

Summary of responses received	How have the issues been acted on or not
Fees are too high / unaffordable	The fees were calculated on a full cost recovery basis. Since conducting the public consultation a review of the fees and anticipated staffing resources has been completed and it is proposed to reduce the staffing resource in order to reduce the fees payable by licence applicants.
Discount for Accredited landlords is not sufficient.	See above, we have reduced the fee for Accredited Landlords.
Won't reduce Crime & ASB	Our view is that the scheme will address Crime and ASB. The consultation feedback focuses on the limitations of landlord's ability to address crime and ASB. We have a different view. Over 95% of compliance and behaviour change achieved by the Council is through informal means, i.e. letter, telephone calls, visits - we consider landlords and agents have the ability to use the same interactions with problematic tenants. Additionally, respondents have missed the role of the Council and Police through the licensing process - our officers will be clearly visible in the area to act as a deterrent and we plan to work closely with the Police and other partners to inspect every licensable property in the area. Through having a presence in the area and property inspections we will be able assist with tackling any criminal or ASB directly observed during this process. We will also proactively target criminal landlords who fail to licence their properties. A Selective Licensing scheme provides additional legal powers to address such crime or ASB. Many of the licence conditions are designed to address ASB. The Council does take on board the concerns raised from the consultation and is aware of the limitations that landlords face in eradicating ASB in certain situations. Each case of ASB identified will be assessed on a case by case basis and in turn so will the expectations of the licence holder. It is the Council's belief that through partnership working and increased regulation through the licensing scheme tackling ASB will be more achievable for landlords and the Council.

<p>Legal framework already in place why implement licensing? Licence conditions duplicate existing legislation</p>	<p>Many of the licence conditions do bring together existing legal provisions such as annual gas safety inspections but these are not currently enforceable by the Council and are not a priority to the HSE. Other conditions formalise good practice such as Electrical Condition Reports which are recommended every 5 years but not a strict legal requirement unless they present a risk to the occupants or visitors.</p> <p>The licence document also lays out what is expected from licence holder in a clear and concise format. It draws together numerous different requirements from a wide selection of legislation and government guidance in a format which is clear to the licence holder. The benefits of this is that it is clear to all licence holders what is required at a time where legislation can be quite confusing and licence holders know exactly what is expected of them for compliance. As these requirements are set out as licence conditions the council is able to quickly and easily address any failures by the licence holder under Part 2 of the Housing Act 2004.</p>
<p>scheme will penalise good landlords</p>	<p>Very few landlords in the area are Accredited which is the recognised standard for 'good' landlords. The scheme aims to incentivise good landlords by offering a greater fee discount. In our experience even 'good' landlords benefit from independent inspections by appropriately trained officers. Housing law is extremely complex and regularly changing and our intention is to provide advice and support to landlords through the licencing process to ensure properties are safe and compliant.</p> <p>It will also be a more effective way of ensuring all landlords within the area bring their houses up to the same standard and operate in the same way. Currently 'good' landlords may feel aggrieved that neighbouring private rented properties are not up to the same standard as their own and this is something that this scheme will look to address.</p>
<p>lots of ASB from rented properties nobody knows who to complain to.</p>	<p>A benefit of implementing a licensing scheme is that it will raise awareness for the community of their rights and responsibilities as private rented tenants. In most cases when officers inspect properties they will meet tenants and be able to educate and advise on all housing issues but also issues</p>

	<p>relating to ASB.. The availability of a public register will make it transparent which properties have a licence and in time it is expected that tenants will know to report any concerns relating to ASB to the licensing team.</p>
<p>Some improvements necessary but targeting all private landlords in Netherfield will drive good landlords out of the area.</p>	<p>The Council wants to work with all landlords and is not intending to drive good landlords out of the sector. They are a key partner, but the evidence suggests there are issues in Netherfield which a Selective Licensing scheme will help to address.</p> <p>All landlords will have an inspection of their property and will be able to call on the licensing team for advice and guidance. It is also expected that as properties are brought up to standard this will improve the area as a whole and in turn benefit those landlords who are currently meeting their legal obligation.</p>
<p>Should only target problem properties in the area.</p>	<p>Without a licensing scheme the council simply does not have the resources to target properties on a scale which would be necessary for the whole of the Netherfield ward. The Council only has resources to provide a reactive service across the borough. As stated in a previous comment many do not know how to report issues and we know there is under-reporting of issues.. A licensing scheme will enable the council to better identify where the private rented properties are in the area in order to target them.</p>
<p>Will this stop bad landlords being bad?</p>	<p>We believe the scheme will improve property management and housing conditions in Netherfield. Failure to comply with the licence conditions can result in prosecution and/or revocation of the licence. In such an instance where a licence is revoked the person having control would have to employ someone competent to manage their property for them. Therefore non-compliance would have a large detrimental impact on a 'bad' landlord which in turn should encourage them to operate in line with the law. When licenses are revoked, the problematic person can no longer have control and someone competent instead would need to take over the management of the property.</p>

<p>Landlords will pass on costs to tenants and rents will rise.</p>	<p>The market will dictate the local rent levels. Nottingham City Council is proposing a similar licensing scheme covering the majority of the city, during their consultation the same fears about rent rises has been raised. We anticipate a scheme being designated in Nottingham and if rents rise across Nottingham City due to licensing then they would rise across Gedling regardless of whether a scheme is implemented in Netherfield. We have not found evidence of rents rising due to licensing schemes. Spread over 5 years the cost is in the region of £2.50 a week and less for Accredited landlords. We are proposing a 2 part fee which will help spread the cost for landlords.</p>
<p>Potential investors will be put off from area</p>	<p>Evidence from Ashfield District Council's experience is that good landlords and investors have been attracted to their licensing areas.</p>
<p>Should be a voluntary code of practice and star rating as with takeaways</p>	<p>All takeaways are subject to mandatory registration and subject to regular unannounced inspections from the Council - this is not the same for private rented homes. We have promoted Accreditation locally which is free through DASH and voluntary but there has been a low uptake.</p>
<p>Landlords need stricter guidelines to ensure good housing for tenants.</p>	<p>We agree that all landlords should comply with the minimum legal standards. The proposed licensing scheme will assist with this.</p>
<p>should provide more social housing</p>	<p>This is a separate matter to the proposal.</p>
<p>should implement a scheme for tenants to report poor standards</p>	<p>That currently exists. Our intention through licensing is to take the onus off of the tenants reporting, we consider there is under reporting of issues. Tenants will also become more aware of their rights as private rented tenants and in turn how to report concerns to the Council.</p>
<p>Majority of landlords provide good homes, majority do it as a business of pension for them, should be a 2 strike system regarding complaints and reports of ASB.</p>	<p>We are in the process of updating our enforcement policy which will outline how we will deal with non-compliance.</p>

<p>Standards should be a minimum for all landlords but they should not be charged a fee unless they do not meet the standard. Landlords already pay income tax.</p>	<p>The licence fees will generate the revenue to provide the service. Without the fee income we would be unable to employ the staff to assess whether the properties meet the standard. Income tax does not contribute to costs associated with regulating the private rented sector. The current Government policy is businesses who are regulated should contribute towards the costs of the regulation and not general tax payers. All fees that are to be charged will go only towards paying the costs to operate the scheme.</p>
<p>The proposal will make it harder to rent. Landlords should be vetted to see if they are fit enough to rent out a property without it infringing on those renting and looking to rent.</p>	<p>We do not consider the proposal will make it harder to rent. The licensing proposal will introduce a vetting system to ensure landlords are fit and proper and the properties meet current minimum standards. We disagree that the introduction of landlord licensing will infringe on those renting or looking to rent.</p>
<p>Bad landlords will simply hide from the scheme.</p>	<p>We will encourage the community and tenants to report properties requiring a licence. We will also gather intelligence and proactively investigate landlords who require a licence. Where necessary we will take firm and appropriate enforcement against unlicensed landlords who operate in the area. If such action is taken then the landlord would still be required to apply for a licence and any enforcement/prosecution action would impact their ability to be granted a licence. If a licence is refused then the landlord would need to employ someone competent to manage the property on their behalf i.e. a managing agent or fit and proper landlord.</p> <p>The fine for failing to licence a property is currently unlimited which should serve as a respectable deterrent to landlords.</p>
<p>A well know criminal has moved near me and gone round neighbours' housing asking to buy their properties from them.</p>	<p>The council encourages tenants and the community to report criminal behaviour to the police and appropriate enforcement agencies, such as the council if there are offences relating to housing conditions.</p>

<p>What way are you going to improve tenant's lives, I'm going to increase the rents or serve notice my tenant.</p>	<p>The evidence is clear that there are social, economic, and environmental issues in Netherfield that can be improved by a licensing scheme to improve housing conditions and property management. Through the scheme there is potential for improved health outcomes and improved opportunities for tenants through improved housing conditions. The council urges landlords to carefully consider the reasons for implementing the scheme and the potential benefits for the area. The licensing fees will be no more that £2.50 a week when spread over 5 years.</p>
<p>If there is an issue with private rented landlords focus on these landlords with targeted reviews and fines.</p>	<p>Without a licensing scheme the council simply does not have the resources to effectively target properties on the scale necessary in the Netherfield ward. The Council only has resources to provide a reactive service across the borough. As stated in a previous comment many do not know who owns rented properties and how to report issues to them. We know there is under reporting of disrepair and property management issues in the private rented sector and expect the licensing scheme to aid this issue.</p>
<p>The scheme is designed to make money, profiteering from landlords.</p>	<p>The fees were calculated on a full cost recovery basis. Since conducting the public consultation a review of the fees and anticipated staffing resources has been completed and the fees and proposed staffing resource has been reduced.</p> <p>The scheme will not operate at a profit, the fees recovered from landlords will all go directly towards operating this scheme.</p>
<p>There are properties in Netherfield that appear below standard for habitation.</p>	<p>The evidence available in the proposal document supports this statement. Licensing will address this by requiring landlords to bring properties up to standard.</p>
<p>Scheme should include Legionella testing.</p>	<p>The licensing conditions can only include specific requirements included in the regulations for selective licensing. However the process of licensing will allow the council to offer advice to landlords and where necessary enforcement on other legal requirements which have the potential to impact the health and safety of tenants.</p>
<p>99% of landlords look after their properties and tenants</p>	<p>'Look after' is a broad statement based on perception and your reference of '99%' does not correlate with the data which formed the basis for our proposal. The evidence in the proposal indicates it is highly likely that there</p>

	are private rented properties in Netherfield that fail meet the minimum legal standards.
Potential for properties to be smoke free.	<p>This is not possible through licensing conditions. But there is opportunity to bring about improvements and address wider determinants in health as a direct result of implementing a scheme and is one of the aims of the proposal. There will opportunity for service providers to work in partnership with the council and also utilise the public register to target interventions.</p> <p>Should this ever become a requirement at central government level then this is something we could potentially incorporate into the licensing process.</p>
Multiple flats at end of road leaving rubbish on street, police often attending Currently ruining reputation for Netherfield.	The proposed scheme will help address these comments if the properties are private rented.
Bad landlords could be fined directly not charge good landlords	The licence fees are not the same as fines. Licence fees cover the cost of providing the licensing service. Due to the age and quality of the housing stock in the ward it is anticipated that all landlords will benefit from independent property inspections to ensure properties meet the current minimum legal standards.
Should be looking at all rented stock across the borough no matter who is the landlord	<p>The legislation set by Government applies to private landlords only. Consideration will be given to other areas of the borough after learning from the experience with Netherfield.</p> <p>As much as we would want the scheme to cover all rented stock we can only operate within the framework as set by Central Government. There will be an increased presence in the area which we expect will help to detect issues relating to rented properties which are not private rents which can then be addressed by our officers.</p>
tenants on housing benefit will not be able to afford an increase in rent	Rent prices relate to the local market. The introduction of licence fees does not necessarily mean rents will rise. Spread over 5 years the licence fee will have minimal impact on landlords.
should charge heavier enforcement penalties	Breaches of improvement notices and failure to licence a property are now subject to unlimited fines. Breaches of licence conditions also carry a fine if found guilty in court.

By making landlords responsible it will mean that necessary steps will be taken without the tenant feeling under pressure.	The council agrees with this statement.
Selective Licensing has done nothing to improve conditions in Nottingham City, it will just drive landlords underground.	Selective Licensing is not currently operating anywhere in Nottingham City. Nottingham City Council has only consulted on a proposal.
I think this is wanted for tenants as some landlords do nothing or very basic work.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
Useful for targeting disrepair, low housing demand and management failing. Not effective for tackling crime and ASB landlords have limited power to influence tenant behaviour. Supported by reports from resident associations in Nottingham City.	These comments are noted. The primary aim is to address housing conditions and property management. The council considers in achieving these aims the scheme will contribute to tackling crime and ASB. The proposed Selective scheme in Gedling differs from the Nottingham Additional licensing scheme. Gedling Borough Council are aware that crime and ASB issues are often complex and do not always have a quick easy fix. We want to work with landlords to help address crime and ASB and believe that licensing will assist with this.
Conditions coupled with a comprehensive inspection regime are a positive step.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
Dealing with crime and ASB is responsibility of enforcement agencies, Neighbourhood Wardens, police and social services, not landlords	We disagree. Landlords are a key partner in tackling crime and ASB. Issues are often complex and partnership working is widely recognised as the most effective way of effectively managing these issues.
Why not simply identify all the rented properties and inspect them. Start with those landlords who haven't registered their properties.	The introduction of a licensing scheme will provide the council with the resources to identify all of the rented properties and do just that. Landlords do not currently have to register their properties. The introduction of a licensing scheme will require all private landlords in the area to apply for a licence.
Netherfield has had millions poured into it, why is it still bad, why are landlords to blame for the deprivation.	Improving housing conditions and property management will improve health outcomes and increase opportunities for tenants to help make Netherfield less deprived. We are not suggesting landlords are to blame for Netherfield 'still being bad' as you state. There are numerous social and economic issues which have an impact on areas such as Netherfield, some of which are housing conditions and ASB which this scheme aims to have a positive effect on.
Conditions may improve the standard but would not welcome 6 monthly inspections.	These comments are noted.

Why not social housing, should apply to social housing.	The legislation set by Government applies to private landlords only and we have to work within this framework.
Will help the exploitation of low income tenants and improve the quality of housing.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
Rental accommodation not sole cause of crime and ASB, home owners and families also to blame.	The council is not blaming crime and ASB on any single source. This scheme will help to address issues associated with private rented properties.
Main problem is social housing tenants.	The evidence suggests the issue is broader than one sector of tenant.
Landlords cannot be expected to educate or influence tenants	The council disagrees with this statement and landlords are an important partner in influencing poor tenant behaviour.
Landlords can only tackle ASB by evicting tenants	That is one option. The vast majority of behaviour change is achieved by more informal means.
We now have drug dealing, motorcars and bikes racing around Netherfield all times of the day and night.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
dog mess has got much worse recently.	This matter has been reported to the Neighbourhood wardens who routinely patrol the area to witness offenders.
Targeted investigating, more Police presence, with a community interaction is likely to bring about a more effective result to reduce crime and ASB.	We consider the introduction of selective licensing will enhance and complement this suggestion. Under the current regime the council does not have sufficient information or resources to further target interventions. Selective licensing will provide further information where all of the private rented homes are to allow targeting of interventions. We intend to work closely with the police who we are co-located with.
Frequent drinking outside properties, broken glass, police attendance.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
how will conditions be enforced?	We propose to employ additional staff and intend to inspect every private rented home in the ward to check whether they are compliant with the licence conditions and housing law. The officers will also respond to any complaints received about housing conditions or breach of licence conditions. The council will carry out any enforcement in accordance with the service enforcement policies.
Landlords currently have option to not renew tenancy for problematic tenants.	We agree with this statement, however in some cases further intervention is required before the end of the tenancy agreement.

<p>Problem tenants will just move elsewhere.</p>	<p>Displacement is an effective tool in dealing with crime and disorder and antisocial behaviour. We believe the prospect of a tenant potentially losing their home due to their behaviour is an effective deterrent in the majority of cases.</p>
<p>The council needs to invest more into the area in terms of amenities, infrastructure, and roads. No correlation between property condition and crime and ASB.</p>	<p>We disagree and consider there is a correlation; Netherfield is well served in terms of roads and amenities. The proposal shows evidence of poor quality and poor property management in the ward. Central Government introduced the legislation and powers to address these issues.</p>
<p>Licensing is not the solution.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. As outlined in the proposal the council is utilising a number of approaches to improve the ward and feels that licensing will help aid this.</p>
<p>Crime and ASB Data is flawed figures given were from Netherfield and Colwick as a whole area, some of the perpetrators were from outside of Netherfield.</p>	<p>The police data was used to provide hotspot maps for the whole borough. Significantly more crime occurred in Netherfield than Colwick. The same about perpetrators could be said for crime statistics for any ward. Year on year Netherfield is in the top 15/20 wards in the whole of Nottinghamshire most affected by high levels of crime.</p>
<p>Fees should be based on Council tax rate which Council has figures for.</p>	<p>The fees are set on a full cost recovery basis in terms of the cost to the council to provide the service.</p>
<p>Is the fee annual or not</p>	<p>The fee is for the period of the designation, up to 5 years. We are considering implementing a 2 part fee structure which will help to spread the cost.</p>
<p>What benefit will come from the fee other than providing income to the Council.</p>	<p>Additional staff will be employed dedicated to the Netherfield ward. These staff will inspect every private rented home in the ward to ensure the properties comply with the licence conditions and current housing law. Where standards fall below the desired level the landlord will be required to bring about improvements. The officers will also gather intelligence of any criminal behaviour/ASB/safeguarding or other relevant matters and liaise with the appropriate organisations to ensure issues are addressed.</p>
<p>The area is not being maintained by the Council there are lots of weeds.</p>	<p>These comments have been forwarded to the council's Parks and Street Care service.</p>
<p>Personally think the fee should be more, the money raised should go toward policing properties and the maintenance of the properties.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The fees are set on a cost recovery basis for providing the service as per the requirements set out by Central Government for such a scheme.</p>

The fee structure is not a major issue,,,,, the scheme proposed is.	The comments are noted.
Rents low and profit margin low, tax will reduce this margin	These comments are noted.
Fee seems disproportionate to the level of work required checking certificates.	The fee covers the full range of services associated with receiving, processing, and compliance checking of licence applications.
How can fee be justified compared to Ashfield £250 and £350 fees.	Ashfield are proposing to increase their fees. Our fees are calculated on a full cost recovery basis. However following the consultation we will be looking to reduce our fee from the initial proposal which will mean reducing the number of staff to oversee the scheme.
Should provide service anyway without licence fee.	The council does not have the resources to provide the service without charging to recover the cost of providing the service.
Accredited landlords are considered good landlords and shouldn't have to pay anything at all.	We recognise that less work should be required when processing applications from accredited landlords and are therefore offering a discount fee. As a result of feedback in the consultation process we are considering increasing the discount for accredited landlords.
How can DASH provide the same service for free	DASH are subsidised to provide their services. They do not provide the same service as a licensing regime but there are some similarities.
£675 is low for HMOs who can make £2000 per month in rent.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
What happens to the fee if the rental property changes hands.	A new fee will be required as licences are not transferable. The reason for this is because a fit and proper assessment of the proposed licence holder and any other people having an influence is undertaken when processing the licence. If the property changes hands this would have to be undertaken again.
Why should I pay if I already pay council tax	The licence fee is to cover the costs of provide the licensing service. Council tax pays for services used by the general public not one specific sector.
The fees are too high compared to the running costs associated with the Nottingham City scheme	The fees are similar to the Nottingham City scheme. The difference in the cost is largely due to the different scales and approaches in administering the schemes.
Fees will help encourage responsible landlords to the area.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
Landlords have had to absorb other costs in recent years costs will be passed onto tenants.	These comments are noted and we are looking to reduce the licence fees and introduce a 2 part fee which will help spread the costs and make the scheme more affordable.

The fees raised are reasonable only £2.60 per week over 5 years. The funds raised will help employ the staff to inspect poor quality housing in Netherfield.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
There should be no reduction for any landlords, everyone should be treated the same. Most landlords don't care who they put in their properties or for the neighbours.	These comments are noted.
How much will I have to pay DASH to become Accredited?	Currently DASH is free to landlords operating in the Gedling Borough area.
Is the discount only for NLA members or does it apply to RLA and DASH members?	The discount will apply to all recognised landlord accreditation schemes including the ones mentioned.
Discount is a great incentive to encourage Accreditation.	These comments are noted and support the proposal. We would always encourage landlords to become accredited with a recognised accreditation scheme.
Other fees of the scheme are more reasonable as they are imposed when the landlord is not complying with their duty.	These comments are noted and support the proposal.
Report of criminal activity associated with a property on Deabill Street	Reported to Community Safety Team to investigate / liaise with partners.
Other fees will lead to increased rents.	These comments are noted and following feedback in the consultation we are proposing to reduce the licence application fee.
If a landlord is unable to use an online form or upload documentation due to age or disability to disadvantage them by charging extra for a paper form is wrong.	The council will accept paper applications but it will cost the council more to process them and so will need to recover these costs from the applicant. If an applicant has a disability which means they are unable to submit an electronic application and are only able to submit a paper application we would make reasonable adjustments to accommodate this and would not charge the applicant the additional cost associated with processing a paper application.
Manor Crescent and Park Road are not classed as Netherfield	They are within the Netherfield ward.
Why just this area?	The proposal document explains why the Netherfield ward has been selected. There is clear evidence supporting why the Netherfield ward has been selected.
Everything will be brought down to a low level rather than raising the standard.	There is no evidence to support this claim in other schemes in the country. We believe the scheme will improve housing conditions and property management as all landlords will be required to bring properties up to standard which makes them safe.
Should include the whole of the borough and country/nationwide.	These comments are noted. We do not consider there is sufficient evidence to support a borough wide scheme.

<p>Why Netherfield there are run down parts of Arnold, Carlton and Gedling.</p>	<p>The proposal document explains why the Netherfield ward has been selected. There is clear evidence supporting why the Netherfield ward has been selected. If the Council's Cabinet decide to designate the Netherfield ward for selective licensing and once the benefits have been understood, consideration will be given to whether there is evidence to support any other schemes elsewhere in the borough.</p>
<p>Landlords struggle to collect rent from tenants who receive Housing Benefit direct and we will also have to cope with Universal Credit with a 6 week delay. I'd make it all of Gedling. How can you create a Netherfield Ghetto?</p>	<p>The evidence available does not support a borough wide scheme. We do not consider this proposal will disadvantage the Netherfield ward.</p>
<p>No map published</p>	<p>The proposal map was available as attachment on the webpage and via a link through the consultation question. The map was also included in the proposal document.</p>
<p>There is definitely an issue in Netherfield.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>
<p>Progress is important.</p>	<p>These comments are noted.</p>
<p>Why not propose all of Carlton and Gedling as well?</p>	<p>The evidence supports a clear case for the Netherfield ward as outlined in the proposal document. The strategic approach is to first learn from the Netherfield experience where there is an identified need for selective licensing and then consider whether other areas would also benefit from a similar scheme.</p>
<p>Should do the whole of NG4 or not at all. Don't pick off bits where you feel renting is presenting the community social issues that is for the constabulary to deal with. Checking gas certificates will not lift society.</p>	<p>The evidence supports a clear case for the Netherfield ward. The aim of the scheme is to improve housing conditions and property management. The council works very closely with the Police and other partners to tackle crime and ASB. The scheme has a much broader remit than only checking gas certificates.</p>
<p>Emerys road has always been in Gedling not Netherfield. The streets around these properties contain bungalows, detached, semi-detached houses and flats. Many pensioners live on Emerys Road there are not problems with these properties.</p>	<p>The proposal includes the whole residential area of the Netherfield ward. The evidence supports a ward based approach.</p>
<p>Its is certainly needed in Netherfield.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>
<p>Proposal to convert Fire and Spice into 9 flats, surely not a good idea, wont make good living conditions.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and relate to development in the ward and not the proposed scheme.</p>

<p>Lived in Netherfield 14 months only ASB come across is lots of dog fouling. I am sure ASB does happen in other Nottingham areas.</p>	<p>These comments are noted.</p>
<p>If a landlord is rubbish then ban them regardless of where property is.</p>	<p>The Government has now introduced banning orders for landlords. The introduction of licensing requirements will complement the banning order powers.</p>
<p>Not been advertised properly says Netherfield only not Netherfield ward, looking on map covers Carlton. Has this been properly notified to landlords?</p>	<p>Extensive consultation has been carried out, it is clear that the proposal includes all residential properties in the Netherfield ward.</p>
<p>It is fair if the scheme covers other wards than Netherfield; probably unfair if it doesn't.</p>	<p>The proposal document explains why the Netherfield ward has been selected. There is clear evidence supporting why the Netherfield ward has been selected. If the Council's Cabinet decide to designate the Netherfield ward for selective licensing and once the benefits have been understood, consideration will be given to whether there is evidence to support any other schemes elsewhere in the borough.</p>
<p>The only fair way to introduce Selective Licensing is for all properties in Netherfield.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme includes all private rented properties in the Netherfield ward. The legislation and government guidance only applies to private rented properties.</p>
<p>There are large pockets of deprivation in Netherfield. Some property investors see this a great opportunity to gain high returns. The down side to this is that people on low income are affected and have to live in poor housing conditions. There are properties in Netherfield that have single glazed windows, damp and no central heating and hot water. This shouldn't be tolerated. It is clear that this area needs to be regulated and improvements need to be done.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>
<p>The council should spend this money on doing repairs and building homes in Gedling.</p>	<p>The fees are calculated on a full cost recovery basis for providing the service.</p>
<p>I am a good landlord. I look after my tenants and I look after my house in Netherfield. It's clean, safe and secure. Due to the bedroom tax and that I rent it to a lady with a disability and on DSS I am already losing money on not charging the rent I should. It makes me want to sell up.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and following feedback in the consultation we are proposing to reduce the licence application fee and break it down to be paid in two parts to help assist applicants.</p>

<p>Penalises good landlords, I would support the scheme if it applied to landlords not providing a good standard. Do not support it being mandatory for good landlords.</p>	<p>The licence fees are calculated to provide sufficient resource to administer the scheme. The council would not be able to check whether every property and landlord is 'good' without charging to provide the service. We are proposing a greater discount for accredited landlords in recognition that they offer a better quality of service and it costs the council less to process their licence applications.</p>
<p>Completely understand the wish to improve housing standards. Current legislation already provide tools to tackle issues related to poor housing standards. Bad landlords will always be bad landlords unless the law is enforced. Good landlord will suffer from scheme, and their tenants who will be paying higher rent.</p>	<p>Good landlords and their tenants will also benefit from improvements to property management and conditions. We are proposing a greater reduction in licence fees for accredited landlords as well as a 2 part fee to help spread the cost.</p> <p>Should 'bad' landlords continue to be 'bad' they will fall foul of the licensing requirements and action will be taken. This in turn will either encourage them to improve or ensure that someone competent is responsible for their property.</p>
<p>A cap on rents and an accredited star rating scheme alongside a voluntary code would be a better start than this proposal.</p>	<p>The council is unable to cap rents this would require legislation and resources from Central Government. To be successful a star rating scheme would require independent verification and additional resources to implement which would need to be paid for. Government guidance supports that those who are regulated should meet the cost of that regulation.</p>
<p>Landlords will sell up making tenants homeless, increasing costs for the council. Landlords will avoid buying in the area, and house prices will reduce for owner occupiers.</p>	<p>We have been unable to find any evidence to support this claim from other schemes already operating in the country. Feedback from the consultation indicates that good landlords will not be put off by the licensing requirements.</p>
<p>Poor landlords should be reported and addressed, not implement a scheme that penalises all landlords.</p>	<p>The evidence suggests that many issues go unreported for a variety of reasons. The scheme will not penalise landlords but will ensure their properties meet minimum standards.</p>

<p>Fewer properties will be available to rent in Netherfield. Will consider selling all 8 properties that rent out in area and buy elsewhere. Scheme will increase costs and the amount of work for landlord managing the properties under the proposals.</p>	<p>The properties will remain with the Netherfield ward to provide homes to the community. We consider the costs associated with selling properties and relocating to be significantly greater than the licence fees. The works required by landlords are not onerous and formalise good practice and meeting minimum legal standards which we want to become standard practice in the area. Any issues identified in terms of improvement within the properties as a result of the licence inspections would be required in any other properties purchased in other areas as they form the basic minimum requirements for rented properties. We will work with tenants and landlords to facilitate improvements and reasonable timescales will be given for completion.</p>
<p>The government has already stopped income tax relief on buy to let mortgages. Soon owning rental properties will become unviable and you will have to increase your social housing stock.</p>	<p>The council recognises the importance of a well-managed and maintained private rented sector. We do not consider the scheme will make private renting unviable.</p>
<p>Disagree with proposal, concern about increased costs for tenant and landlords all because council hasn't listened to tenants and thoroughly checked private landlords. Instead of fees why not target actual landlords who let down private letting? Why not impose these charges and more on them? why not revoke any licence they need to let? why not shut those landlords down? These fees will hurt everyone.</p>	<p>The current regime does not require checks before a property is rented privately. The scheme is targeted to where the evidence suggests intervention is required. Without introducing a licensing scheme the council would be unable to revoke any licences. Should a scheme become operational it is our intention to take enforcement action against unlicensed landlords and where landlords do not follow our advice to make their properties compliant. This would include prosecution proceedings, revoking licences etc. Where a licence is refused or revoked the person having control of the property would have to employ someone fit and proper to become their licence holder and manage the property for them.</p>
<p>Time to give the younger generation something to strive for, i.e homeownership and all its responsibilities.</p>	<p>These comments are noted but are more of a statement than an issue.</p>
<p>All I will do is give notice and put happy tenants on the streets you sort it out.</p>	<p>These comments are noted, and are unnecessary unless the property is substandard and the landlord is incapable of complying with the minimum legal standards.</p>

<p>Its not been thought through properly. See how is goes down in the National Press, and on Twitter etc. How popular will you all be for putting a whole area into a GHETTO implying substandard living conditions?</p>	<p>Selective licensing is a power provided by Government subject to the criteria outlined in the Government's guidance. We consider the Netherfield ward meets the criteria outlined in the Government's guidance. There are many selective licensing schemes operating in the country. The intention of the scheme is to improve property management and housing conditions in the ward.</p>
<p>Protection from rogue and uncaring landlords is needed but the council need to stop using Netherfield as the dumping ground of the borough.</p>	<p>Netherfield is a priority ward for the Council and has a dedicated Localities Co-ordinator to bring together partners to improve the ward. We believe the selective licensing scheme will bring about improvements in property condition and management within the ward.</p>
<p>Idea seems positive to improve quality of life for tenants. Concerned about costs.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. We are proposing a reduction in the licence fees from the initial proposal together with a greater discount for accredited landlords and a 2 part fee which will help spread the cost of the licence fees.</p>
<p>To support the licensing scheme employees could take part in making every contact count training which is an approach to behaviour change that utilises the millions of day-to-day interactions that organisations and individuals have with other people to support them in making positive changes to their physical and mental health and wellbeing. Contact jo.marshall@nottsc.gov.uk for more information and support.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and should the scheme proceed officers will complete this training. It is an intention of the scheme to maximise the outcomes achieved as a result of the site visits to properties.</p>
<p>How is this information used? How do I know if it will work? Not convinced all landlords will comply? What guarantees are in place?</p>	<p>The council anticipates that some properties will not be compliant and some may not apply for a licence. The council will ensure the appropriate enforcement action is taken where necessary. There are significant penalties to landlords where there is non-compliance which acts as a significant deterrent.</p>
<p>Doesn't think a £675 licensing scheme will suddenly solve all the problems.</p>	<p>The intention of the scheme is to improve housing conditions and property management in the ward. It will not improve the area overnight but in time once properties are brought up to standard we are confident it will help address a number of issues identified in this ward.</p>
<p>The scheme should just be for where there are problem areas with ASB and negligent landlords.</p>	<p>The evidence outlined in the proposal indicates this statement applies to the Netherfield ward.</p>

<p>Has been needed for years.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>
<p>EMPO believes the number of properties being rented across Netherfield will be higher than published by the Council in the proposal. The Council is basing its figure of 635 properties on data extracted from the 2011 census. However it appears no calculation has been made to reflect the growth of the Private Rented Sector since 2010 which households renting have increased by 1.1million according to the English House Survey.</p>	<p>We have taken into account that the private rented sector has grown since the 2011 census but it is difficult calculate the exact impact of this growth to the Netherfield ward. Through the consultation some landlords have indicated they intend to sell their properties so that also has to be taken into account when predicting the number of private rented properties. We consider the census data is sufficiently robust to support the proposal.</p>
<p>Housing quality and the safety of citizens has strong and clear links to improved outcomes for people. This is a key step in the right direction to adding some control to a rental sector within which there have been clear historical issues.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>
<p>Where is the incentive for landlords to improve tenants living environments? Whole concept is ill-conceived and bureaucratic.</p>	<p>The council has carefully considered and supported the proposal. We consider that the provision of well-maintained and managed homes is a basic right for the community. We propose a greater fee reduction for accredited landlords to encourage more landlords to become accredited.</p> <p>Bringing private rented properties up to an acceptable standard shouldn't be dependent on an incentive for landlords – it should be done because this is the nature of the sector and tenants have a right to a safe property in which to live.</p>
<p>If you could find a method of penalising bad landlords and improving the life of poorly treated tenants without penalising good landlords and their own tenants then I would be all in favour of the scheme.</p>	<p>We do not consider the proposal is penalising good landlords, and due to the age and condition of the housing stock in the ward even good landlords would benefit from an independent inspection from an authorised officer.</p>
<p>This is an attempt to root our rogue landlords. Council already has sufficient powers. Another funding exercise for council coffers.</p>	<p>The scheme will introduce additional requirements that do not currently apply. We consider the licence conditions are required. The scheme is self-financing and fees are calculated on a full cost recovery basis.</p>
<p>How can landlord control tenant behaviour. Landlord has to give notice to inspect. Council and police have enforcement powers to close properties these are not being used in Netherfield.</p>	<p>We consider that landlords are an important partner in addressing tenant behaviour. The scheme will provide additional staffing resource to carry out further enforcement. We hope to work in partnership with landlords to address such issues and believe this scheme will aid that.</p>

<p>I agree on 3 conditions. 1 GBC tracks down all rogue landlords in Netherfield, rather than just a tick box exercise and way of raising money. 2 the fee is spread annually, it can be done so there are no extra costs to GBC. 3 refund any fees within 5 years to anyone who ceases to be a landlord - please be fair to landlords.</p>	<p>The intention is to take proactive action to ensure all private landlords apply for licences as necessary. We consider the introduction of an annual fee would increase the burden and risk to the council for the scheme and would lead to increased fees. However, we are proposing a 2 part fee which will help spread the cost. We will be unable to refund the licence once the licence has been processed as the costs will have already been incurred by the council. The licence fees are set on a full cost recovery basis.</p>
<p>I believe that the introduction of licensing will help prevent exploitation of low income tenants and improve the quality of housing that is available to residents of Netherfield. The system will help regulate what's going on in the private sector and we full support Gedling Borough Council's proposals. Everyone deserves a safe secure home. Being a landlord or a property investor should be seen as a business and NOT a investment.</p>	<p>We note these comments that support the proposal.</p>
<p>The proposal does not take into account rent to rent or sublet properties, or those who exploit both landlords and tenants</p>	<p>We consider that rent to rent and subletting of properties is not regular practice in the area. We will tackle cases on a case by case basis ensure the licensing regime is complied with. We intend the scheme to address those who exploit tenants and landlords.</p> <p>In cases where properties are being sub-let without the owner's knowledge the licensing process will highlight this to the owner who can then take the appropriate action.</p>
<p>What support will the Council provide for landlords?</p>	<p>Our intention is to employ specific officers with the job title of 'Improvement & Enforcement Officers' part of their remit will be to offer support and guidance to enable landlords to comply with their legal obligations and licence conditions. Within the Public Protection Service we also have an ASB Co-ordinator, Environmental Health Officers and Neighbourhood Wardens who will be able to support the scheme and landlords. We intend to signpost landlords to relevant services and offer support. We recognise that informal means are often far more cost effective in bringing about improvements and compliance with legal obligations.</p>

<p>How can landlords tackle overcrowding without infringing on tenants?</p>	<p>Landlords can offer clear advice and expectations at the beginning of tenancies and investigate reports of overcrowding in a property. We understand that sometimes a tenant's circumstances change throughout a tenancy and their family can out grow a property. We would expect landlord's to take reasonable action and where necessary support a tenant to ensure their property is not overcrowded. The overcrowding provisions are specifically aimed at rogue landlords who deliberately overcrowd their properties to increase their profit margins at the expense of the tenant's rights and safety.</p>
<p>Proposal fails to address link between homelessness and the effect that licensing has on tenants.</p>	<p>Selective licensing is a power provided by Government subject to the criteria outlined in the Government's guidance, one of the key criteria is 'high levels of deprivation'. There are many Selective licensing schemes operating throughout the country we are not aware that such schemes lead to an increase in homelessness.</p>
<p>There is no obligation within selective licensing for the landlord to resolve an allegation of ASB. A landlord has a tenancy agreement with a tenant and this is the only thing that the landlord can legally enforce.</p>	<p>In our experience, enforcement and eviction are not always the solution as neighbour disputes can sometimes be complex. Many can be resolved informally. Sometimes disputes can be resolved by practical solutions that can be resolved by the landlord and tenant communicating with each other, as proposed through the licence conditions.</p>
<p>How will a landlord know if a noise complaint is genuine ASB, what if they end a tenancy and the complaint is false?</p>	<p>We would recommend liaising with the Council's Public Protection Service who can investigate the noise. We would only recommend ending the tenancy if the facts of the case supported such action. For example if the offender had ignored warnings and was proven to have breached an abatement notice or had been served with fixed penalty notices for noise etc.</p>
<p>Local authorities with large number of private rented properties need to consider a strategy for collection of excess waste at the end of tenancies.</p>	<p>We are in conversations internally with our waste service to consider what further support can be offered for licenced landlords. We will explore this suggestion further.</p>
<p>Is it the councils policy to reduce the private rented sector? Where does the council wish to see the private rented sector grow?</p>	<p>The council has no control over the growth of the private rented sector. Selective licensing is proposed to regulate the quality of the private rented sector and improve property conditions and management.</p>

<p>Landlords will face increased costs by raising rent prices and will look elsewhere for tenants.</p>	<p>Spread over the 5 years of the scheme the fees are not considered significant for landlords. Tenants should expect the level of service required by the licence condition as standard practice for private rented accommodation, all the licence does is formalise this and provide powers to the Council to take action where there is a breach.</p>
<p>Mortgage lenders have withdrawn mortgage products where selective licensing has been introduced. This appears on a landlord's credit history causing them higher costs.</p>	<p>We are not aware of this happening locally. There are many city and borough wide schemes around the country; we consider it unlikely that landlords would be unable to access mortgages as mortgage companies will be aware of such schemes. Landlords need to ensure they are adequately financed to provide living accommodation for their tenants.</p>
<p>Proposing selective licensing will stigmatise the area and affect property values and increase insurance premiums.</p>	<p>We disagree that this effect would be due to selective licensing. Insurance premiums are already linked to crime statistics in an area and house prices relate to the location and local market value. Selective licensing is an attempt to improve property management and housing conditions which will benefit the area.</p>
<p>Selective licensing will have a greater impact on tenants evicted from social housing. How does the council expect landlords to solve these tenants' issues when the social sector has failed?</p>	<p>Selective licensing will only impact tenants who fail to behave appropriately. We support social landlords evicting problematic tenants who blight communities with criminal and antisocial behaviour. We expect private landlords to work with the council and partners to address crime and ASB. Part of the aims of the scheme is to reduce crime and ASB in the ward.</p>

<p>The council should consider the Homesafe approach of Doncaster - this has not been reviewed or presented in the proposal.</p>	<p>Officers have spoken directly with Homesafe and with Doncaster BC and West Lindsey DC who operate these schemes. These are essentially private sector run schemes which according to our constitution would subject to public procurement tendering. We are not aware these same rules have been followed in the other council areas. We consider a tendering exercise would add significant delays to a scheme and the council would lose control of the service compared to a directly delivered scheme. Contracting the service to a private sector organisation would place additional contract management burdens on the council and potential reputational issues if the scheme does not deliver. We would prefer a directly delivered approach as proposed in line with what is currently provided for the vast majority of selective licensing schemes in the country.</p>
<p>some landlords won't know about the scheme how are we going to find them?</p>	<p>We will promote the scheme widely and have a visible presence of officers in the ward. We will target the area using gathered intelligence to identify properties that should be licenced. Where landlords fail to licence their properties they will be subject to proportionate enforcement action.</p>
<p>What is going to attract landlords in the future to Netherfield?</p>	<p>There are many reasons to invest in Netherfield. Feedback from some landlords through the consultation process indicates they would not be put off investing in Netherfield.</p>
<p>What happens if a landlord doesn't have the money, especially if they have multiple properties?</p>	<p>We do not consider the costs are prohibitive to landlords with multiple properties. We are proposing to introduce a 2 part fee to help spread the cost and to reduce the licence fees from the initial proposal.</p>
<p>Will there be a public register?</p>	<p>The Housing Act 2004 requires a public register of licenced properties and the details that should be contained on the register.</p>
<p>Landlord of a property on Dunstan Street supports the scheme as some landlords are exploiting tenants. There is a link between ASB and poor housing. Gas engineers are regulated to operate, the same should apply for landlords.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and support the proposal.</p>