarily protect tenant. If go ahead with this need to add some wording to warn AST tenants about their lack of security.
3	& this should also be for silver band
4	But not really sure as the landlord has a duty to provide a home to a certain standard which they should keep to. You could potentially have a lot of people placed in Gold band as RSL's can take a time to make right disrepair!!
5	It surely must depend on the hazard. An explanation of hazards is required before anyone can answer this question
6	Not clear what you mean by a 'hazard'. It could be caused by the tenant in which case we could take action for breach of tenancy agreement and instigate our recharge policy
7	Surely it depends on what the 'hazard' is as to whether they are placed in gold band

Q8 We propose to make it clear within the revised policy that silver band other homeless will be awarded to applicants two months in advance of the expiry date of the valid notice to quit Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	26.0%	20
Agree	57.1%	44
No View	14.3%	11
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	2.6%	2
If you disagree please tell us why		1
<i>answered question</i>		77
<i>skipped question</i>		10



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	This does not go far enough, it is an absurdity that someone who has no home is given the same priority as someone, who has a home but has a 'medical priority'.

Q9 Silver band - children in flats was introduced when the policy was first agreed back in 2007. Circumstances have since changed and it is now felt reasonable for applicants with children under 10 to be housed in flats and should therefore not be given priority on the housing register if they are currently living above the ground floor in a flat. This change could affect approximately 325 applicants who are currently in this band reason. All these applicants will re-assessed for other housing needs. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	19.7%	15
Agree	48.7%	37
No View	9.2%	7
Disagree	14.5%	11
Strongly Disagree	7.9%	6
If you disagree please tell us why		16
<i>answered question</i>		76
<i>skipped question</i>		11




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Access to a private should also be taken into consideration. Landlords should have the discretion to place age restrictions on flats which may not be suitable for children under 10 yrs of age.
2	I am surprised to see this removed. People with young children find it extremely difficult to organise carrying babies, pushchairs and shopping up stairs to a flat. Silver banding doesn't give the tenants overriding priority but does reflect the difficulty experienced. Is the impact of this banding so significant that it needs to be withdrawn? Suggestion: Would it be appropriate to keep the banding but reduce the age of the children to under 5 or if not at least allow it for people with more than one child in a flat.
3	This is very unfair. Perhaps change the age to school age (4 or 5) instead of 10 years of age. Place yourselves in that position, if the property does not have access to a lift then should be silver with a toddler and/or younger child/ren, pushchairs, prams, shopping. This is not easy
4	Children need somewhere to play, communal areas are a waste of time as they are generally unkempt and covered in pet waste

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
5	I feel that it is almost impossible for some tenants to get prams and buggies etc up and down stairs (especially if they are impaired in any way). I feel that children from 0-5 should not be housed in flat, but from 5 upwards they can manage the stairs safely and do not need a pram or buggy.
6	young children in flats is very difficult for some mums - how do they get the child, buggy shopping etc in all in one go.
7	I feel we should be able to assist some children and I was always glad SDC could offer this to children under the age of 10 and I still feel this way. I don't agree with children not being able to have a garden to play in plus in high rise and flats it can open the doors for certain types of people who could put all these young children at a greater risk in the building and outside with no facilities.
8	could cause fire hazards and may find an increase in medical need
9	agree for under 10s, but under 5s there should be a lift as not suitable to have a buggy and have to deal with stairs to the entry to a flat.
10	Children over the age of 2 need an outside space, being confined can have a detrimental affect on the child's development and put considerable strain on a family,
11	children should not be in high flats; it is not really healthy for them. Many already don't get exercise and fresh air this will make it worse.
12	as a landlord, it is not easy to manage young children in flats upstairs, as well as being difficult for the tenant
13	I feel that the management on flats would be extremely difficult if the age criteria was removed. Pushchairs being stored in the communal staircase and noise from children.
14	I agree in principle but think it would be very unfair to move the goalpost from those already awarded a band for this purpose. However, for future assessments I agree. Having said that, it will delay homeless cases being housed as they will all hold out for a house because they can!
15	Could cause housing management issues
16	priority should be given if there is no lift to the flats.

Q10 We have added in a new Bronze Band category to make it easier to let Sheltered Housing and Extra Care properties (which can be hard to let) by encouraging applicants without a local connection to join the register for these properties. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	21.1%	16
Agree	34.2%	26
No View	22.4%	17
Disagree	14.5%	11
Strongly Disagree	7.9%	6
If you disagree please tell us why		17
	<i>answered question</i>	76
	<i>skipped question</i>	11




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Extra Care??
2	Local people should always be given housing priority over non local people so as to keep family and friend networks together
3	In my parish I believe that this category of accommodation would be easy to let. Please correct me if you have statistics to suggest otherwise.
4	I feel that rather than let those without a local connection move to these properties, we need to investigate why they are hard to let and whether any changes can be made to make them more letable.
5	If there is a lack of demand for such units of accommodation then maybe alternative use should be sought rather than changing eligibility criteria.
6	Disagree for Sedgemoor district - they do not struggle to let these types of properties. Who would be the responsible LA for processing the applications?
7	There is always someone on the register that could do with this type of accommodation that may be overlooked. Why can we not look on our own register for vulnerable people who may not be at the right age but we know would be suited to this type of housing. Not everyone tells the truth and being honest if they come from another area we wont know them or what they really have wrong with them. They could just be a pain in the bottom client for another area and they are glad to get rid of them.
8	As I understand it this is already happening and would not want to seen this openly advertised.
9	Not sure how the Local Authority would be able to control this just for Sheltered or Extra Care applicants
10	Again it depends on where the property is. If its a very rural area offer these homes first to single abled people thereby allowing them to remain living in the area where they were born.

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
11	For sheltered and Extra Care properties it is important for those with a local connection to be given priority. On a case by case basis we could review any non-local applicants.
12	This is confusing. The policy states that those without a local connection are non-qualifying persons and do not qualify to join our housing register. The question seems to suggest that we no longer require as many of the Sheltered Housing and Extra care properties as they are hard to let. If this is the case, then they should be converted and used as general needs properties to help reduce the increasing 1 and 2 bed need that we have in this County. My understanding is that we have a huge demand for 1 bed properties for the general population in our own district/county without needing to encourage more older people to move into the area.
13	any property in the somerset area should stay that way unless there is proof of a connection
14	will make it a lot less clearer when discussing with applicants about LC. Should go to applicants with a LC in the first instance
15	These should be reserved for those people with those needs
16	Remove barriers to letting out these properties such as age discrimination rather than adding another band and allowing people from outside the area to bid.
17	This is not consistent with rules for others. These properties could be much easier and quicker let if the age restrictions were re-assessed. The majority are over 60's with some being over 55's, yet I see many cases with medical needs for a sheltered property but they cant apply because they aren't old enough. A fit and healthy working 60yr old takes priority over a wheelchair bound 30yr old, where's the sense in that. We have under 55's that remain in TA for months and months because nothing suitable for their needs and within their age bracket comes up that they can bid on. It's extremely frustrating.

Q11 We propose to remove emergency banding where a surviving tenant needs to move from sheltered/adapted housing because the requirement for the specialist housing no longer exists. They will be placed within gold band for tenancy succession. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	16.2%	12
Agree	62.2%	46
Neither agree nor disagree	12.2%	9
Disagree	6.8%	5
Strongly disagree	2.7%	2
If you disagree please tell us why		5
<i>answered question</i>		74
<i>skipped question</i>		13



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	A surviving tenant (partner deceased after illness??) would be deeply grieving and in need of support, this change could add an extra stressor.
2	I feel they have been through enough issues having to move full stop let alone making the time factor longer and them finding a home harder. Definitely not they could be very elderly but at any age, have some compassion!
3	the property needs to be free for those with need.
4	If the specialist adaptations are no longer needed by the succeeding tenant, they need to be moved on. The speed of this could support NHS bed blocking and all sorts.
5	Emergency band would be more suitable to move these people on especially if there are applicants on the register who would need the specially adapted property.

Q12 We propose to change the wording in the policy for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces. The current and proposed wording is shown below. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	17.6%	13
Agree	50.0%	37
Neither Agree nor disagree	31.1%	23
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly disagree	1.4%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		3
<i>answered question</i>		74
<i>skipped question</i>		13



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Not sure what this means can only use the back dating once as if they are rehoused they are rehoused from the back date. if they want to move again I would have thought would be under the same rules as the normal register.
2	Why change it? It more or less says the same thing!
3	under new a) would they have to of already left the services or can they still be serving and get the backdating, Will finances be taken into account?

Q13 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clear that backdating for applicants currently serving or former members of the armed forces will only be applied once. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	24.3%	18
Agree	56.8%	42
No View	16.2%	12
Disagree	1.4%	1
Strongly Disagree	1.4%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		4
	<i>answered question</i>	74
	<i>skipped question</i>	13



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Keep it simple.
2	Is this once to be re-housed, in case they don't keep application up to date/open and it gets closed then reapply. Needs clarification of this in the policy
3	Not sure of what this actually means. I would try to help anyone who has been in the armed forces to be happy and rehoused as could have lost someone.
4	What if they are awarded this but then source their own accommodation for a period of time and are re-banded accordingly but then become homeless or threatened with homelessness in a short space of time?

Q14 We have made a change to make it clear that there is a 28 day time limit for applicants to advise their Local Authority of any change of circumstances. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	32.4%	24
Agree	50.0%	37
No View	8.1%	6
Disagree	8.1%	6
Strongly Disagree	1.4%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		8
	<i>answered question</i>	74
	<i>skipped question</i>	13



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	We feel guidance should be issued to partner agencies to ensure they are aware of this and are not misleading applicants. Is a change of circumstances form needed, or a whole new application? This is incredibly important and should be widely publicised. If there is alternative option for vulnerable groups as suggested in the reason, then this should be made clear in the revised policy wording.
2	28 days is a very tight time limit for people to notify CoC. If the change is during to a stressful time many applicants won't be able to keep to this. It will also disadvantage the most vulnerable applicants who may not realise that they need to notify the CoD. Will there be ability for the application to be reinstated where clients have not been able to meet this requirement?
3	Yes ideally but not sure we can prove these but This should be a definite for Change of address
4	28 days apply unless there are extenuating circumstances - to be considered on a case by cases basis
5	Would ask what benefit this has? Know how long it takes me to organise this!
6	didn't know there was a time limit.
7	This needs to be based on a individuals circumstances i.e. mental health.
8	For many of our clients who are made homeless it can easily be 28 days before they are referred to TAH. They may not have any address, and, especially for the more chaotic ones, it is probably the last thing on their minds before we get a chance to stabilise them enough to do a change of circs.

Q15 To help prevent social housing fraud we propose to stop applicants informing their Local Authority of change of circumstances by telephone, and confirmation will need to be either online, by e-mail or by letter. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	40.5%	30
Agree	41.9%	31
No View	5.4%	4
Disagree	9.5%	7
Strongly Disagree	2.7%	2
If you disagree please tell us why		9
	<i>answered question</i>	74
	<i>skipped question</i>	13



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	we felt this should come with guidance to partners to ensure they are able to adequate support people with this requirement.
2	I see the reasoning for this, but I am concerned that with Literacy levels in Somerset, this will create a problem in at least 15 to 15% of cases.
3	Could contact by telephone be allowed in order to meet the 28 day deadline but a requirement that it is followed up by one of the above methods - could the application be suspended until the confirmation is received?
4	unsure for fraud reasons but we should have a audit trail of info to go back on anyway
5	Not sure cutting off phone calls are good idea, what about those that cant read or write.
6	Some of our older adults residents may not be digitally included and they may struggle with letter writing due to a disability or learning difficulty.
7	May put at a disadvantage applicants with literacy issues and no access to support may feel intimidated with the need to write.
8	Why would you want to restrict the means by which a resident can update circumstances? Why not employ better security checks instead.
9	For many of our homeless clients this will be impossible or very difficult. Many have no access to (or knowledge of) e-mail/internet and with no address obviously letter is often not practical.

Q16 We propose to change the wording in the policy to give applicants, who wish to keep rent costs at a minimum, the flexibility to allow more than two children to share a bedroom. Do you agree with this change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	21.6%	16
Agree	43.2%	32
No View	18.9%	14
Disagree	13.5%	10
Strongly Disagree	2.7%	2
If you disagree please tell us why		16
<i>answered question</i>		74
<i>skipped question</i>		13




Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Such allocations would be in breach of H.A. policy
2	agree and would that this will be at the landlords discretion depending on the size of the bedrooms and availability of living space in the property and garden, ages of children and not to over crowd the property. Preference may be given to a family with fewer children who match the size of the property.
3	Keep it simple
4	Is this not going to give false hope as landlords are not going allow this in many properties with sizes of bedrooms
5	KHA policy expectation that max of 2 children to one bedroom.
6	I do not feel its in the interest of any child to share a bedroom with more than 1 other child. (ie 3 or more). It does not give them the space to grow or develop personally, or give them any private space.
7	I would like to know how in principle this would be delivered as my concern is that it could place children into poor conditions not conducive to learning.
8	I think it should be up to the family if they should share and the size of the bedrooms. I look back to my childhood and there was 4 or 5 of us sharing one bedroom!!!
9	No more than 2 children should share a bedroom. I thought we had moved on from this.
10	Could cause lots of overcrowding. Not fair on children who won't get a say in the matter
11	Can be abused by Landlords and cause considerable overcrowding.
12	as long as they sign to say they are happy and cannot be lacking a bedroom if they reapply

Number	If you disagree please tell us why
13	Agree - as long as it is clear that they cannot then get banded as overcrowded should they have another child or one of the children reaches 10/16?
14	However, they must then be unable to seek a higher banding due to 'overcrowding'
15	I think this would encourage people to over crowd the properties and this could cause issues with mould etc within the property
16	Would the application then at a later date be able to reapply and get Silver (or Gold) for lacking enough bedrooms. How when bidding will the applicant know that the bedrooms are big enough to accommodate more than two children, will there be measurements added to the adverts?

Q17 We propose to change the policy to make it clear that applicants with young adults away from home in full time education during term time will be entitled to an extra bedroom for that child.. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	16.4%	12
Agree	58.9%	43
No View	17.8%	13
Disagree	4.1%	3
Strongly Disagree	2.7%	2
If you disagree please tell us why		6
	<i>answered question</i>	73
	<i>skipped question</i>	14



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Their intent to return must be established.
2	Yes when they come home where are they going to live unless they are eligible to keep their room!
3	Implications re housing benefit entitlement do need to be explained to ensure further / increased financial difficulty.
4	if they have a permanent place of residence then shouldn't get an extra room. same as staying access for children which can be up to 50% of the time
5	Social housing is a limited resource, with more people attending university this would be essentially allowing people to under occupy if their child was to attend University. We cannot guarantee that they will be living there when not in terms time or continue to live there once their course has finished. This has the potential to increase social housing fraud.
6	For those on HB this will cause hardship as they maynot be able to claim HB for this time

Q18 We propose to simplify the policy to ensure that applicants with evidence of need for overnight care are given an additional bedroom without having to provide proof of a qualifying benefit. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	12.3%	9
Agree	52.1%	38
No View	15.1%	11
Disagree	13.7%	10
Strongly Disagree	6.8%	5
If you disagree please tell us why		15
<i>answered question</i>		73
<i>skipped question</i>		14



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Qualifying benefits should be in payment to ensure best use of stock.
2	who decides on evidence of need?
3	I feel that they should provide proof of a qualifying benefit. How will you be able to confirm whether this is needed or not otherwise.
4	leaves this too open to fraudulent statements
5	I agree in principle but am concerned that this may lead to the system being abused
6	Should have proof of need.
7	Subject to affordability assessments
8	I just feel that being open and above board is the best way forward with this.
9	they should prove that they need an overnight carer and are getting the allowance for it
10	If they have a need for overnight care, then they should be in receipt of a qualifying benefit.
11	The evidence should be provided to ensure that they do have an overnight carer
12	sometimes the 'evidence' provided for a carer is not sufficient so the qualifying benefit supports this
13	Social housing is a limited resource there needs to be a robust approach to allowing applicants to have additional bedrooms. Proof qualifying benefits provide that benchmark applicants must meet and professionals letters (if that's what is expected as evidence) are seldom provide the level of evidence needed and more often than not pay lip service to the applicant who has asked for the letter to be written.
14	Extra rooms should only be provided to those who have an assessed medical need for them and there for proof should be provided
15	this is putting onus back on landlord to make decision & recover rent


Q19 We have reviewed the medical and welfare assessment process and are proposing to add additional wording to the policy to explain how applicants are awarded medical/welfare banding. Medical & Welfare Assessment(For the purposes of the medical and welfare assessments the applicant or the member of the household affected will be referred to as the individual). 14.1 The approach when banding under medical and welfare is to focus on how the individual's medical and welfare issues and their general well-being could be improved by a move to alternative accommodation. Account will be taken of: (i) The individual's medical or welfare condition; (ii) The affect the current property / environment has on the individuals medical or welfare condition; and (iii) How moving to an alternative property would help the individual's medical or welfare issues or improve their general well-being. 14.2. The Homefinder Somerset schemes reserves the right to request supporting evidence when banding under the medical or welfare criteria. Evidence from a third party is mandatory when considering the award of Gold or Emergency band. Any evidence submitted should be from a professional person who has first-hand knowledge of the individual and the environment they live in. The professional should advise of the individual's medical or welfare condition and give their professional opinion on the affect the current property / environment has on the individuals medical or welfare condition. From reading the above paragraphs do you understand the approach that will be used when assessing medical and welfare banding?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.4%	68
No	1.4%	1
Don't know	4.2%	3
If you answered no please tell us why?		2
	<i>answered question</i>	72
	<i>skipped question</i>	15



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	I would prefer to simplify the language.
2	Greatly welcome the introduction of a tangible welfare assesement. NB: I think it should be the 'effect', not 'affect'.


Q20 Do you agree with the approach we are taking?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	85.7%	60
No	4.3%	3
Don't know	1.4%	1
If you answered no please tell us why?	8.6%	6
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		17



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	We felt this should also cover people who are blocking beds in residential respite units or low secure hospitals for the same reasons. We are aware of people who are often 'stuck' in these provisions because there is no suitable 'move on' available, or that they are seen as a lower priority due to being 'accommodated' in unsettled accommodation. Giving these individuals (often a very small number) a higher priority to find suitable accommodation would help their own well-being and support independent living in their local community, whilst also freeing up the valuable short break resource.
2	I have concerns that advocates such as doctors and social workers will support a move based on their clients wishes rather than any evidence based criteria. my preferred approach is that the medical or other professional confirms the individuals condition and the housing options staff decide, based on their training and knowledge whether a move would improve things. otherwise, the flood gates will open for advocates to write in support of their clients.
3	Why no evidence for silver banding? Need to distinguish between a letter of support in the applicants words (typical GP letters that we see) and an independant report detailing factual information.
4	I think the welfare criteria is very broad and will mean a huge amount of applicants will qualify for silver medium medical/welfare. By default many of our applicants will have welfare issues. Not all will have a medical need to move.
5	I think including welfare will mean that most applicants could end up in the silver band
6	The phrase 'general well being' is too vague and needs clarity. Example: An applicants general well being may be poor because they do not like the property they are in at present, do not qualify for a higher banding on medical grounds, yet stop feeding themselves, taking care of themselves or the property in which professionals such as GP may feel the need to express their concern. The applicants general well being is poor and could be improved if they moved but this is due to their own actions and not because they suffer with a medical condition.


Q21 The medical and, or welfare issues of any individual can be assessed as follows:
Medical (i)Physical condition/illness: An assessment will be made taking account of the information provided by the applicant and any medical professional who has knowledge of the individual, their conditions and the effect the current property is having on their conditions. (ii)Mental Health An assessment will be made taking into account the information provided by the applicant and any professional worker who has knowledge of the individual, their mental health conditions and the effect the current property or local environment is having on their mental health.From the paragraphs above do you understand the medical assessment process?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	98.6%	71
No	1.4%	1
Don't know	0.0%	0
If you answered no please tell us why		0
<i>answered question</i>		72
<i>skipped question</i>		15




Q22 Do you agree with the principles of the medical process?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.3%	66
No	1.4%	1
Don't know	0.0%	0
If you answered no please tell us why?	4.3%	3
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		17



Q23 Welfare (i)General Welfare An assessment of the property and the local environment the individual is currently living in will be made to establish whether the individual has access to reasonably comfortable, affordable and secure living standard based on the information provided by the applicant and any professional worker who has knowledge of the individual and the environment the individual is living in. Consideration of the general housing circumstances in the district, the availability of facilities, resources and services in the property and the local environment where the individual lives in will be taken into account as well as the ability of the individual to access them. **(ii)Financial hardship** A full assessment of the household's income and expenditure will be undertaken to determine if the cost of the current accommodation is affordable or if it is creating financial hardship that cannot be resolved within a reasonable period of time. From the paragraphs above do you understand the welfare assessment process?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	93.0%	66
No	2.8%	2
Don't know	4.2%	3
If you answered no please tell us why?		4
<i>answered question</i>		71
<i>skipped question</i>		16



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	Prefer to simplify the language.
2	How will you ensure consistent assessment of affordability and financial hardship?
3	general welfare needs to take account of whether any of the family work in the town, their children attend school in that town, whether they have family & friends in the town, particularly dependant family and any other connections to that town need to be recognised within the banding system.
4	leaves it very open for applicants to argue why they should be in silver band when before were probably bronze

Q24 Do you agree with the principles for assessing welfare?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	85.7%	60
No	4.3%	3
Don't know	2.9%	2
If you answered no please tell us why?	7.1%	5
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		17



Number	If you answered no please tell us why?
1	We felt this example was not representative. Could the example be a person with severe mental health issues whose experience of temporary accommodation or rough sleeping is causing severe self-harm, or suicide attempts? This feels more realistic of the common cases?
2	agree with the financial hardship assessment, not so much with the general welfare assessment.
3	The financial assessment is likely to be inconsistent and likely to lead to considerable number of reviews. From an administrative perspective, this could be very difficult to handle.
4	We live in a predominantly rural part of the country, the availability of facilities, resources and services is always going to be limited compared to urban areas
5	Will they get this just once? they may move and decide again they qualify. The statements are to generalised and will make it difficult not to place applicants in silver. I think the majority of applicants will be in silver band, creating mainly 2 bands -silver and gold

Q25 The Government has changed the law to allow existing tenants the freedom to move for work. Therefore we propose that where an applicant has an offer of permanent work they will be able to join the register immediately Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	29.0%	20
Agree	58.0%	40
No View	7.2%	5
Disagree	5.8%	4
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
If you disagree please tell us why		8
<i>answered question</i>		69
<i>skipped question</i>		18



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	What is the definition of permanent? I don't think the legislation describes it as permanent and some industries work almost entirely on short term contracts.
2	This is the case now if over 16 hours a week!!!
3	This should mirror homeless legislation LC requirements
4	This needs to link with local connection so that the local population is not displaced due to a rapid influx created by Hinkley C employees
5	Thought this was already part of policy
6	unsure what this means- can they apply and not have to provide ID etc?
7	To prevent fraud I would suggest they be allowed to apply to join the registry upon proof of an offer, but for it not to be activated until there is proof positive that it has happened. At TAH we see a fair few people who say they came here with an offer of work which either fell through or was agency/zero hour and this is how they have become homeless. This is especially true of seasonal work in West Somerset/Sedgemoor.
8	should be where the applicant has accepted an offer of permanent work

Q26 We propose to change the wording of the policy to make it clearer to applicants the importance of a quick response to landlord of the property. Current Wording Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy Discrepancies in your application will be referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding. Each applicant will be given the opportunity to view the property before making a final decision on whether to accept or refuse. Proposed Wording Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy Discrepancies in your application will be referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding. Each applicant will be given the opportunity to view the property before making a final decision on whether to accept or refuse. Applicants will be expected to view a property within 48 hours (following contact from the landlord) and will be expected to make a decision on any offer within 48 hours of receiving the offer. Is the new wording clearer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	91.3%	63
No	7.2%	5
Don't know	1.4%	1
If you answered no please tell us why		9
	<i>answered question</i>	69
	<i>skipped question</i>	18




Number	If you answered no please tell us why
1	We feel that this is unreasonable in some circumstances. There should be a reasonable adjustment in this time frame for certain circumstances. For example if the person is in hospital or an individual with a learning disabilities. In some cases a number of visits with family, social worker etc. may be required to decide if the property is appropriate. These visits may not be able to organise in the 48 hrs. required. Again, we felt this should come with guidance to partners to ensure they are able to adequate support people with this requirement.
2	how are discrepancies linked to viewings?
3	It is longer.
4	In the new wording reference should be made regarding two forms of contact by the landlord.
5	It is clearer but 24 hours would be better for landlords.
6	But it still could be made more clear.
7	Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy Discrepancies in your application will be

Number	If you answered no please tell us why
	referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding. change to: Each individual landlord is responsible for the verification of the successful applicant and issues with your application will be referred back to the local authority and this may result in a change to your banding.
8	It may be clearer but the 48-hour time span is a very short one if the applicant wishes to seek advice from a supported housing provider as to financial/practical risks or other points to consider.
9	remove 'homefindersomerset.co.uk Common Lettings Policy' from the wording and it does

Q27 We propose to reduce the timescale from eight to four weeks for when a Local Authority can place an expression of interest on behalf of accepted homeless applicants who have not been proactive in seeking a permanent home. Do you agree with this change?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	27.5%	19
Agree	58.0%	40
No View	10.1%	7
Disagree	2.9%	2
Strongly Disagree	1.4%	1
If you disagree please tell us why		4
	<i>answered question</i>	69
	<i>skipped question</i>	18



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Again, we felt this should come with guidance to partners to ensure they are able to adequately support people with this requirement.
2	Bids may be placed in areas applicants do not wish to consider. I feel they should have the option of remaining in their preferred area or at the very least their LA area. This could be used as a tool to quickly discharge homeless duty.
3	Many of our homeless clients can be homeless for weeks before they approach either TAH or LA's. They often need 8 weeks to be in a stable & practical position to bid etc
4	I also think that if they are gold band approved homeless they should be applying for flats and not just houses/new builds and not just applying for one small village. Some homeless cases take months before being housed because they will only apply for houses or a particular village, which begs the question whether they are in fact homeless if they can wait for months for a particular type of property, village, even road!

Q28 When an applicant wishes to be considered for a property we ask them to make an expression of interest on that property. Previously we called this 'making a bid'. Do you prefer 'expression of interest' or 'making a bid'?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Expression of interest	59.4%	41
Making a bid	30.4%	21
Don't know	10.1%	7
If you disagree please tell us why		9
<i>answered question</i>		69
<i>skipped question</i>		18



Number	If you disagree please tell us why
1	Making a bid sounds very competitive.
2	It doesn't really matter either makes sense but you are going to confuse 'some' applicants keep changing the wording. There wasn't anything wrong originally when it was known as bid.
3	Im not sure that either names are fully understandable. I would use something like - Im letting you know im interested in this property.
4	better than make a bid (people still ask if they hav eto make a downpayment!)but still very wordy - a lot of people we deal with have a low reading age
5	I understand the ethos of expression of interest but no one uses it.
6	Neither is great, why not just change it to 'I'm interested', it's less formal.
7	applicants still say making a bid
8	No preference
9	I don't like either, bid is confusing, expression of interest is a mouthful. Why not simply 'apply'?

Number	Q29 Any further comments to make
1	<p>For the following Supported Housing change:</p> <p>The applicant resides within a short-term Supported Housing project (usually up to a maximum of two years) and is seeking to 'move-on' into independent accommodation. NB: The Project Manager of the scheme must confirm in writing that the applicant is ready for such a move and has acquired reasonable skills to sustain a tenancy. Until this time, the applicant will be placed within the Bronze Band. The effective date will be the date they entered the Supported Housing, or the date a homeless application was made, where the earliest date will apply.</p> <p>We feel that the sentence in brackets (usually up to a maximum of two years) should be removed. It is no longer applicable to any support housing project. This contradicts the Service Specifications of most supported housing projects in operation.</p>
2	<p>Amendments seem fair and reflect changing circumstances,</p>
3	<p>At least 15% of the population in the county have trouble reading; about 25% have no qualifications. Reading/understanding documents is a problem and making it longer/more complex is not a good idea.</p>
4	<p>6.12 Bronze accepted an offer that doesn't meet needs: Does this mean any tenancy (private or social housing) ? We have examples of people who have moved within the private sector to accommodation that is not considered suitable and so they still need to be considered for rehousing but nevertheless the move did improve their situation. Eg:</p> <p>1) A couple who needed 2 bed accommodation for confirmed medical reasons which had been accepted by Somerset Homefinder. They moved from a one bedroomed private rented property in Wiveliscombe to similar in Taunton. The husband had care needs and couldn't be left for more than 2 hours at a time. The wife had cancer and was having treatment at Musgrove hospital. They had no local support in Wiveliscombe. They moved to alternative one bedroomed accommodation in Taunton which enabled her to go for her treatment and leave her husband. They had been unable to find 2 bedroomed accommodation so still needed to be registered on homefinder for 2 bedroomed accommodation.</p> <p>2) Similarly a couple who were living in a room in a shared house. The husband is disabled and unable to go up and downstairs without assistance. The wife goes out to work and leaves the husband on his own during the day. When they lived in the shared house he had to stay in his bedroom all day as the bathroom was on the same floor, the kitchen was on the ground floor so he was unable to access this. They found a much more suitable one bedroomed privately rented flat, but it was on the first floor. The husband can now at least spend the day in the sitting room, having access to both a toilet and the kitchen, but it is still not suitable as he cannot go out alone. Would you anticipate that these two cases would be put in the bronze band? If so it would appear to penalise people who make an effort to improve their circumstances. If not, the wording needs further clarification.</p> <p>Also, if this is aimed at people within the private rented sector, it doesn't take into account the situation of people how have to move as their tenancy comes to an end but have been unable to find 'suitable' accommodation.</p> <p>NB it also doesn't give any indication of how long this restriction would apply - under the old wording it did at least allow further consideration following a change of circumstances.</p>
5	<p>Locality needs to be taken more into account as I have witnessed many families having to take property away from their family and friends breaking up their social network and causing them to have to travel by car to work and take children to school, this urgently needs to be addressed within the Homefinder system as it is a serious flaw.</p>
6	<p>This was far too long a questionnaire.</p>

Number	Q29 Any further comments to make
7	I think it may be hopeless to state my view but would verymuch like to see regard for anyone seeking a home to have a local connection(eg Parents, close relatives),and therefore a respect for others living in the area.
8	<p>Section 3 refers to an Open register. This should be clarified and reference made to 22.4</p> <p>6.8 Financial viability of all tenants needs to be assessed to ensure it is affordable including those in supported and extra care housing. Plans should be in place prior to offering accommodation.</p> <p>6.12 Those who have applied for a DFG will be placed in Bronze band - this does not assist landlords to move those tenants where the need for adaptations has been recognized. Policy should support those tenants requiring an adapted property to move quickly prior to substantial funds being committed,</p> <p>9.1 Assumes reference number and eligibility dates will continue or remain the same</p> <p>13.5.4. Courts have advised they will not be making an Order where there is agreed shared custody for a child. This referred to in the policy but is not specifically addressed in the policy. Also not consistent where adult children at Uni or in armed forces can be considered as part of the household.</p> <p>13.6.6. not listed (numbering issue).</p> <p>26.2 Should this refer to Formal offers of accommodation</p>
9	Applicants have never found the Homefinder site easy to use. People may have access to the site but completing the form is too difficult for them. You must simplify it.
10	The proposed changes to wording should make the process easier for applicants to understand
11	Some of these changes seem to make the policy wide open and I think many landlords would find the need to run their own lettings policies along side this policy. I think the changes in the Welfare Reform legislation needs to be considered when updating this policy
12	My biggest bug-bear is approved homeless who then don't apply for properties as the specific type or road they want isn't coming up. I feel that if they are claiming homelessness, then they should automatically be on autobid for any suitable sized property within a certain mile radius. I feel this would stop many abusing the system, would get homeless cases rehoused quicker and would keep the turn around on TA moving quicker! Autobid for approved homeless would solve a lot of issues.