

Appendix 3, summary of issues raised in 12 week consultation

102 Respondents completed the questionnaire.

Main points raised (negative):

- Licensing will increase rents/costs will be passed onto tenants
- Licensing will result in landlords selling their properties which will result in over demand in the areas
- The council already has powers to deal with property disrepair and property management so why is licensing needed
- The fee is too high/it is an additional tax
- Landlords using agents should be exempt from the need to licence
- The accreditation discount is too high or not enough
- The scheme should be borough wide/The scheme should cover other areas not covered in the proposal
- The scheme targets good landlords when it should be focused on purely the bad ones
- Bad landlords won't apply and will avoid having to go through the requirements of licensing
- The financial implications of the Covid pandemic make it an inappropriate time to introduce a scheme which will require landlords to pay licence fees and increase their rents

Main points raised (positive)

- Will ensure that properties are well maintained and managed
- Hold landlords to account
- Stop landlords from being able to hide from their responsibilities
- Should apply to all landlords

Summary of responses received	How the issues have been acted on or not
Properties will be well maintained and safe	The council agrees that a licensing scheme would increase the number of properties being well maintained and safe.
The Scheme in Netherfield is not working, ASB, drugs, crime dirty streets are very much an issue, there are alot of transient residents and more HMO's are being considered, gone are the days of a long term community , of which the older residents remember. This scheme should be looked at first before another is set up.	The scheme in Netherfield has been effective in introducing minimum standards and improving housing conditions. The scheme alone will not remove all social issues but does introduce a mechanism to address anti-social behaviour and criminal behaviour.
Besides being another tax on the Landlord, I do not see where the license fee money has further improved the standards of property. You can provide a nice, safe, clean, and warm house to a tenant for them to destroy, vandalise, and not report any issues they occur and the landlord still be at fault.	The licensing fee is a cost recovery based on the cost incurred by the council in processing the licence and carrying out licensing related compliance duties.
Will force landlords to provide safe homes	It is believed that a licensing scheme will lead to improved management of properties and improved standards within those homes.
We have properties in Netherfield and Ashfield and I can't see a benefit to me as a landlord! Just added expense.	Licensing ensures to ensure that management of properties is satisfactory, that the management is being carried out by fit and proper licence holders and agents and that sufficient financial means are available to suitably and safely manage the property. In addition to this the council carries out a property inspection and addresses any areas of concern under HHSRS and other relevant information in order to safeguard tenants. The licensing process therefore helps to ensure all licensed properties are safe to occupants and that management practices are suitable to ensure the safety of occupants.
The Council already has the power to enforce standards under current legislation but generally fails to do so. SL just increases rent and moves problems elsewhere.	The licensing scheme provides the council with the resources to proactively address a large number of properties in a number of different areas known to have issues as covered in the proposal document. A far larger number of properties than would be possible otherwise. It also puts in place a number of <u>management</u> requirements via licence conditions, not all of which can be easily addressed/dealt with under current legislation. The licence conditions

	<p>ensure that the licence holder is clear on what is required in terms of managing the property and gives the council more powers to take action when management practices are not satisfactory.</p>
<p>1. ASB is, in law, not the responsibility of the Landlord. 2. The Council already have the power to enforce legislation, licensing does not improve the options available to do so.</p>	<p>Selective Licensing does not state that ASB is the responsibility of the landlord. What selective licensing does is put a number of requirements on the licence holder to take, what the council believe to be reasonable steps, in addressing ASB when they become aware. The council recognises that there are many aspects and stakeholders when it comes to investigating and addressing ASB. The landlord/agent is clearly a central stakeholder and as such should take steps to tackle/reduce/eliminate ASB if it is occurring at their properties. The council and partners such as the police can and would also assist and offer support to licence holders and agents where ASB is reported. The licence conditions relate to the management of the property and ensure that the licence holder is clear on what is required in terms of managing the property. A number of conditions go over and above what could be covered and addressed using legislation. The conditions also give the council more powers to take action where management practices are not satisfactory.</p>
<p>Responsible landlords will already be doing this.</p>	<p>If a landlord is already 100% compliant then there is little for them to be concerned about regarding the licensing process. It takes a lot of time and money to be a fully compliant and responsible landlord and therefore it must be frustrating for compliant landlords when they see other properties in the street which are not compliant. These properties could be impacting on the rentability of their own property, contributing to ASB in the area or charging the same rent without the landlord putting in the same time and money. Licensing will ensure that all private rented properties are managed to the same standard which will in turn improve the area and mean that all landlords have to put in the same time and money to maintain their properties. 78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant.</p>
<p>Similar scheme by Nottingham City Council has simply increased the cost of renting for individuals and families. The costs are passed on by the landlord to the tenant. It may also lead to a reduction in</p>	<p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration</p>

<p>rental properties available, which again, leads to price increases.</p>	<p>of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month, £2.25 per week) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month, £2.69 per week). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
<p>Good landlords already look after their property and tenants with these procedures and bad landlords will still ignore these so the good end up paying again!!!</p>	<p>If areas are designated as selective licensing areas then it becomes a criminal offence to occupy a private rented property without having applied for a licence. The council can then take enforcement action against those landlords and agents which would consist of either issuing a Civil Penalty Notice or prosecution. Should a landlord be prosecuted that council could then potentially refuse a future licence application unless the landlord employed a competent person to manage the property on their behalf. The council welcomes intelligence from the community on properties which may be operating without a licence and has an anonymous reporting facility on its website.</p>
<p>License holders are already providing properties conforming with the proposed conditions. Non licence holders will continue 'under the radar'</p>	<p>78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant.</p>
<p>Has a landlord . All certificates have to be attained for insurance purposes. Plus all must be given to tenant prior to tenancy</p>	<p>Licensing is about far more than checking certificates. It covers all aspects of property management.</p>
<p>It's a tax that will be passed on to tenants. I agree that i should provide quality properties and wouldnt dream of letting someone live in substandard property. My tenants have access 24/7 to call out are vetted also if something goes wrong boiler or electrical. Councils already have powers to deal with bad landlords. Its just that you dont enforce</p>	<p>Not all landlords operate to this level of management. Council's do already have powers to deal with numerous housing related issues however the licensing scheme brings in resource for the council to proactively address a large number of properties in a number of different areas known to have issues as covered in the proposal document. Licence conditions are also clear and prescribed so that licence holders are clear on exactly what is expected. Some conditions also go over and above what can be dealt with by the council under existing legislation and enables the council to easily take action where management practices are not satisfactory.</p>

<p>effectively. Cost has to be passed on along with admin fee.</p>	
<p>The fee is too high. This charge will push my tenants rent up. Pushing them further into poverty</p>	<p>The licensing fee covers the cost incurred by the council in processing licenses. The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month, £2.25 per week) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month, £2.69 per week). As means of comparison the AA’s British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
<p>I absolutely do not consent to 6 monthly or any inspections. I have a right to live in quiet enjoyment and having a landlord assess my home every 6 months would impinge upon that. If this proposal is part of the conditions of the licence I would leave the area. Instead I would prefer as a tenant to be able to have a mechanism where I can self report the condition of the property and any issues direct to the council as the tenant. This would reduce the risk of landlords covering up any issues.</p>	<p>All tenants have a right to quiet enjoyment of the property they rent and occupy. Regular inspections are useful for both the tenant and the landlord as it provides an opportunity for the tenant to report any concerns and also for the landlord to observe how the property is being occupied so that they can take any steps they deem as necessary. Inspections would be arranged with the tenant at a time that was convenient and the tenant could accompany the inspector if they wished. It is not uncommon for regular inspections to be contained within tenancy agreements. Regular inspection ensure that landlords are able to check on the condition of the property and ensure it is well maintained. Whilst some tenants report repair issues not all do and as such landlords may not be aware of repairs that are needed to protect the tenant or the condition of their property.</p>
<p>U gonna' have argument on some of them roads maybe but to charge everyone, good landlords with good houses with</p>	<p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-</p>

<p>good tenants maybe paying cheaper rent than normal, u gonna' make it worse for them</p>	<p>accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p>
<p>This will not prevent the tenants from running the properties down</p>	<p>Effective management will help ensure that landlords and agents can quickly and effectively address any mistreatment of properties by tenants and take positive steps to address any issues and protect their property. One of the licence conditions requires that licence holders inspect properties at least every six months – this will ensure licence holders can realise any issues that may be occurring and be proactive in taking steps to address them.</p>
<p>Within the existing scheme tenuous faults were used to include properties in the statistic of requiring improvement, for example increases in the number of electric sockets not required under any legislation. In our property the electric socket requirement was already covered, but the inspector failed to move furniture so did not count the actual number of sockets.</p>	<p>99% of hazards within a residential property are addressed using the Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS). This would include any requests made for additional electrical sockets. There are very few prescribed standards within legislation for private rented properties because each property is different and a one size fits all standard cannot often be applied to all. Therefore there is no legislation that specifically states a landlord should do something such as provide a minimum number of sockets. Housing hazards are assessed under HHSRS which is a risk based approach and can be enforced using the Housing Act 2004. We have had a number of landlords argue the need to provide a minimum of two double electrical sockets in bedrooms – the majority of the properties within Netherfield were built long before the need for additional electrical sockets were commonly needed. Nowadays there is a greater need for electrical sockets as the majority of people are more reliant upon electrical devices and overloading of sockets can lead to an increased risk of fire, electrocution and falls on levels. One double socket can be installed as a spur from an existing socket so the cost of installing a socket is minimal and the potential benefit to the tenant is significant. There is a guidance document entitled “Minimum provision of electrical socket-outlets in the home (Electrical Safety First)” which was produced in 2018 and contributed to by large number of experts in the field of domestic electric including NICEIC and NAPIT which recommends a higher socket provision than the two doubles the team has been requiring. The two double sockets that the team require is what we consider</p>

	<p>to be the absolute minimum to suitably control risk and in an ideal situation there should be more provided.</p> <p>To suggest one type of hazard within a properties is 'tenuous' compared to others epitomised exactly why it is necessary for trained officers to inspect properties and carry out assessments. Landlords may believe they are fully compliant in ignoring hazards they consider 'tenuous' and in actual fact be putting tenants at risk.</p> <p>Inspectors will endeavour to view all sockets where possible but will not go moving tenant's furniture where it isn't appropriate. In cases where it was not possible to accurately determine the number of sockets in a room the letter will explain this fact and ask the landlord to ensure there are a minimum of two double sockets.</p>
<p>We were asked to put a double socket into a spare bedroom instead of a single. Technically this is improving a property..... Easy fixes are being targeted but truly problematic landlords have probably avoided being registered. Why would it work any better in any of the above areas?</p>	<p>See the point above. All hazards identified in the property are communicated to the licence holder and agent no matter how large or small. If the risk is such that those works could be required under enforcement action the council record them as required remedial works. If they could not be enforced then they are clearly marked on the letters as 'recommended works' and those are recorded separately.</p> <p>The council has taken action against a number of landlords and properties who have not applied to licence their properties</p>
<p>I am a Lettings Manager living and working in Gedling. Having seen the impact of NCC Selective licensing scheme to the local housing market I can say that these scheme disproportionately affect low income tenants. A significant majority of private landlords maintain a good standard and are fully compliant with health and safety legislation. You are going to indirectly tax 95% of good landlords in order to try and catch a very small number of rogues.</p>	<p>The remit for councils introducing selective licensing schemes is set out in the council's phase 2 proposal document. Simply put there are 6 conditions which, if present in a certain area, can be the basis of a selective licensing designation. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An area that is, or is likely to become, an area of low housing demand - An area experiencing significant and persistent problems caused by anti-social behaviour - Poor property conditions - High levels of migration - High levels of deprivation - High levels of crime

	<p>It is therefore highly likely that any area that fits the above criteria and which the council chooses to consult on extending selective licensing to will contain a high number of low income tenants.</p> <p>The council's statistics from phase 1 (detailed previously in this document) show the opposite of this view – not all landlords are fully compliant despite believing they were. The council is also not suggesting that just because certain improvements are required in the conditions at a property and/or in the management of a property that the landlord in question is not a 'good landlord'. However this does not change the fact that a large proportion of properties inspected were not compliant and that the tenants of those properties have benefited as a direct result of the council's involvement by improvements being made to the conditions within the property and/or the management of the property.</p>
<p>As a private tenant in Netherfield, I have experience of the scheme already implemented there. I had reservations about the amount of disruption caused by modernisation works; and a lot of my time was indeed taken up - to the extent that I could undertake little else for a number of weeks. I can now say that I have found the additional electrical sockets useful, and the modern consumer unit (which replaced a traditional fuse box) has successfully drawn my attention at an early stage to an insulation defect in an old cooker. The modernisation works were implemented with due sensitivity, and I believe that to be vitally important (the closeness of the US election result may remind us that citizens can have legitimate concerns regarding the intrusion of 'Big Government'). In</p>	<p>Change isn't always easy for tenants and also having contractors in to carry out repairs can also be inconvenient and disruptive to normal life. We understand that and would always encourage landlords and agents to work around tenants to ensure disruption is kept to a minimum. It may also be the case that tenants have got used to certain quirks within their property and have grown to accept them. However this doesn't change the fact that those tenants could be either knowingly or even unknowingly living in conditions which present a risk to their health, as determined using the legislative framework (HHSRS and Housing Act 2004). The council has a statutory duty to take action where it finds that significant hazards are found in properties. We hope that there would be a degree of trust from tenants towards our trained officers when assessments have been made and works required to protect health. The standards we apply are the basic minimum standard to ensure health and wellbeing within the properties.</p> <p>We always try to consider the tenant's wishes and where appropriate we wouldn't push for works to be carried out to a property if the tenant was against it and the risk was proportionate. Some hazards carry such a high level of risk that the landlord would need to carry out the repairs for the tenant to continue to live in the property and in those cases (often fire related hazards) we would insist on those works being carried out.</p>

particular I was grateful that neither central heating nor double glazing were imposed against my wishes - I wouldn't want to see historic windows replaced.

For less serious hazards where tenants ask that works are not carried out we will always look to accommodate those wishes and have often discharged our statutory duty in an alternative way so as to respect the tenant's wishes.

I privately own a property within the Carlton Hill Ward and I am also a Lettings Manager of an independent Lettings specialist in Nottingham. I have personally overseen 180 Nottingham City Council selective licence applications and 6 Netherfield Gedling Borough Council selective licence applications. Selective licencing has done nothing whatsoever to improve housing conditions for residents in Nottinghamshire as councils spend the majority of their time and resources administering the scheme, rather than improving housing standards. Councils already have legal powers to enforce action against rouge landlords and you they should use these powers to improve housing. After submitting close to 200 licence applications since 2018 when selective licencing was introduced, only 1 property has been inspected during that time and no housing standards have been improved, yet countless hours of paperwork and thousands of pounds have been spent creating word documents which give councils the power to enforce action they already were in a position to do.

Gedling Borough Council cannot comment on schemes run by other councils. GBC are committed to inspecting all properties for which a licence application is received. Inspections had to be paused due to the Covid-19 pandemic – something which no one foresaw coming but inspections have recommenced and those properties will still be inspected retrospectively. As mentioned previously in this document, licensing provides the resource for the council to proactively target a much large number of properties than would otherwise be possible. The licence conditions put in place a clear set of standards that licence holders must adhere to when managing properties and the licensing scheme gives the council more powers to take action when unsatisfactory management practices occur.

<p>Many rental properties have messy overgrown gardens as the tenants don't tend to them. Landlords should have to tend to these every 3 months or so, not just between tenants, which could only be annually, leaving streets looking messy for long periods of time. There should also be a category on the council website for raising issues with rented properties such as ASB or poorly maintained properties. Residents should be allowed to have a say in to whether properties can be bought to be rented in the area/street. I'd much rather live on a street with no rental properties for these reasons, and am strongly considering selling my property due to now being surrounded by rental properties and how the street has deteriorated over the years.</p>	<p>There is a clause in the licence which required licence holder to ensure that gardens, yards and other external areas are cleared of rubbish, debris and accumulation between tenancies so the presence of licensing does help with your concerns somewhat. We hear what you say when you say this should be an ongoing requirement and not just when a tenancy ends. The council can only take action within the legislative framework that is available. For example for licensing schemes relating to shared houses there is a requirement for gardens and yards to be kept clear at all times – this is because this is written into the legislation by central government and can therefore be acted on by my local government. There is no such provision for selective licensing. There are however other ways the council could assist in these situations and the selective licensing team would be more than happy to sign post you to the relevant officers within the council to assist.</p> <p>Poorly maintained properties and ASB can be reported to the council by emails using privatesectorhousing@gedling.gov.uk. We would then ensure the request was forwarded onto the relevant department.</p>
<p>I have repairs from a landlord raised for years and no action even for gas</p>	<p>This is something that licensing would help to address. Gas certification is required to be submitted as part of the licence application process. It is also a condition on the licence that annual gas checks are carried out and that paperwork is submitted to the council within 7 days of a request. Any other necessary repairs would be identified on the property inspection and works required of the landlord as a result. There is also a condition in the licence requiring that the licence holder ensure all reasonable and practical steps are taken to respond to repair and maintenance issues at the property and that any works to deal with repairs are undertaken within a reasonable period of time. If licence holders breach licence conditions the council can take action by either prosecuting, issuing a fine and/or revoking the licence.</p>
<p>I adhere to all of the conditions in the scheme anyway as I am a responsible landlord. I abide by the rules set by the local council anyway, as I believe most landlords do. There are already guidelines</p>	<p>The licensing process formalises management requirements that licence holder must adhere to and provides additional powers to the council to take action where management practices fall below these standards. These requirements will be in place for all licensed properties so even if you are fully compliant yourself you still will likely see benefits by other neighbouring</p>

<p>in place whereby the council can fine me or take me to court so I dont understand why they wish to bring in selective licencing, unless it is purely a money making excercise, as it is in Netherfield and City Centre.</p>	<p>properties improving and more effective management of neighbouring tenants. Improvements in the area will also benefit your property in terms of value and rentability.</p>
<p>It is a deterrent to landlords to comply when its a GBP700 per property plus the upgrades that need doing. We own 6 properties in Gedling and our properties have always been in excellent order and we would be happy for you to contact them all to confirm. We spend approximately GBP5000 to get licenses and upgrades. We do not have a problem with the inspections and getting the properties upto latest code but the landlords that are complying are not the problem ones. We know landlords that have not complied as they do not want to spend the money and nothing happens to them. We feel that now landlords will need to put up the rents to cover the extra costs</p>	<p>The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. This fee is paid in two parts so the overall cost is spread. You state that you have spent £5000 on licenses and upgrades – presumably the upgrades have come as a result of the licensing process in these situations which in itself shows the benefit of licensing schemes. The majority of landlords state that they are fully compliant and they are not problematic landlords however the stats from phase 1 shows that the majority of properties were not up to standard and had required repair requirements. If you know of landlords who are not compliant then we urge you to make us aware so that we can investigate and take action where necessary.</p>
<p>Selective Licensing has to improve the standards of privately rented properties as long as EHO carry out or request regular inspections (by agents or landlords) and proof of certification when it's renewed.</p>	<p>We agree that Selective Licensing does improve housing conditions and management.</p>
<p>Most is already covered ie gas yearly certification, 5 years electrical check etc. If you use a reputable letting estate agent for fully managed property then these are already 'policed', antisocial behaviour is</p>	<p>Yearly gas certification is a great example of how licensing increases the powers available to take action against landlords if management practices are substandard. Currently the local authority does not have any powers to take action against a landlord who does not carry out a gas safety check annually at a singly occupied house unless there are defects to the gas installation. The enforcement of gas safety certificates falls to the Health and Safety</p>

<p>manly beyond scope of a private landlord and is a council or police matter</p>	<p>Executive. Licensing puts in place conditions for the licence holder ensuring that they carry out annual safety checks and supply certificates to the LA on request. If checks are not done the council then has more powers to take action against the licence holder.</p> <p>Just because a property is managed by an agent does not guarantee that it is free from hazards or managed correctly. A large proportion of properties found to have issues with management and/or conditions have had 'reputable' agents involved in the management. In some cases these agents have not been aware of basic fire safety principles and the legalities of licensing regimes.</p> <p>Selective Licensing does not state that ASB is the responsibility of the landlord. What selective licensing does is put a number of requirements on the licence holder to take, what the council believe to be reasonable steps, in addressing ASB when they become aware. The council recognises that there are many aspects and stakeholders when it comes to investigating and addressing ASB. The landlord/agent is clearly a central stakeholder and as such should take steps to tackle/reduce/eliminate ASB if it is occurring at their properties. The council and partners such as the police can and would also assist and offer support to licence holders and agents where ASB is reported.</p>
<p>there are enough regulations on landlords and agents already to ensure that properties are rented out in the PRS are in good standard. There is no need for an additional license which is nothing but a tax grab on already hard up landlords and agents.</p>	<p>Licensing brings together numerous requirements covered by different legislation and enforcing bodies into one clear set of conditions. If landlords are already compliant then they will be able to comply with the conditions without any additional work. However if landlords are not compliant the council can take action quickly and easily to address this.</p>
<p>The scheme will rely on policing that the Council simply do not have the resources to commit to this. I have seen various council-led initiatives over the years that rely on unrealistic policing and the overall effect means no benefit to anyone.</p>	<p>The licensing fee covers compliance duties. This is why the fee is necessary – so that the council does have the resources to process licenses and address non compliance.</p>
<p>You have missed out a vital piece of information....??? I received news of this through email... I have clicked onto your</p>	<p>The proposed fee structure explains that the fee is payable in two parts. The fee is a one off payment that will cover the duration of the licence (the majority of licenses issued are for the duration of the licensing scheme which is a five year period).</p>

<p>'proposed fee structure' but I don't understand if this is a 1 off payment or charged once a decade / yearly / monthly or daily??? For anyone to give a valid opinion to this matter surely they should be made fully aware of how much it will cost... In my opinion this clearly means this is a paper exercise and that this scheme will be rolled out whatever anyone says..... Instead of doing your jobs and identifying dodgy landlords, it is just another way for your to increase your tax revenues and tax every landlord. Strongly disagree with the whole scheme, I own 1 x buy to let and it is my only pension provision your taxes will increase my costs so I will have to put rent up to help cover the costs. I am assuming that the bulk of the cost will be for you to move paperwork around. Target unscrupulous landlords... Don't punish the 95% of responsible landlords.</p>	<p>If split over the period of five years, the cost of the licence equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As a means of comparison, both of these amounts are less than the average cost of housing insurance as detailed in the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018.</p> <p>The licensing process consists of significantly more than moving paperwork around.</p>
<p>Having conditions attached to a licence, would ensures that landlords are accountable to an independent body. They can be held accountable should properties present as unsafe, overcrowded or uninhabitable. There may be also criminal reasons that could be unearthed as to why a landlord shouldn't be a landlord. It would be hoped that such a scheme would lessen property repair times and drive up quality. I wonder too, if it would stop absent landlords negating on their reasonability's where</p>	<p>We agree with all of the points raised. In terms of the point about absent landlords – licensing absolutely would address this issue. When assessing the management practices in place at a property and when determining whether they are suitable we would expect that if a landlord lived away that they had some local representation in the form of an agent or family member.</p>

<p>an agent isn't in place. Better housing puts less pressure on other community resources such as health services, due to the higher standards of living conditions reducing the impact upon physical and mental health.</p>	
<p>You don't need a scheme costing £700 to ensure gas safety and electrical safety. A mandatory Gas Safe check is required annually, and as such by making relevant legislation will force the issue. Also there should be some training required for tenants e.g. how to put the bins out and collect them in the relevant days. Putting the correct items in the appropriate bins, how to behave appropriately within the neighborhood. To understand that subletting is not acceptable. the importance of occasionally opening the windows and airing the property etc</p>	<p>There is far more to selective licensing than ensuring gas and electrical safety.</p> <p>Yearly gas certification is a great example of how licensing increases the powers available to take action against landlords if management practices are substandard. Currently the local authority does not have any powers to take action against a landlord who does not carry out a gas safety check annually at a singly occupied house unless there are defects to the gas installation. The enforcement of gas safety certificates falls to the Health and Safety Executive. Licensing puts in place conditions for the licence holder ensuring that they carry out annual safety checks and supply certificates to the LA on request. If checks are not done the council then has more powers to take action against the licence holder.</p> <p>One of the conditions of the licence is that the licence holder shall at the beginning of a tenancy, provide written information to the occupier of the property indicating a number of aspects of waste management such as what day refuse collections take place, what type of bins to use for household and recycling waste, details of the council's bulks waste collection service.</p> <p>There is also a requirement on the licence holder to inform the tenant within 7 days of any allegations of anti-social behaviour and potential consequences of its continuation.</p> <p>The landlord should be providing information to their tenant on the issues you have raised when the tenancy commences so as to ensure tenants are aware. Then if the tenant doesn't follow the rules action should be taken by the landlord to address this.</p>
<p>There are too many rogue landlords and there needs to be change. I experienced</p>	<p>We believe that selective licensing is one tool which can help to us to identify and take action against rogue landlords to protect tenants.</p>

rough living as a teenager due to a rogue landlord.	
This is just a barrier to entry for private landlords. For landlords who already have a lot of property this won't matter as they can afford to take the hit. Ultimately the tenant is the person who will pay more and that's not fair.	For a landlord looking to enter a market covered by selective licensing they can invest in the area in the knowledge that other privately rented properties on their street are operating to a good standard and that if they fall below that standard the council will take action. These landlords will not have neighbouring properties being rented cheaply with substandard housing conditions and management.
It wont jimprove the situation for tenants, it may possibly make it more expensive	As the statistics previously covered in this document show, licensing does improve housing conditions which are linked to physical and mental health for the tenants. Therefore the scheme will improve the situation for tenants.
I am a private landlord and have licenses for my properties in Netherfield. What about the tenant and their lack of respect and upkeep for the homes they rent? You make it all one way and provide no support to landlords who are making up the housing deficits.	Our service is there for landlords as much as it is tenants. We are here to offer support and advice to landlords should they require it and we invite landlords to contact us if they feel like they need advice in terms of tenant behaviour. A private rental agreement is a private contractual agreement between the landlord and tenant and the council has no jurisdiction to take action in regards to this agreement. However we can offer support should ASB be identified at the property and we work closely with the police who can also offer further assistance. There is however a certain degree of responsibility on the landlord to address tenant behaviour either through warning tenants, enforcing the terms of the tenancy or in the most extreme situations evicting tenants who are in breach of contract.
I believe that private landlords should be held accountable for the condition of their properties thereby ensuring the health and safety of their tenants.	We agree and we feel that licensing ensures a higher level of accountability for landlords and agents in the management of privately rented properties.
Every situation is different. In our case, we rent from our daughter, there are no problems, all this will do (in our situation) is increase costs unnecessarily, which, as pensioners, is not acceptable/	If you rent the property from a family member then the house would be exempt from licensing.
Anything that controls bad business is a good idea.	Licensing formalises a number of principles that licence holders have to adhere to in order to ensure properties are effectively and safely managed.
I own other property's in NG7 which are subject to the license scheme , before the license started every thing was fine since	NG7 is not within the Gedling Borough Council area and therefore would not be impacted by this proposed scheme. Should a landlord within any area of the proposed phase 2 scheme in

<p>the license scheme I have had to increase the rents by 25 % what has now happened is the tenants don't stay anywhere as long they would rather have less regulation. All landlords already have Gas Certificates, insurance and all other requirements , Also if you do go ahead you should be more user friendly the N C C scheme was a fiasco you cannot even speak to a person as all the phone lines have been turned off . There is enough legislation at the moment to cover everything.</p>	<p>Gedling Borough Council area increase rent by 25% due purely to the introduction of the licensing scheme then we would argue that this is not proportionate.</p> <p>We have seen no evidence that suggests tenants want less regulation. Tenants want to live in safe well managed properties.</p> <p>You reference the fact you already have insurance. If split over the period of five years, the cost of the licence equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As a means of comparison, both of these amounts are less than the average cost of housing insurance as detailed in the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018.</p>
<p>the is a landlord in my street that owns about 10 houses here, and another 30 odd properties in the district, he doesn't care what happens at the properties as long as he gets his money. there have been noise complaints, police once a week, a mess on the street and their front yards, it's ruining our street and will affect our house prices and and insurances</p>	<p>We agree that poor housing management and housing conditions can negatively impact house prices and insurance prices. We believe that by introducing a licensing scheme and improving housing management and conditions within an area that this will benefit tenants and property owners by improving the area and increasing desirability and in turn house prices. Licensing would mean that landlords are unable to 'not care what happens at the properties as long as he gets his money'. As with all landlords who apply for the licence, he/she would have to go through the process of being assessed and then if the licence was issued he/she would need to comply with the licensing conditions. Tenants can also make complaints to the team if they feel that the landlord isn't managing the property correctly or if the landlord isn't addressing ASB.</p>
<p>The scheme has resulted in many private landlords selling their properties due to the cost of having to have the licence to keep a rental property going, or those that have had to get the license have had to up their rent charges to a degree where people are not able to afford to live in them just to cover the costs</p>	<p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p>

<p>It may improve a bad landlords property and management. Then again it may not as these landlords often have no respect for the rules or wouldn't be bad landlords in the first place. Others, like me, who are good landlords, look after their tenants and keep the properties in very good condition, will have to shoulder unnecessary extra costs. How does the licensing give the council's Environmental Health team powers to do more when landlords are not taking steps to deal with issues relating to property standards?</p>	<p>Licensing gives the council additional powers to do more via the conditions of the licence that the licence holder is bound by. Should the licence holder breach any of the conditions the council can take action either via prosecution, fine and/or revoking the licence. If the licence is revoked the landlord would need to have someone else step in and manage the property on their behalf who was considered fit and proper.</p>
<p>I strongly agree about the proposed licence. Previously my partner and I lived in rented accommodation for a number of years. Although the properties had received gas safety checks I was concerned at the age of the gas hob/gas fire in two of the properties we lived at. In one of the properties there was a gas leak from the hob where a small explosion occurred in a cupboard in front of my legs, We called out the emergency gas services and the gas hob was totally eroded underneath and was decommissioned. When in second property I asked about the yellow markings on a glass of the gas fire and was informed this was wear and tear. We weren't aware there were issues and both of us in the winter had vomiting spells, I started to experience other symptoms to</p>	<p>Selective Licensing would help to address all issues you have listed. If these hazards were present during the property inspection then the officer would note them down and then write to the licence holder requiring works to be carried out. This would be done on the back of a licensing visit without the need for the tenant calling the council to attend. If these defects occurred after a licence had been issued, the tenant could contact the team and we would again write to the landlord requiring works to be carried out. If works were not carried out in a reasonable timescale the team could take action under the breach of licence.</p>

<p>the point where I flopped over my laptop when working from home and was very confused/disoriented. Again the gas fire was decommissioned due to a crack in the fire furnace and I had to go to hospital to be checked out. The landlord fitted a new boiler in the kitchen but as the old boiler was a back boiler in the lounge, he left the hole where the fire was over the winter, with a cable where we were unsure it was live or not! We were cold in the lounge as there was insufficient heat from one radiator. Other experiences include, water coming through the ceiling onto an electrical light in the kitchen, the stairs rails being unstable, a loose cooker door. When we left the property I reported the landlord to environmental health as I was concerned that things had still not been fixed. I view that landlords are not replacing gas/electrical items that are over 20 years old they shouldn't be allowed to rent out a property until it is viewed that these items are fit for purpose. An eroded gas hob is not! We rented the property from a reputable Estate Agent. When we left the property we had painted a few rooms. I'm shocked the property was back on the market for rent for £725 a month - yet the fire issue wasn't resolved and the stairs remained the same.</p>	
<p>Apart from the safety of tenants, the disrepair and unsightly rubbish in gardens is a blight on neighbouring</p>	<p>There is a condition in our licenses which requires landlords to ensure gardens are cleaned between tenancies. At any other time residents could contact the licensing team with</p>

<p>property which is well maintained and will improve the area for all.</p>	<p>concerns about disrepair or rubbish accumulations and action could be taken and potential enforcement action for breach of licence condition.</p>
<p>this sounds like another scheme for the council to charge the land lord money for this service, how will you be financing this???</p>	<p>The licensing fee covers the cost of administering the scheme.</p>
<p>Some tenants will be better off, other will be evicted from the properties or landlords will increase rents to cover the extras costs, or will not be willing to fund for the scheme.</p>	<p>Nottingham City Council introduced a selective licensing scheme covering the majority of their area in August 2018, one month before GBC's phase 1 in Netherfield went live. Since then the city council has been monitoring homelessness applications made to their housing need department to assess whether selective licensing was contributing to tenants being made homeless. Landlords are also asked for their reasons as to why they are evicting tenants. As of October 2021 not once has selective licensing been mentioned as the reason for tenants being evicted.</p> <p>As mentioned previously, the licence fee is paid in two parts and is less per month when spread over the five years than the equivalent average monthly cost of housing insurance (AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018)</p> <p>The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
<p>Landlords who already look after their tenants will continue to do so. Those who don't care, will still break the rules, regardless of penalties.</p>	<p>If landlords do not comply with the licensing requirements they can be prosecuted or fined. If they continue to ignore the licensing requirements the fines will increase with each repeat offence. Enforcement action taken against landlords could result in revoking of licenses, effectively removing the rogue landlord from the management process of the property. The landlord would be required to employ the services of a fit and proper person to manage the property on their behalf. Your statement would be more accurate for properties operating in areas not covered by licensing. Licensing enables the council to address exactly this issue.</p>
<p>This scheme echoes a number of requirements that already exist and which are adhered to by responsible landlords</p>	<p>Yes the conditions detail a number of management practices that should be carried as standard. Yearly gas certification is a great example of how licensing increases the powers available to take action against landlords if management practices are substandard.</p>

<p>including the Gas and Electrical Safety Regulations. I have personally spent over £10,000 on improvements to my property since it was my own home in order to make it a place that my tenants can enjoy in safety and comfort.</p>	<p>Currently the local authority does not have any powers to take action against a landlord who does not carry out a gas safety check annually at a singly occupied house unless there are defects to the gas installation. The enforcement of gas safety certificates falls to the Health and Safety Executive. Licensing puts in place conditions for the licence holder ensuring that they carry out annual safety checks and supply certificates to the LA on request. If checks are not done the council then has more powers to take action against the licence holder.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed conditions of the scheme will reduce crime and antisocial behaviour related to privately rented properties in Colwick, Daybrook or Newstead Village?</p>	
<p>Living in a safer house will not stop those who want to be anti social being anti social</p>	<p>Safer housing is not guaranteed to stop someone acting in an antisocial manner but it can lead to people feeling more ownership for their property and neighbourhood and in turn encourage them to act in a more respectful way. People in safer housing will also likely be more content and therefore less likely to act in an antisocial way.</p> <p>The council isn't stating that licensing will deal with ASB just by making houses safer. There are conditions within the licence which put a responsibility on the landlord to take proactive steps should ASB be reported at one of their properties. The council and partners such as the police then work with the landlord to address the ASB.</p>
<p>Where is the proof house dictates anti social behaviour?</p>	<p>The proposal document outlines the basis for the council choosing the areas it has for phase 2. The question was whether you believe that the proposed conditions, some of which relate to ASB, will reduce crime and antisocial behaviour in areas identified as having high levels of ASB. The house alone does not dictate antisocial behaviour but housing management, or lack of, can contribute.</p>
<p>Has not had an effect in Ashfield</p>	<p>Ashfield is obviously a separate council to Gedling Borough Council so we are unable to comment in detail in relation to this point however we are not aware of any data that has been produced by Ashfield District Council determining the impact of their scheme on ASB in the areas covered.</p>
<p>Making LLs responsible for antisocial behaviour without giving them tools to</p>	<p>Since the time of writing section 21 is available to landlords again. Landlords can also take action against tenants committing ASB under breach of tenancy and Section 8 proceedings.</p>

<p>deal with it is pointless. S21 is currently unavailable as a tool so how can LLs deal with this issue?</p>	<p>The council and partners would also work with landlords and offer support in situations where tenants were partaking in anti-social behaviour.</p>
<p>How will it improve crime and antisocial behaviour? Crime and ASB is more closely aligned with social housing not the PRS.</p>	<p>Unclear whether this is your opinion or based on fact. We are not aware of any facts that state ASB is only or predominantly associated with social housing and not PRS. We believe it will improve crime and antisocial behaviour by putting requirements in place for landlords to follow should ASB be reported at their property. We are not suggesting that the entire responsibility rests on the landlords should ASB be reported at one of their properties but the landlord is a key stakeholder in the process and as such should be taking action to help address it. Some landlords believe that ASB has nothing to do with them and do not take any responsibility of action to address it which we believe is wrong.</p>
<p>Bad tenants should be tackled already!</p>	<p>Licensing formalises the requirement on the landlord to engage in the process of tackling bad tenants.</p>
<p>our houses and tenants having nothing to do with anti social behaviour or crime. Licencing will do nothing, more police presence and powers would solve it.</p>	<p>We are the local authority so cannot influence police presence and powers. What we can do is introduce schemes such as selective licensing to increase our own powers in dealing with reports of ASB and then involve partners such as the police into joint working solutions on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>You cannot blame a landlord for tenants shortfalls</p>	<p>The council is not blaming landlords for ASB committed by tenants. We have identified areas that have high levels of ASB and believe the selective licensing can help to address that. We are not suggesting that the entire responsibility rests on the landlords should ASB be reported at one of their properties but the landlord is a key stakeholder in the process and as such should be taking action to help address it. Some landlords believe that ASB has nothing to do with them and do not take any responsibility of action to address it which we believe is wrong.</p>
<p>This scheme seems like it's more about punishing poor people than protecting rensbtsy</p>	<p>We would need you to provide further information on why you think the scheme punishes poor people to comment on this. The scheme is designed to protect tenants and some of the most vulnerable people in society including those at the lower end of the socioeconomic spectrum.</p>
<p>There are wider social issues that me providing a copy of my gas certificate will not solve or me as a landlord attending training</p>	<p>The conditions which apply to ASB are the most relevant to tackling ASB. Training could well improve a landlords knowledge and ability when it comes to dealing with ASB in properties they rent.</p>

<p>It will put landlords in the position of 'policing' their tenants lives. I have a good relationship with my tenants (who I don't suspect of any illegal activity), but I don't want to be seen as 'snooping'.</p>	<p>There is no suggestion that a landlord should be snooping – quite the opposite. The licence states that the tenant has the right to quiet enjoyment of the property. What the licence requires is that landlords carry out regular inspections, arranged with the tenant and that landlords take certain steps as and when ASB is reported at their property.</p>
<p>You cannot expect the Landlord to be responsible for the Tenants ASB. This is a matter for the Law and the proposed license does not impact on the Lawmakers</p>	<p>We are not suggesting that the entire responsibility rests on the landlords should ASB be reported at one of their properties but the landlord is a key stakeholder in the process and as such should be taking action to help address it. The landlord is the owner of the property and is the person/company who has the contractual agreement with the occupier. Therefore landlords and agents have a prominent role to play if their tenants are being anti-social and/or breaching the terms of their tenancy.</p>
<p>Are you implying people who rent cause anti social behaviour? Or are you implying that I should police antisocial tenants myself? Do you really believe thats a good idea?!</p>	<p>No suggestion has been made that anti-social behaviour is exclusive to the private rented sector. The council has highlighted areas that suffer from high levels of ASB and selective licensing is a tool available to councils to use. We believe that selective licensing will help to address high levels of ASB by ensuring effective property management. I presume you are a landlord – we do not expect you to police ASB but we expect that you take proactive steps to address ASB if it is reported at one of your properties.</p>
<p>Improving the standard of a rented property is a great thing. It will attract better quality tenant overall. However , it doesn't remove the need for lower income families who need to continue living in these areas.</p>	<p>There is no reason why families on low income should not expect to live in a safe well managed property. Just because a family has less money doesn't mean that they should be made to live in poor conditions.</p>
<p>It's not for private landlords to solve anti-social behaviour and crime within Nottinghamshire, private tenants should not be discriminated against as private homeowners should also be held accountable for anti-social behaviour and crime. Private landlords have very little powers to enforce action against tenants should there be evidence of anti-social behaviour and crime, complaints of this nature are passed on to councils and</p>	<p>Landlords are a key stakeholder in tenant ASB cases reported at houses they own and operate. Landlords do have powers to address ASB at their properties by enforcing the terms of their tenancy agreement. Council and Police cannot take action against a tenant due to breach of tenancy and the council and police cannot evict a tenant from a private property. This is why a partnership approach is required, with the landlord as one stakeholder in a wider process. The council and partners such as police will assist landlords and agents if ASB is reported at one of their properties. The licence conditions require that landlords take proactive action if ASB is reported at one of their properties.</p>

<p>the police respectively. These are social issues that are Nottinghamshire wide, not specific to these areas, so a regional approach must be taken to tackle these issues, but not through licencing. There has been no evidence whatsoever in my opinion that anti-social behaviour or crime has been affected in any way due to licencing, either in Nottingham City or in Netherfield due to landlords submitting licence applications.</p>	
<p>Can only be good for all</p>	
<p>crime and antisocial behaviour are down to the individual tenant, not the landlord or the quality of housing they provide. no landlord wishes to have a difficult tenant. if crimes were committed, then the police would be involved, as would antisocial behaviour. Selective licencing fees having to be paid by the landlord will not change whether the tenant commits crimes or antisocial behaviour – you are punishing the landlord only via financial means.</p>	<p>Landlords need to take some responsibility for the actions of the tenants in and around their properties. It is not as simple as any crime or ASB being purely the responsibility of the police or council especially if the behaviour is happening in or around a private residence.</p> <p>Landlords are a key stakeholder in tenant ASB cases reported at houses they own and operate. Landlords do have powers to address ASB at their properties by enforcing the terms of their tenancy agreement. Council and Police cannot take action against a tenant due to breach of tenancy and the council and police cannot evict a tenant from a private property. This is why a partnership approach is required, with the landlord as one stakeholder in a wider process. The council and partners such as police will assist landlords and agents if ASB is reported at one of their properties. The licence conditions require that landlords take proactive action if ASB is reported at one of their properties.</p>
<p>We have no idea how this would reduce crime by having a property up to code. Its the people that cause the problem not the property</p>	<p>Selective licensing covers property management as well as housing conditions. The house alone does not dictate antisocial behaviour but housing management, or lack of, can contribute.</p> <p>Safer housing is not guaranteed to stop someone acting in an antisocial manner but it can lead to people feeling more ownership for their property and neighbourhood and in turn encourage them to act in a more respectful way. People in safer housing will also likely be more content and therefore less likely to act in an antisocial way.</p>

	<p>The council isn't stating that licensing will deal with ASB just by making houses safer. There are conditions within the licence which put a responsibility on the landlord to take proactive steps should ASB be reported at one of their properties. The council and partners such as the police can then work with the landlord to address the ASB.</p>
<p>Not sure how the proposed conditions of the scheme will reduce crime and antisocial behaviour. Do you have proof of this from other Council's or from the scheme you introduced in Netherfield? From experience, Selective Licensing forced a number of our managed landlords to sell their property, forcing tenants out. If this happens, surely you're just moving the antisocial behaviour (of the minority) of private tenants to another area?</p>	<p>There are conditions within the licence that put a responsibility on the licence holder to take proactive actions when ASB is reported at their property. We believe that this will ensure landlords involve themselves positively in any ASB investigations so that a solution can be reached more effectively. The scheme in Netherfield has enabled council officers administering the scheme to meet regularly with Nottinghamshire Police to problem solve ASB and crime issues affecting the community linked to the private rented sector. Without selective licensing these fortnightly meetings would be less effective.</p>
<p>The licensing scheme in Nottingham does nothing to prevent or reduce crime or ASB. How can simply taxing landlords achieve this? Landlords are not on the streets committing crime or ASB!</p>	<p>We cannot comment on a scheme operated by a separate council as we do not have access to their data. The licensing fee covers the costs incurred by the council in processing and issuing licenses. The licenses in turn put requirements onto licence holders to ensure that they are effectively and safely managing their properties. There is no suggestion that landlords are committing crime or ASB but if their tenants are then landlords have a role to play in addressing the behaviour.</p>
<p>What is the correlation that is being proposed that links the scheme to an improvement in behaviours of residents and non-residents of the areas alike? Disconnected at best, illogical at worst.</p>	<p>Licence conditions require licence holder to take a proactive approach to addressing reported ASB at their properties. In doing so tenants will be warned at a very early stage that action will be taken if ASB continues. This in turn is likely to make tenants think more about how their actions, or the actions of people they invite into their houses, could have a detrimental impact on their housing situation. We are not suggesting that all tenants will listen and improve their behaviour as a result of this approach as the reasons for ASB being committed are complex, however landlord taking a proactive approach is only going to benefit the potential behaviour of tenants. Proactive steps taken by the landlord alongside actions taken by the council and police will ensure that the tenant is made fully aware of the impact of the ASB and the consequences of it continuing. If a tenant is committing ASB on a regular basis and never gets any kind of contact or warning from their landlord then that is</p>

	<p>one less deterrent being used to try and resolve the behaviour. Deterrents that the landlord is able to apply may have more effect in some cases than those presented by the local authority and/or police.</p>
<p>You have missed out a vital piece of information....??? I received news of this through email... I have clicked onto your 'proposed fee structure' but I don't understand if this is a 1 off payment or charged once a decade / yearly / monthly or daily??? For anyone to give a valid opinion to this matter surely they should be made fully aware of how much it will cost... In my opinion this clearly means this is a paper exercise and that this scheme will be rolled out whatever anyone says..... Instead of doing your jobs and identifying dodgy landlords, it is just another way for your to increase your tax revenues and tax every landlord. Strongly disagree with the whole scheme, I own 1 x buy to let and it is my only pension provision your taxes will increase my costs so I will have to put rent up to help cover the costs. I am assuming that the bulk of the cost will be for you to move paperwork around. Target unscrupulous landlords... Don't punish the 95% of responsible landlords.</p>	<p>The proposed fee structure explains that the fee is payable in two parts. The fee is a one off payment that will cover the duration of the licence (the majority of licenses issued are for the duration of the licensing scheme which is a five year period).</p> <p>If split over the period of five years, the cost of the licence equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As a means of comparison, both of these amounts are less than the average cost of housing insurance as detailed in the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018.</p> <p>The licensing process consists of significantly more than moving paperwork around.</p>
<p>It would stand to reason if there were better oversight for those who let their properties, there would be more accountability from landlord and this in turn would ensure it's in their best interests to reduce the issues that cause difficulties for others.</p>	<p>We agree that licensing increases the level of accountability from a licence holder in all aspects of property management. Better property management means better property conditions and safer and happier tenants. Improved quality of properties and happier tenants across an area can have significant benefits to occupants, property owners and businesses within an area.</p>

<p>ASB is more apparent in council run tenancy as most private landlords mortgages prohibits against renting to those without jobs.</p>	<p>You are suggesting that ASB only or mainly occurs by people without jobs. We would dispute this statement. ASB can be committed by anyone in society irrespective of their background, socioeconomic standing, property tenure or working status. We accept that some areas suffer more from ASB than others and that the areas in question may have other trends which link them such as poor housing conditions, high levels of deprivation etc but to suggest that ASB is only carried out by council tenants or those without jobs is misinformed.</p>
<p>What evidence do you have that this will have the above effect. Will people suddenly stop drinking and hanging around in gangs - I don't think so. PEOPLE CREATE THE PROBLEMS NOT THE ACCOMMODATION. Irrespective of who owns the house its the people that cause the issues. So please don't create a pseudo science that by creating some licensing scheme is the cure</p>	<p>Landlords need to take some responsibility for the actions of the tenants in and around their properties. It is not as simple as any crime or ASB being purely the responsibility of the police or council especially if the behaviour is happening in or around a private residence.</p> <p>Landlords are a key stakeholder in tenant ASB cases reported at houses they own and operate. Landlords do have powers to address ASB at their properties by enforcing the terms of their tenancy agreement. Council and Police cannot take action against a tenant due to breach of tenancy and the council and police cannot evict a tenant from a private property. This is why a partnership approach is required, with the landlord as one stakeholder in a wider process. The council and partners such as police will assist landlords and agents if ASB is reported at one of their properties. The licence conditions require that landlords take proactive action if ASB is reported at one of their properties.</p> <p>We are not suggesting that a licensing scheme will solve all ASB. We believe it is a tool that is available which will help in addressing ASB.</p>
<p>People can make the one choice if they like a property or not</p>	
<p>The council has no other choice but to intervene.</p>	
<p>But hope it has a positive effect</p>	
<p>Most private landlords in the Colwick / Carlton area are not living locally. How will a license to rent privately prevent crime when the majority of crime committed is from residents who do not live in the area?</p>	<p>Licence conditions require licence holder to take a proactive approach to addressing reported ASB at their properties. In doing so tenants will be warned at a very early stage that action will be taken if ASB continues. This in turn is likely to make tenants think more about how their actions, <u>or the actions of people they invite into their houses</u>, could have a detrimental impact on their housing situation. We are not suggesting that all tenants will listen and improve their behaviour as a result of this approach as the reasons for ASB being</p>

	<p>committed are complex, however landlord taking a proactive approach is only going to benefit the potential behaviour of tenants. Proactive steps taken by the landlord alongside actions taken by the council and police will ensure that the tenant is made fully aware of the impact of the ASB and the consequences of it continuing. If a tenant is committing ASB on a regular basis and never gets any kind of contact or warning from their landlord then that is one less deterrent being used to try and resolve the behaviour. Deterrents that the landlord is able to apply may have more effect in some cases than those presented by the local authority and/or police.</p> <p>Licensing does not require that a landlord live locally in the area. Effective property management can be used without living in the area in question. Where landlords live outside of the Nottingham area we would expect that they have some form of locally based manager to assist in the property management.</p>
There is no link	
Can you explain why you think it reduces anti social behaviour or crime by making landlords put extra plus sockets in to accomdate extra phone charges etc??	<p>You are confusing two very different parts of the licensing process. Housing conditions are covered by the property inspection. Officers inspect properties to check that they are free from hazards to ensure the safety of the tenants. This would include electrical socket provision.</p> <p>The conditions of the licence relate to property management. There is a section of licence conditions which relate specifically to ASB. It is though the licencing conditions, specifically those that relate to ASB, that we believe licensing helps to address ASB.</p>
I cannot say what effect the licensing would have on antisocial behaviour but would hope that it would prove beneficial.	
Since I personally have no knowledge of ASB or crime I can't comment.	
Crime levels have increased around my NG7 property's as before there were working class tenants now with the housing shortage that this scheme contributes to the council are moving in undesirable people. in a free market every	<p>Anti-social behaviour can occur in any tenure of property. Licensing is focused around ensuring a landlord of a privately rented property takes responsibility for the behaviour of the tenants they have occupying their properties by getting references before they move in and by taking certain proactive steps should ASB be reported at one of their properties. Licensing</p>

<p>thing runs fine , since the scheme many property's near mine have been sold leading to a shortage, I get regular letters from NCC virtual begging me to house some of their tenants I never received these letters before. I my self sold a property (ironically to NCC) and I still own next door and as I said this property now has anti social tenants in. I had to sell the property to fund the licenses.</p>	<p>only covers the private rented sector due to the legislation covering it which was produced by central government.</p> <p>The data in our proposal document for phase 2 suggests that in a free market everything doesn't run fine which is why we are proposing a selective licensing scheme.</p>
<p>If there is ASB conditions then troublesome tenants will have to be evicted if they don't integrate responsibility to the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The conditions are in place to ensure licence holder take proactive steps to address ASB. Eviction is one option but would be an absolute last resort should other steps not bring about the necessary improvements in behaviour.</p>
<p>My landlord doesn't do any of the work</p>	<p>Licensing would address this without the tenant contacting the council. We would pick up on any areas of disrepair during the property inspection and then work with your landlord to carry out the repairs and improve the property. There is also a condition in the licence requiring that the licence holder ensure all reasonable and practical steps are taken to respond to repair and maintenance issues at the property and that any works to deal with repairs are undertaken within a reasonable period of time. If licence holders breach licence conditions the council can take action by either prosecuting, issuing a fine and/or revoking the licence.</p>
<p>Have the scheme doesn't affect the anti social behaviour in the area in my opinion. I live I the daybrook area and haven't noticed any antisocial behaviour in the 3 yese I've been here</p>	<p>Whilst Daybrook is an area that is proposed under phase 2 it currently is not subject to licensing. Not everyone encounters ASB but for those that do it can be very stressful.</p>
<p>Where is your evidence? Show us your evidence from the Netherfield area. Where are your statistics that can be attributed solely to this scheme and not other factors? Your conditions of the scheme say ' The scheme also improved</p>	<p>All evidence supporting this proposal are in the Phase 2 proposal document on our website. No statistics can be attributed solely to a licensing scheme without the potential for impact by other factors due to the complex nature of ASB and society. We have also been in an unprecedented global pandemic for the best part of 2 years which will have impacted crime and ASB data significantly.</p>

<p>partnership working with Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire Police to reduce anti-social behaviour and make residents feel safer where they live'. It doesn't actually say that it achieved that. Make public your evidence!</p>	
<p>Is that not what pay tax for the police to do, why should we have to pay for this service twice???</p>	<p>No this is not the same service as what council tax covers. This is a specific licensing scheme targeting certain parts of the Borough to improve property management and housing conditions within the private rented sector.</p>
<p>No crime/ASB where I live?</p>	<p>Not everyone encounters ASB but for those that do it can be very stressful. Just because one house on a street does not witness any crime or ASB doesn't mean crime and ASB is not occurring in the area.</p>
<p>These areas are low cost rentals & attract poorer families. As a landlord, you try to select tenants who will respect your property & their neighbours. However, you cannot control the law breakers & antisocial element (usually the younger family members of the tenant).</p>	<p>We agree that a landlord cannot 100% guarantee that a tenant they take on will not partake in crime or ASB in the future. However we do believe that a landlord can take proactive steps to try and reduce the risk of them taking on tenants who may commit crime/ASB by ensuring they get tenant referencing. We also agree that landlords can take proactive steps to try and address ASB if it is reported to be occurring in or around the property that they rent out.</p>
<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed conditions of the scheme will reduce antisocial behaviour related to privately rented properties in Carlton Hill Ward? (To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed...)</p>	
<p>Anti social behaviour starts with children in the schools, and respect and discipline between people and families.</p>	<p>ASB is complex and can occur due to many different reasons.</p>
<p>Stanton hill is still rough and attracts crime and drugs</p>	<p>Stanton hill falls within Ashfield Borough Council's area and selective licensing scheme and we do not have the statistics to be able to comment on this.</p>
<p>Making LLs responsible for antisocial behaviour without giving them tools to deal with it is pointless. S21 is currently unavailable as a tool so how can LLs deal with this issue?</p>	<p>This question is a repeat and has already been addressed previously in this document.</p>

<p>Why would this be different to the above areas? Bad tenants should be tackled already!</p>	<p>We agree that actions against tenants partaking in ASB should and do already occur. Licensing will formalise this requirement on the part of the licence holder.</p>
<p>Has a landlord you will have to deal with antisocial behaviour as council want little to do with it.</p>	<p>The council has a dedicated team that work to address ASB within the Borough. We work with partners such as the police to share information and work together in addressing reports of ASB and we would always welcome cooperation from landlords in these situations.</p>
<p>The landlord should not be expected to deal with this. I am not a PCSO.</p>	<p>Unfortunately this is the viewpoint that forms part of the problem. Landlords are a key stakeholder in any ASB investigation occurring in or around a property that they rent out and as such they should be involved in addressing it.</p> <p>Landlords do have powers to address ASB at their properties by enforcing the terms of their tenancy agreement. Council and Police cannot take action against a tenant due to breach of tenancy and the council and police cannot evict a tenant from a private property. This is why a partnership approach is required, with the landlord as one stakeholder in a wider process. The council and partners such as police will assist landlords and agents if ASB is reported at one of their properties. The licence conditions require that landlords take proactive action if ASB is reported at one of their properties.</p>
<p>You cannot change the Tenants behaviour by forcing Licensing on the Landlords</p>	<p>We believe that effective property management can change how a tenant occupies a property for the better. If a licence holder ensures that the terms of the tenancy are complied with and takes the relative and necessary action when they are breached, then the behaviour of the tenant is more likely to be compliant with those terms. In cases where tenant behaviour does not improve, licence holders can then take action on the basis of breach of contract.</p>
<p>Legally all I or anyone could do is call the police. Being an accredited landlord on the scheme makes no difference to this or what the police can or can't do in a given situation.</p>	<p>Yes the most appropriate action in some circumstances would be to call the police. We are not suggesting that licence holders need to police criminal situations themselves without involving the police or council. Where the role of the landlord can assist with ASB is in the days following an incident, as per the licence conditions, in order to prevent it from happening again.</p>
<p>The Carlton Hill Ward particular makes no sense whatsoever, why have some areas been taken off and others not? I understand</p>	<p>In response to the additional section added on Carlton Hill and why some areas have been picked above others. The reason that the areas considered under the Phase 2 proposal have been included is due to the data and the remit that councils must work to when</p>

<p>there is a boundary that has to be made somewhere, however the council are contradicting themselves hugely by taking this approach - why do some residents deserve all the benefits that council are proposing licencing brings and other residents don't? It makes no sense.</p>	<p>proposing to introduce a selective licensing scheme (all of which is covered in detail in the council's proposal document).</p> <p>The remit for councils introducing selective licensing schemes is set out in the council's phase 2 proposal document. Simply put there are 6 conditions which, if present in a certain area, can be the basis of a selective licensing designation. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An area that is, or is likely to become, an area of low housing demand - An area experiencing significant and persistent problems caused by anti-social behaviour - Poor property conditions - High levels of migration - High levels of deprivation - High levels of crime <p>Therefore some areas have been chosen because they meet the above criteria. The proposal document shows that Carlton Hill received the second highest number of ASB related service requests between 2014 and 2019</p>
<p>Antisocial behaviour isn't specifically linked to any dwelling so just stigmatisation</p>	<p>The proposal document details the number of ASB cases in various different wards across the borough and highlights that some areas have a higher number of cases than others. We are not intending to stigmatise those areas, we want to take proactive measures to help address these trends and improve those areas.</p>
<p>i have no experience in Carlton Hill, but my feelings are the same as the answer to question 5. antisocial behaviour is down to the tenant, not the landlord or the quality of housing they provide.</p>	<p>Selective licensing covers property management as well as housing conditions. The house alone does not dictate antisocial behaviour but housing management, or lack of, can contribute.</p> <p>Safer housing is not guaranteed to stop someone acting in an antisocial manner but it can lead to people feeling more ownership for their property and neighbourhood and in turn encourage them to act in a more respectful way. People in safer housing will also likely be more content and therefore less likely to act in an antisocial way.</p>

	<p>The council isn't stating that licensing will deal with ASB just by making houses safer. There are conditions within the licence which put a responsibility on the landlord to take proactive steps should ASB be reported at one of their properties. The council and partners such as the police can then work with the landlord to address the ASB.</p>
<p>As above, and as a homeowner in Carlton Hill, we would like to see proof of this. I guess this could be achieved by potentially "forcing" a landlord to increase their rent to cover the costs of licensing, which in turn will result in some tenants moving elsewhere. Not sure how morally right this is.</p>	<p>The statistics behind the council's proposal for phase 2 can be found within the phase 2 proposal document on our website.</p> <p>The intention of licensing is not to increase rents so that only certain people can afford to live within these areas.</p> <p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>It is therefore the council's view that rents would not need to be increased and if the landlord did increase the rent over and above the figures stated above that the increase would not be proportionate to the increased costs incurred as a result of the need to licence a property.</p>
<p>Whilst I agree with statement, I'm not sure its as clear cut as this. It could make it difficult for those who have had or who still have complex lives, to obtain a tenancy through a private let. A licenced landlord may not want to run the risk of taking on a tenant who has had issues in the past, which relate to antisocial</p>	<p>This is a valid point, thank you for raising it. There is certainly a possibility that landlords may choose not to take on tenants whose references show a previous history of ASB. This is a decision for the landlord to make, as would be the case with or without a licensing scheme. The landlord could choose to take on a tenant with a history of ASB but with more prescribed terms as part of the tenancy agreement so that the landlord has more power should the tenant commit ASB once in the property. The landlord could carry out property inspections at more regular intervals. There are numerous steps that a licence holder can take to</p>

<p>behaviour. In effect, the system could inadvertently lock out those with more complex lives and histories. This could create more pressure on general needs lets. And those who present as homeless.</p>	<p>proactively address potential concerns they have regarding a tenant and ASB. All we want through licensing is for licence holders to take proactive steps and some responsibility for tenant behaviour. If taking on a tenant with a previous history of ASB we would expect that a licence holder has a plan of action to prevent this from reoccurring and for what will happen if the ASB does reoccur. The licence holder wouldn't be in breach of the licence if their tenants commit ASB and they had taken reasonable and proactive steps to manage and/or address it.</p>
<p>This simply won't happen, time will reveal all. We all know that minds have been made up and the scheme will go ahead this 'have your say' is in fact irrelevant</p>	<p>The council is following due process and no decision has yet been made on whether the scheme will go ahead at all, either as proposed or with modifications. We have already listened to a number of concerns raised during the consultation process which related to the impact of Covid on the private rented sector. We have delayed making a decision on the scheme until the situation with Covid has stabilised, which in part was taken due to the consultation feedback. The final decision on whether the scheme goes ahead will be taken by members.</p>
<p>It's had a positive impact in Netherfield and in the city, St.Anns.</p>	<p>We are pleased you believe that licensing schemes have helped with ASB.</p>
<p>How will punishing an absent landlord stop the tenant from engaging in anti-social behaviour? Perhaps more beat PSCO or Police may be the better way to tackle this in the Carlton / Colwick area.</p>	<p>Landlords are a key stakeholder in tenant ASB cases reported at houses they own and operate. Landlords do have powers to address ASB at their properties by enforcing the terms of their tenancy agreement. Council and Police cannot take action against a tenant due to breach of tenancy and the council and police cannot evict a tenant from a private property. This is why a partnership approach is required, with the landlord as one stakeholder in a wider process. The council and partners such as police will assist landlords and agents if ASB is reported at one of their properties. The licence conditions require that landlords take proactive action if ASB is reported at one of their properties.</p> <p>Whether a landlord is an absent landlord or a landlord who lives locally the requirements on them to ensure that a house is safe and effectively managed are the same. Absent landlords can meet this requirement by asking someone local to manage the property on their behalf.</p> <p>The licensing scheme and its conditions are not about punishing a landlord, they are about improving housing management and increasing compliance. Taking action against a licence holder for a breach of licence condition would be a last resort.</p>

	<p>Licensing schemes are one of a number of ways that enforcement authorities can look to address issues such as ASB within neighbourhoods. PCSO and Police patrols are a police decision. The licensing scheme would operate alongside, and compliment any PCSO and/or police patrols.</p>
<p>Firstly as a resident until recently I was not aware of an antisocial behaviour issue and secondly I would be interested to know how the council are attributing this alleged problem to residents of privately rented properties. I do not see anything in this proposal that will deter antisocial behaviour which is not already a legal requirement such as identity and right to rent checks on tenants.</p>	<p>The council is not attributing the ASB solely to private tenants. The statistics within the proposal document are for the ward as a whole. Licensing can only cover privately rented properties due to the remit for selective licensing schemes as determined by central government. The areas chosen within the proposal are areas with a high percentage of privately rented properties so the council envisages that by ensuring those properties are effectively managed it will help to address the high levels of ASB within the area.</p>
<p>Please provide comments to explain your response, including any comments that you have on the proposed conditions themselves.</p>	
<p>Why should reputable land Lords have to pay such high costs to prove that their properties are safe</p>	<p>The licensing fee covers the cost incurred by the council in administering the school. As detailed in the proposal document and within this document, we believe that the scheme brings a number of benefits to landlords, tenants, property standards and the areas as a whole.</p>
<p>More costs added onto Landlords, this is more expensive than the 1st Scheme</p>	<p>The proposed fees for unaccredited landlords have risen by £60 and for accredited landlords they have risen by £95. During phase 1 the discounted accreditation fee was in place due to the belief that the resource required to process applications from accredited landlords would be less as the properties in theory would already be to a higher and more compliant standard. What we found in practice was that a large proportion of accredited landlord properties still required action to be taken by our officers and that the time spent in processing those applications was not significantly less when compared to unaccredited applications. The council still recognises that accreditation improves licence holder knowledge which in turn should mean better housing standards and management. The council also wanted to continue to incentivise accreditation so the new proposed fee is still a significant £115 saving on that paid by an unaccredited landlord.</p>

	<p>We have also learned lessons on how we can improve the service we provide from our experiences gained whilst implementing phase 1. One realisation we have made is that we need more staff to process and issue licenses and this additional cost has been factored into the revised fees.</p> <p>Our fees are in line with those charged by other local authorities and in some cases our fees are significantly less.</p>
£700 appears rather excessive for £70 office admin time and a £50 field officer visit.	The fee is calculated based on the cost incurred by the authority in processing/issuing licenses and carrying out compliance duties.
Landlords will simply pass this cost on to their tenants. They are the the ones who you are supposed to be helping.	The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.
Price should be lower to get high compliance with landlords	The fee is calculated based on the cost incurred by the authority in processing/issuing licenses and carrying out compliance duties.
Far to expensive for nothing in return.	The proposal document details what the return is for a selective licensing scheme.
This will result in further rent rises for tenants at a time when many are already struggling to pay due to Coronavirus.	<p>The situation relating to Covid 19 has moved on a lot since this comment was made. The vaccine has been made available to most age groups and boosters are now being offered to the most vulnerable. Social distancing requirements have been removed and businesses are able to operate as normal. The council listened to the consultation feedback in relation to the concerns raised about designating a scheme whilst the pandemic was in full swing. As a result we delayed making this decision until the covid situation was more under control.</p> <p>The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
The cost will be passed on to the Tenant in any event and spread over the 5 Year period. With Income Tax and Agent's Fees	The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. There are many factors which could make a landlord

<p>this is likely to result in a Rental increase of £20 per month on top of the Annual rise in line with CPIH/Market Value whichever is greater. The PRS is a business not a charity.</p>	<p>increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
<p>It's a punishment for good landlords and our tenants will have to pay the price while the council pockets their money. Will probably force a lot of landlords to evict their tenants and sell their properties. Everyone loses, except the council....</p>	<p>The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. If a landlord increases rent over and above this amount and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost. As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year (£3.13 a week).</p>
<p>Too expensive. If there is the ability to pay in instalments over the duration of the license, that is better. However, large up front costs simply get passed on to the consumer.</p>	<p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence.</p>
<p>Landlords will pass the cost of this tax on to the tenants and will result in higher cost for private renting.</p>	<p>The licensing fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. The council is of the view that the cost of the licence is not such that it should mean the landlord has to put up the rent to cover it. If a landlord increases rent over and above the amounts detailed above and</p>

	states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.
Because it doesnt help any problems just another tax on landlords who will then have to increase rents to cover it. Bad landlords will not pay it as is proven on the Nottingham City council area and just go under the radar.	Phase 1 evidence shows that the scheme has had a number of benefits within the Netherfield ward. Not licensing a property that is required to be licensed is a criminal offence so if landlords fail to apply the council can take enforcement action against them which in turn may impact their ability to hold a licence in future. We encourage anyone with information about unlicensed properties to contact us either via phone or email or via our anonymous reporting webpage. Please see above for the response to licensing meaning that landlords will increase rents
£700 is a 'landlord tax'	The fee is a cost recovery for the service that the council will provide.
The payment is only helping the council. I have paid elsewhere and have very little value for the high cost. With no reason for excessive charges.	The fee is a cost recovery for the service that the council will provide. The proposal document details a number of positive outcomes that phase 1 has brought about. Improving housing management and conditions within an area not only improves the health and wellbeing of tenants and the community but it contributes to improving the area as a whole.
Needs protection to ensure cost isn't passed on to tenant through rent increases	There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. The council is of the view that the cost of the licence is not such that it should mean the landlord has to put up the rent to cover it. If a landlord increases rent over and above the amounts detailed above and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost. Unfortunately the council are unable to prevent landlords increasing rents as it is a private agreement between the landlord and the tenant.
The fee adds no value to tennant or landlord	The proposal document details a number of positive outcomes that phase 1 has brought about. Improving housing management and conditions within an area not only improves the health and wellbeing of tenants and the community but it contributes to improving the area as a whole.
I have engaged with the Nottingham City Selective Licensing scheme. I don't see where the money has produced anything -	Licensing increases the level of accountability from a licence holder in all aspects of property management. Better property management means better property conditions and safer and happier tenants. Improved quality of properties and happier tenants across an area can have significant benefits to occupants, property owners and businesses within an area.

<p>except almost 2 years to be granted all my licenses.</p>	
<p>U not giving anyone incentive to get accredited with 1 house.</p>	<p>There is a discount for accredited landlords applying to licence properties. The discount is the same for an accredited landlord licensing one property as it is for a landlord applying to licence multiple properties. The council encourages landlords to become accredited in order to improve management standards and knowledge of housing legislation irrespective of any licensing scheme or license fee discount. The discount is offered on the basis that accredited landlord properties should be managed to a higher standard and take less resource to process.</p>
<p>If you pay an agent to look after the property then you don't need to pay the council ad well. Agree the fee for those landlords who don't go through an agent</p>	<p>Some of the most problematic properties we encounter are managed by an agent – both in terms of licensing functions and general disrepair actions. Unfortunately having an agent manage a property does not guarantee that it will be free of hazards and managed to a satisfactory standard.</p>
<p>It's too expensive - margins are already low. Rents will have to rise to accommodate the cost which is bad for the tenants. It seems to me that all landlords are being punished because of a few bad ones. Focus on them - or is this just another way for the council to impose an extra tax.</p>	<p>The licensing scheme provides the council with the resources to proactively address a large number of properties in a number of different areas known to have issues as covered in the proposal document. A far larger number of properties than would be possible otherwise. It also puts in place a number of <u>management</u> requirements via licence conditions, not all of which can be easily addressed/dealt with under current legislation. The licence conditions ensure that the licence holder is clear on what is required in terms of managing the property and gives the council more powers to take action when management practices are not satisfactory.</p> <p>The council's statistics from phase 1 (detailed previously in this document) show that not all landlords are fully compliant despite believing they were. The council is also not suggesting that just because certain improvements are required in the conditions at a property and/or in the management of a property that the landlord in question is not a 'good landlord'. However this does not change the fact that a large proportion of properties inspected were not compliant and that the tenants of those properties have benefited as a direct result of the council's involvement by improvements being made to the conditions within the property and/or the management of the property.</p>

	<p>If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent. The council is of the view that the cost of the licence is not such that it should mean the landlord has to put up the rent to cover it. If a landlord increases rent over and above the amounts detailed above and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost.</p>
<p>The fee is a financial burden on the landlord and will result in an immediate cashflow situation at a time when funds are already stretched. In many cases it will be necessary to use funds set aside for repairs to pay the fee. The fee does not cover the true cost of administering the scheme and therefore wastes taxpayer money. Landlords already operating at thin margins will have no choice but to pass on the fee by raising rents. It is apparent from the change in rental prices in the Netherfield region that this is already happening.</p>	<p>If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>The fee is calculated on a cost recovery basis for the service provision and does not use taxpayer money.</p> <p>There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent and rents have increased nationally since the beginning of the Covid 19 pandemic, not just in Netherfield. The council is of the view that the cost of the licence is not such that it should mean the landlord has to put up the rent to cover it. If a landlord increases rent over and above the amounts detailed above and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost incurred by licensing.</p>
<p>This additional cost to owning a property will ensure prospective landlords don't buy in these areas or let go of their housing in these areas as soon as is beneficial. There will be fewer houses to rent. This has already happened in Netherfield. This policy therefore has a negative effect on those who</p>	<p>The licensing fee is calculated on a cost recovery basis to cover the cost incurred by the council in processing and issuing licenses. No profit is made from the fee. The fee is paid in two parts – the first part is paid on submission of the application and the part 2 is payable once the licence paperwork is ready to be issued. This helps to spread the cost of the licence. The total fee for an accredited landlord is £585 and for a non-accredited landlord is £700. Assuming the management arrangements, fit and proper status of the licence holder and manager are satisfactory the licence will be issued for the duration of the licensing scheme (five years). If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates</p>

<p>want or need to rent by restricting where they can live. This is absolutely morally and ethically wrong and needs to be considered as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year.</p> <p>The council does not agree that this cost is such that it will mean a landlord has to sell a property and even if properties are sold that does not mean that those properties will not be purchased by private landlords and continue to be let out to private tenants. Phase 1 has shown that licensing schemes improve property conditions and in turn help to safeguard tenant's health and wellbeing.</p>
<p>Investors and landlord will simply not purchase B2L properties in these area's reducing the housing stock even further and creating more volatility in an already stretched rental market in this city. I am personally advising B2L investors to avoid licensing area's due to the cost and administrative hassle this creates. I am not the only one.</p>	<p>The percentage of rental properties within the proposed areas is already at higher than other areas of the Borough. The council is in favour of houses being made available for family accommodation either via private rental market, social housing or owner occupying. The fact that investors and landlords choose not to buy properties in the proposed areas does not necessarily mean that there will be less properties available for families to occupy. Empty properties aside – in order for an investor or landlord to purchase a property they would likely be buying a property that was already family occupied as there are very few multiply occupied properties in the proposed areas. Licensing ensures that houses are safe and well managed for private tenants wishing to live there.</p>
<p>this is difficult to answer, as the fee could be considerable to a small landlord and minimal to a large one</p>	<p>We have tried to keep our fee as reasonable as possible when factoring in the service provision that we need to provide should Phase 2 be designated. We feel our fee is competitive when compared to other councils across the country running similar schemes.</p>
<p>Should the council proceed with this scheme, there should be a small fee to register the licence and then a one off fee for a property visit to cover the councils expenses in visiting the property (if they ever do visit which is rare). It's completely unjustifiable to demand such a figure and the cost will be passed on to the tenants and rents will increase. Nothing makes me more angry when I hear the councils don't</p>	<p>In phase 1 the council committed to visiting all properties where a licence application was received. The processing of a licence consists of a lot more than a property visit and the fee is calculated accordingly to cover the costs of the full processing procedure on a cost recovery basis. No profit is made from the fee.</p> <p>The council accepts that some landlord increase rents and put this down to the cost of licensing. The council cannot prevent landlords increasing rents and the council cannot prevent landlords increasing rents over and above the additional costs occurred by licensing and blaming the increase on licensing. However consideration needs to be given to the costs</p>

believe there is any evidence to suggest that licencing does not increase rents when it clearly does. Since the introduction of licencing in Nottingham City Council, rents have increased for a number of factors but licencing has been a major factor in the recent price hikes, this includes in Netherfield where rents are at an all time high. The rental market is complex but the council would be hugely naive to think that landlords would not pass this cost on to the residents. If you increase landlords costs, they will seek to recover it in some means and as a landlord personally, I will increase the rent should the council proceed with this scheme. I deal with Landlords and Investors every day as part of my working life and I can 100% confirm that the majority of landlords will take the same approach. EMPO also concur with this there is large evidence to suggest that licence fees increase rents for tenants. During a national pandemic where some tenants are struggling to makes ends meet, I was horrified to hear that Gedling Borough Council were even considering this and I think you should strongly re-consider your fees should this for whatever reason actually go ahead. Lastly, it would be interesting to see a breakdown of what this fee actually pays for as there does not seem to

and what is proportionate. If the cost of the licence is split over the period of five years it equates to £117 a year (£9.75 a month) for accredited landlords and £140 a year (£11.66 per month). As means of comparison the AA's British insurance premium index published in the fourth quarter of 2018 priced the average cost of housing insurance at £163 a year. There are many factors which could make a landlord increase the rent and rents have increased nationally since the beginning of the Covid 19 pandemic, not just in Netherfield. The council is of the view that the cost of the licence is not such that it should mean the landlord has to put up the rent to cover it. If a landlord increases rent over and above the amounts detailed above and states the reason being selective licensing then the increase is not proportionate to the additional cost incurred by licensing. Any suggestion that a rent increase over and above this amount is proportionate is misleading. If landlords are factoring in the cost of remedial works required in order to become compliant with the law the council would respond that compliance with the law is necessary with or without a licensing scheme and that such remedial works would have been necessary even if a licensing scheme was not in place.

Since you wrote your comment the state of the pandemic has changed. The council listened to comments and delayed making a decision on the scheme whilst the pandemic was in full flow. Restrictions have now been completely removed and the council now feel that the timing is more appropriate to discuss designating this scheme.

<p>be any clarity whatsoever when Nottinghamshire has launched these schemes previously.</p>	
<p>it is far too much. we already abide by the councils requirements for providing private housing. This is purely a money making exercise for the council.</p>	<p>78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant. The fees are a cost recovery for the service provision and the scheme does not make a profit.</p>
<p>This will lead to landlords either not complying or putting up rents to cover</p>	<p>If areas are designated as selective licensing areas then it becomes a criminal offence to occupy a private rented property without having applied for a licence. The council can then take enforcement action against those landlords and agents which would consist of either issuing a Civil Penalty Notice or prosecution. Should a landlord be prosecuted that council could then potentially refuse a future licence application unless the landlord employed a competent person to manage the property on their behalf. The council welcomes intelligence from the community on properties which may be operating without a licence and has an anonymous reporting facility on its website.</p> <p>In terms of rent increases please see previous comments in relation to this issue.</p>
<p>Although it does seem a little expensive compared to the £640 you charged when the scheme was introduced in Netherfield in 2018.</p>	<p>The fee has had to be increased due to a number of factors; one being increased staffing and a second being the lessons learned from phase 2 i.e. accredited properties taking more resource and time to process than first thought.</p>
<p>Too much, what will the good agent covered landlord get from this..no improvement. Go for the bad landlords two now don't adhere to the conditions in law What tenant benefit has been gained in areas already with licensing scheme? At what cost per improvement?</p>	<p>78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant. The fees are a cost recovery for the service provision and the scheme does not make a profit. Unfortunately using a managing agent does not always mean that a property is managed and maintained suitably - A large proportion of problematic properties are those with managing agents involved.</p> <p>There have been a number of benefits had by tenants within Netherfield. 40 properties have been identified as presenting an imminent risk to the health of the occupants. We have worked with the landlords in all of these situations to remove the imminent risk and protect the tenants. 296 properties (78% of those inspected) identified as having repairs necessary</p>

	<p>to bring them up to the minimum legal standard. In all cases licence holders and managers written to informing them of what repairs are necessary. 127 properties improved further safeguarding those tenants.</p>
<p>If I were assured that the scheme was not income generating, I would support the fee, but I hope it is recognised that often the unaccredited landlords will include those with a single property that do not generate a profit even now. If many are forced to sell it could affect property values. Perhaps now is not the time.</p>	<p>The fees are a cost recovery for the service provision and the scheme does not make a profit. We have listened to the comments stating that the original time of the consultation (during the covid pandemic) was not thought to be an appropriate time. We have delayed to a time where restrictions have been lifted and the Covid 19 situation is more under control in the hope that landlords and residents will now accept the timing is appropriate.</p>
<p>What will this money be used for? If not directly associated with the policing of rental property conditions and landlord conduct, why would landlords (who generally provide a service that the councils are unable or unwilling to by providing accommodation for those who do not, or cannot purchase their own dwellings) contribute to other council costs?</p>	<p>The fees are a cost recovery for the service provision and the scheme does not make a profit. The scheme will ensure management practices are satisfactory, that those involved in the property management are fit and proper and that property standards are safe for occupants.</p>
<p>If this is an annual payment, it might put landlords off letting entirely. If the system could ensure swift licencing without delay, year after year, it could be value for money. It might be an idea to have an incentive, such as a landlord helpline, where landlords are given free advice and support should they be having difficulty with a tenant/tenancy.</p>	<p>The payment is split into two parts. The first part is payable on submission of the application and the second part is payable when we are at a point of issuing the paperwork. Once these fees have been paid no further payments are required for the duration of the licence.</p> <p>The team are always available to answer landlord queries and questions and offer support where required. The team would also support landlords where necessary to ensure that they are aware of their legal responsibilities.</p> <p>The council also provides a services via one of its partners called “Call before you serve” which is set up precisely for the reason you suggest – to offer advice to landlords should they be having difficulty with the tenant/tenancy. Further information is available on our website here - Call before you serve - Gedling Borough Council</p>

<p>£700 per property is likely to cause my landlord to increase my rent as his cost goes up. Which in turn makes me poorer monthly and allows me to save even lesser delaying my own chance to get on the property ladder. This is ridiculous. If the fee were up to £200/property for 5 years or even just £700 per landlord instead of per property as a good landlord would take adequate care towards all their properties irregardless</p>	<p>The fee is calculated to cover the cost of providing the service. As much as we would like to offer a lower fee to make it easier for landlords we have to be able to cover the cost incurred by the council in running the scheme. Please see previous comments made in this report with regards to the suggestion rents will increase.</p> <p>78% of properties inspected have had repair issues identified that are required to bring the standards up to the minimum required level. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant.</p>
<p>The cost of the scheme is extremely high for landlords who are suffering with income problems and are often not charging high rents.</p>	<p>The council feels that the licensing fees are reasonable especially when compared to licensing fees charged by other councils both locally and nationally. The fee is payable in two parts which should also help landlords budget for the fees.</p>
<p>I agree that landlords/property owners should contribute to the scheme and that the fees should be commensurate with the true cost of managing the scheme.</p>	<p>The fee is calculated on a cost recovery basis incurred by the council in administering the scheme.</p>
<p>What is the fee for? It doesn't seem to mention it in the bit I read.</p>	<p>The fee covers the costs incurred by the council in administering the scheme. It covers everything from the online application system used by applicants to submit applications, staffing costs for the selective licensing team, costs incurred carrying out checks as part of the processing procedure, the production and provision of licence paperwork and schedule of works etc.</p>
<p>With out doubt I disagree .Heavy handed approach by your self I have had 2 missed appointmentsfrom N C C i received nothing. My tenants are happy . I would definitely have to raise the rents to cover all aspects of the license, some could afford this I believe others couldn't so would have to leave and be re housed by your self. as my rents are all ready low.</p>	<p>Please see previous comments with relate to property owners saying that the introduction of licensing would mean they would need to increase rents.</p> <p>We cannot comment on issues people may have encountered with licensing schemed operated by other councils.</p>

<p>fee for what? That seems rather steep! And should have the option of how the landlord wants to pay, yearly, twice, quarter or monthly.</p>	<p>The fee covers the costs incurred by the council in administering the scheme. It covers everything from the online application system used by applicants to submit applications, staffing costs for the selective licensing team, costs incurred carrying out checks as part of the processing procedure, the production and provision of licence paperwork and schedule of works etc.</p> <p>The fee is payable in two parts – part 1 is payable upon application and then part 2 is payable when we are ready to issue the draft licence. This should help spread the cost and make budgeting easier.</p> <p>We cannot offer the applicant an option of whether they want to pay yearly, quarterly, monthly etc. as setting up, managing and enforcing such varying payment plans would require additional staff and resource that would lead to a significant increase in the licence fee which we feel would be unreasonable and to some degree defeat the point.</p>
<p>Yes have a register of rented properties. Check them. Those that do not meet the required standards are fined and put on a licence system. Why should you charge good landlords who are doing everything right? You are saying that you are going to take money from innocent people to make sure you get the bad ones. I suspect that could be challenged in a Court of Law.</p>	<p>The scheme is required for the council to have the resource it needs to proactively assess and address properties within the areas proposed.</p> <p>78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant.</p> <p>The provision for designation of selective licensing is provided under The Housing Act 2004 which is legislation that has been produced by Central Government.</p>
<p>It is a lot of money for a landlord to pay but would be good if the landlord could pay in instalments. I go strongly agree with the licence because of our experiences. When we moved properties a family with a child went to live in the property and it prayed on my mind what could of happened to a child's</p>	<p>The fee is payable in two parts which would be a minimum of one month apart, often more.</p> <p>Our proposed licensing scheme would significantly increase the chances of defects within properties or issues with property management being identified and solutions put in place to protect tenants. As part of the licensing process we require landlords to provide valid gas safety certification and property inspections provide opportunity for officers to assess properties first hand and also for tenants to raise concerns with officers without fear.</p>

<p>health owing to the leak from the gas fire. So if this occurs in properties rented from Estate Agents I couldn't imagine what properties are like through private rented landlords.</p>	<p>In our experience following scheme 1 it is a common misconception that properties operated by agents are managed to a higher standard than when compared to properties managed by the owner. Some of the worst properties we have encountered have been managed by letting agents.</p>
<p>I Should have known its all about making more money for a service we already have paid for in council tax, VAT, PAYE and all the other taxes we pay. how about you stop trying to bleed to the citizens of Gedling dry.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly explains the purpose for proposing the scheme and that the fee is a cost recovery for the service provision. Council tax payments do not contribute towards discretionary licensing schemes such as selective licensing.</p>
<p>After the finical problems all have been affected by COVID many won't have the extra to cover.</p>	<p>Anyone owning and operating a privately rented property should have the resources to effectively manage the property and ensure that their tenants are safe. Much like with any business there are cost associated with renting out property.</p>
<p>I was under the impression that the fee was per landlord, not per property. This will only drive up the cost of rents!</p>	<p>Licenses are property specific and therefore a licence application is required for each property.</p>
<p>This fee is simply the cost of the bureaucracy of this scheme and provides zero net benefit other than maintaining council jobs - surely this is not the responsibility of landlords alone.</p>	<p>The proposal is clear in laying out the aims of scheme and the benefits of the scheme in Netherfield. 78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS. A number of these properties were either owned or managed by landlords and/or agents that either believed or claimed that their houses were already compliant. We do not view improving 78% of properties and protecting those tenants as zero net benefit, quite the opposite.</p>
<p>There shouldn't be a two tiered payment to gain the same outcome</p>	<p>There is an accreditation discount available for accredited licence holders because it is believed that those properties are more likely to be compliant and as such will take less time and resource to process.</p>
<p>All fees are too expensive. Accreditation should account for more of a discount.</p>	<p>The accreditation discount has been calculated based on the learning from phase 1 – accredited properties generally take less time and resource to process but no as significantly as thought when setting the fees for phase 1. The new proposed fee structure for phase 2 more accurately reflects the difference in time and resource required to process accredited when compared to non-accredited applications.</p>

<p>Although I think the discount is too small, it is at least an incentive for LLs to become accredited rather than hoping they don't get caught!</p>	<p>The council would always encourage landlords to become accredited as it ensures that they are fully aware of all legal requirements relating to renting private property. Accreditation bodies provide training and regular updates on an ever changing sector – both of which help to ensure accredited landlords are more aware of what is required when renting a property out. The accreditation discount is calculated based on the above but it is a double benefit as it encourages landlords to become accredited.</p>
<p>The reduction should be greater: it would be far better for all landlords to be accredited. If they were, you wouldn't need to duplicate the effort or administer complicated selective licensing.</p>	<p>We agree that the more landlords who are accredited the more likely that the quality of housing and management practices across the board will improve. One of the benefits of phase 1 was an increase in accreditation amongst landlords in the area due to the incentive of the fee discount and the introduction of the licensing scheme. We hope that phase 2, should it come into force, would have the same positive impact on landlords within the proposed areas.</p> <p>Accreditation alone does not ensure good repair and management practices in all cases though and it is important that we differentiate between the two as whilst they work hand in hand and complement each other the two are also significantly different. Firstly accreditation is a voluntary process which a landlord has to choose to sign up to and (in most cases) choose to pay for. The landlord can choose at any time to disregard the stipulations of the accreditation body and the body would have no powers over this decision other than to rescind accreditation status. The landlord could then choose to join another accreditation body and still continue with an accredited status. Some accreditation bodies do not inspect properties, instead they accredit the person by ensuring they carry out training and other activities. This does not ensure that the property is up to standard nor does it ensure that the property is being effectively managed. Other accreditation bodies may spot check a sample of properties which again does not ensure that all properties are up to the minimum basic standard.</p> <p>Licensing on the other hand puts legal requirements in place on licence holders in the form of licence conditions. They are clear in what they require and legal action can be taken if they are not adhered to. The licence holder cannot choose to withdraw from the process as they can with accreditation. There is also a legal requirement on persons having control of properties to make applications to licence the properties and in turn become bound by the</p>

	<p>conditions. This applies to all privately rented properties regardless of whether the owners are the type to proactively become accredited or not.</p> <p>Where licence holders are found to consistently or substantially fall below the standards required the council can effectively remove them from the management of the house in place of someone who is fit and proper by refusing or revoking a licence application.</p>
It will incentivise landlords to become accredited.	We hope that this is the case
Its better than nothing but still good landlords shouldnt have to pay anything	There is a variance in the view of what makes a 'good landlord'. We would say a good landlord is someone who ensures their property is effectively managed and meets the basic minimum legal standard in terms of property conditions. 78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS to bring them up to the minimum legal standard.
Accreditation costs far more than the offered discount.	The application discount is not intended to cover the cost of becoming accredited. The hope is that landlords will become accredited because they want to improve their knowledge of the sector and what is required and we recognise this by providing a discount in those situations. Whether to become accredited or not will always be the decision of the individual.
But you still have to pay for accreditation but at least its a one off payment for multiple houses . Has the council want fee for every owned property	Different accreditation bodies have different fee structures for accreditation just like different accreditation bodies have different stipulations in place to hold accredited status. If someone wishes to receive a service then the service has to be paid for whether this be the accreditation body or the administration of the licensing scheme. In terms of licensing – each licence is property specific as this is what the legislation requires. Therefore a separate application and application fee is required for each application made.
Its no bonus, if you are accredited to a high standard you should get 80-90% reimbursement	The fee is calculated on a cost recovery basis. It does not take 90% less resource for the council to process a licence for an accredited landlord when compared to a non-accredited landlord. As mentioned above, accreditation does not always guarantee that a property is compliant or management practices are satisfactory, it just increases the likelihood.
Should be 4 Times that	Presumably this is in reference to the accreditation discount and that it should be 4 times what is being proposed – please see comment directly above this box.
If there must be a scheme, then of course I'd rather it was cheaper for me. But where does the money go? Why is it so	The fee covers to cost incurred by the council in administering the scheme. It is not a profit making exercise.

<p>expensive when the landlord has to do all the work of collating the information? It takes hours to fill in the forms. (One landlord friend was almost in tears with the stress of it)</p>	<p>The landlord does need to fill in the form and provide information this is correct but this is not all of the work that goes into processing an issuing a licence. A large amount of work is carried out by the council in processing an issuing licenses, from providing the application form, reviewing the information submitted, chasing up missing or incomplete information, carrying out fit and proper checks on proposed licence holders and managers, inspecting properties, writing inspection reports, writing letters of disrepair, talking with agents and owners about the disrepair, monitoring and where appropriate chasing up disrepair rectification, creating licence documents, sending out licence documents but to name a few.</p>
<p>DASH is roughly £110, Landlord won't bother.</p>	<p>It is a shame that accreditation and discount for accredited landlords is viewed by some primarily as a way of saving money. Accreditation improves knowledge of the private rented sector. The council believes that landlords who rent properties privately should keep themselves up to date with legal requirements and regularly changing schemes and regulations etc. A good way of doing this is by becoming accredited or engaging with an accreditation body.</p>
<p>This will reduce the rental increases necessary to cover the Licensing</p>	<p>Please see previous comments in this response document relating to landlords increasing rents due to licensing.</p>
<p>Don't need to pay if an agent looks after the property as already pay them</p>	<p>In our experience following phase 1 it is a common misconception that properties operated by agents are managed to a higher standard than when compared to properties managed by the owner. Some of the worst properties we have encountered have been managed by letting agents.</p> <p>Do landlords check that their agents are managing their properties to a satisfactory standard and/or do landlords who pass the responsibility onto agents know that the legal requirements are in order to be able to check their agent is managing the house satisfactorily?</p> <p>Employing an agent to manage a property should ensure that it is effectively managed and complies with all legal standards however unfortunately this is not the reality in a large proportion of cases.</p>
<p>Accredited landlords are of no consequence if a managing agent is employed.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>The licence holder is bound by the conditions of the licence no the manager. In a lot of cases managing agents do not want to be the licence holder – in which cases it would be beneficial</p>

	<p>for the licence holder to be accredited so that they are aware of the standards that are required and expected in terms of maintaining and managing the property.</p>
<p>Management for the scheme in Netherfield have not been in contact with all their landlords. The system is not yet robust so being accredited is actually pretty meaningless. The training is an exercise in ticking boxes to sound good, it doesn't create better landlord's. It is money back for jumping through hoops in the hope that the media or people who rent will think landlords are " better" . It is flawed.</p>	<p>Accreditation is a voluntary process as discussed above and what someone gets out of it depends on what they put into it. The comments in this response show how views differ greatly across the board. Some people say accreditation discount should be 90% and others like this comment say it makes no difference. There is no one size fits all, we can only take a view of the average and put in place a system we think will bring about the biggest benefits. This is precisely why we believe a licensing scheme would be hugely beneficial to the proposed areas as it ensures that all private rented properties need to be to the same standard of repair and management no matter whether the landlord is accredited or not, has an agent involved or not, owns 1 house or 25 houses.</p>
<p>It costs more to become accredited than the saving you propose. Accredited landlords should be exempt from the license as they have already met and exceeded the required health and safety standards. If anything the discount confuses the process and muddies the waters.</p>	<p>It is a shame that accreditation and discount for accredited landlords is viewed by some primarily as a way of saving money. Accreditation improves knowledge of the private rented sector. The council believes that landlords who rent properties privately should keep themselves up to date with legal requirements and regularly changing schemes and regulations etc. A good way of doing this is by becoming accredited or engaging with an accreditation body.</p>
<p>Some largely experienced landlords who have regulated agents, such as ARLA Propertymark, have their properties managed for them by these agents. For some reason they don't benefit from these discounts, it's farcical. If the landlord is putting their trust in a managing agent who is held accountable for doing everything properly, why should the landlord be penalised for not spending additional time and resource by being accredited? If the property manager on the licence is a managing agent who is regulated by a trusted regulator then discount should be provided. This would</p>	<p>The discount would apply if the accredited agent is a proposed licence holder on the application form. This is necessary because it is the licence holder who is bound by the conditions of the licence and as such they need to be the party who is accredited. Licenses are non-transferable so by taking this approach we ensure that the accredited person remains as the licence holder. Managers can be changed at any time.</p> <p>We believe that the fee structure does encourage landlords to employ accredited agents to manage the property and become licence holders. You state that some landlord "who perhaps don't have the time and resource to effectively manage their property would be encouraged to use an agent". Our view is that <u>all</u> landlords who rent property and receive rental income should have the resource and time to effectively manage the property whether that be directly or via an agent. If they do not have the resources then they should not be renting the property. Simply employing an agent without the required resource wouldn't</p>

<p>encourage self managed landlords who perhaps don't have the time and resource to effectively manage their property would be encouraged to use an agent. I still think the overall fee is way, way too high but some level of discount should be provided to accredited landlords, or landlords who's property manager is a regulated agent.</p>	<p>improve property standards as the agent would need access to resources provided by the landlord to manage the house effectively.</p>
<p>Accredited means absolutely nothing. They are generally the worst as they are protected by the system</p>	<p>Accreditation is a voluntary process as discussed above and what someone gets out of it depends on what they put into it. The comments in this response show how views differ greatly across the board. Some people say accreditation discount should be 90% and others like this comment say it makes no difference. There is no one size fits all, we can only take a view of the average and put in place a system we think will bring about the biggest benefits. This is precisely why we believe a licensing scheme would be hugely beneficial to the proposed areas as it ensures that all private rented properties need to be to the same standard of repair and management no matter whether the landlord is accredited or not, has an agent involved or not, owns 1 house or 25 houses.</p>
<p>Some get this for title but never fulfil objectives</p>	<p>We agree that accredited status does not guarantee satisfactory property standards or management. We do believe that on average it does improve knowledge and as such some recognition for this should be provided to encourage positive proactive steps taken by owners and landlords. The processing of the licence application is still exactly the same as for a non-accredited landlord so the final outcome is still the same (they still are bound by the same conditions), it is just hoped that the time spent bringing the property and management up to standard should be less.</p>
<p>it is a nonsense as the charge by companies such as Dash to provide accreditation for landlords almost outweighs the £115 reduction. And the licence lasts for 5 years yet the accreditation only lasts for 3, so the landlord needs to pay again to join the scheme twice for the length of the selective licence.</p>	<p>It is a shame that accreditation and discount for accredited landlords is viewed by some primarily as a way of saving money. Accreditation improves knowledge of the private rented sector. The council believes that landlords who rent properties privately should keep themselves up to date with legal requirements and regularly changing schemes and regulations etc. A good way of doing this is by becoming accredited or engaging with an accreditation body. The idea is not for landlords to become accredited purely to save money in the long run.</p>

<p>We are Dash accredited only for the fee reduction. If this was a way for Gedling Borough Council to check on updated certificates than that would be great</p>	<p>See comments above relating to landlords becoming accredited purely to save money.</p>
<p>There should be no licence fee at all. Surely if you think that licensing achieves the aims of improving standards, reducing crime and ASB you should be paying landlords/agents for saving you money!</p>	<p>The proposal document explains that the scheme is necessary to provide the council with the resource to proactively target areas identified as having met certain criteria with a view to improving property management and standards to safeguard tenants. The fee covers the cost of this service provision.</p> <p>Landlords and agents already get paid by tenants and unfortunately not all provide a well-managed property free of hazards.</p>
<p>The fee is too high and the scheme is not justified and now you want me to jump through hoops to get a reduction on what you steal from me.</p>	<p>Accreditation is the personal choice of the individual. We also do not consider training and continuous professional development in a sector one operates a business in as 'jumping through hoops'.</p>
<p>Reduce all fees by this amount. Why should having accreditation make a better landlord? Use an agent</p>	<p>Accredited status does not guarantee satisfactory property standards or management. We do believe that on average it does improve knowledge and as such some recognition for this should be provided to encourage positive proactive steps taken by owners and landlords.</p> <p>As mentioned above, employing a managing agent unfortunately does not guarantee effective property management or a property free of hazards.</p>
<p>There should be no license fee at all. Surely if you think that licensing achieves the aims of improving standards, reducing crime and ASB you should be paying landlords/agents for saving you money.</p>	<p>Repeat statement addressed above.</p>
<p>This implies a two-tier system and there is a cost associated with obtaining accreditation. Does accreditation improve property conditions? If accreditation truly worked, why would you need the council scheme?</p>	<p>We agree that accredited status does not guarantee satisfactory property standards or management. We do believe that on average it does improve knowledge and as such some recognition for this should be provided to encourage positive proactive steps taken by owners and landlords. The processing of the licence application is still exactly the same as for a non-accredited landlord so the final outcome is still the same (they still are bound by the</p>

	<p>same conditions), it is just hoped that the time spent bringing the property and management up to standard should be less.</p>
<p>I wonder if it should be higher reduction, to give them more incentive to join accredited services.</p>	<p>The fee is calculated on a cost recovery basis based on the amount of time and resource it takes to process an application. The processing of the licence application is still exactly the same for an accredited landlord as it is for a non-accredited landlord so the final outcome is still the same (they still are bound by the same conditions), it is just hoped that the time spent bringing the property and management up to standard should be less.</p>
<p>It is unfair for the council to impose reductions based on bias.</p>	<p>There is no bias involved in the fee structure. Accredited landlords have taken a proactive step to become accredited and improve their knowledge and this is reflected in the discounted fee.</p>
<p>Once again, there are no safeguards in place for private landlords to simply pass the cost of accreditation (let's face it, it's not going to be free, is it?) to the tenant in rent increases.</p>	<p>The council would question why a professional landlord would feel it appropriate to pass on the cost of their own professional development and learning for their own private business practices on to their tenants.</p> <p>It is a shame that accreditation and discount for accredited landlords is viewed by some primarily as a way of saving money. Accreditation improves knowledge of the private rented sector. The council believes that landlords who rent properties privately should keep themselves up to date with legal requirements and regularly changing schemes and regulations etc. A good way of doing this is by becoming accredited or engaging with an accreditation body.</p>
<p>Businesses will benefit over the one man band</p>	<p>Cannot see how the accreditation discount benefits businesses over an individual. The majority of accreditation bodies have a structured fee depending on how many properties are owned/managed meaning those who own/operate more properties would pay a higher fee.</p>
<p>Because you run the courses and we still have to pay to attend, again another money making scheme.</p>	<p>The council does not run the courses nor does the council benefit financially in any way from a landlord becoming accredited. In fact it is quite the opposite, the council part funds the accreditation body DASH which reduced the accreditation fee that landlords have to pay with the hope that it might mean more landlords choose to become accredited and improve their knowledge of the sector. The council also receives a lower application fee despite there being no guarantee that the time and resource required to process the accredited application will be less than a non-accredited application.</p>
<p>I am not sure that a reduction in the fee for accredited landlords is necessary.</p>	<p>We take on board your views and we did consider a flat fee for all applicants however we believe that incentivising accreditation may encourage more landlords to become accredited</p>

	which we hope will have a positive impact on property management in the area. Accredited landlords have taken a proactive step to become accredited and improve their knowledge and we believe this should be reflected in the fee they pay to submit an application.
There should ONLY be accredited landlords.	Unfortunately accreditation is voluntary and we have no powers to make it a requirement. What we do have powers to do is bring in discretionary licensing such as selective licensing which we hope will improve standards across the board, increase accreditation levels and hold non-compliant landlords to account. But most of all protect the health and wellbeing of tenants.
If they are not willing to pay for the scheme, 115 pounds will make no difference	Should the scheme come into force, it will be a legal requirement for all privately rented properties to have a licence application in place. Failure to do so could result in enforcement action being taken and fines being issued.
<u>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the other fees within the proposed scheme?</u>	
Some Landlord may not be able to fill in online forms, disability discrimination, on charging for a paper form	The supplement for applying via paper application is to cover the extra time and resource cost incurred by the council when receiving and processing applications made via paper application.
The entirety of the fees seem excessive and completely unforgiving to landlords of multiple properties.	This section asks about the 'other fees' not the application fees which have been covered previously in this document.
The scheme isn't the problem, but speaking as someone who has a very good landlord, they shouldn't have to pay these fees. It would be better to encourage reporting of bad landlords and fees/actions be put in place for those. Otherwise you are punishing good landlords, and those fees will likely be passed on to the tenant in one way or another, when the cost of renting is already far too high.	This section asks about the 'other fees' not the application fees which have been covered previously in this document. Please see previous comments relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landlords increasing rent due to licensing fees and - Ways that we encourage intel to be provided to us in order to address uncompliant landlords and agents.
Some of these extra costs are not necessary, it will put people off	

<p>The scheme should be cost-neutral; continuation of the scheme should only cost the amount to administer.</p>	<p>The fees are exactly this. All fees are calculated to cover the cost incurred by the council in providing the service.</p>
<p>Good landlords will be doing this already. Bad landlords need to be found and fined and forced to put the right things in place for their tenants</p>	<p>There is a variance in the view of what makes a 'good landlord'. We would say a good landlord is someone who ensures their property is effectively managed and meets the basic minimum legal standard in terms of property conditions. 78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS to bring them up to the minimum legal standard.</p> <p>We encourage intel of poor management/failure to apply etc so that we can investigate and take action where appropriate. Also where standards are not satisfactory when we process and application and/or inspect the property we will also take the necessary steps to safeguard tenants and where appropriate fine landlords and/or agents.</p>
<p>No value for money</p>	<p>The fees are calculated based on the cost of the council providing the service.</p>
<p>Absolute joke council trying to profiteer from the private rental sector, which it massively needs</p>	<p>This is a non for profit scheme as outlines in the proposal document. The additional fees are in place to ensure that where additional resource and time is required over and above what the application fee covers that the cost can be recovered.</p>
<p>£60 seems a bit steep for the forms on paper. I accept a fee if enforcement needs to be carried out - but this will simply make unsafe landlords even more likely to avoid applying.</p>	<p>We would dispute that the paper application fee would lead to landlord not applying. A very small percentage of applications for phase 1 were made via paper and at no point during any of our investigations did a landlord who we took action against for failing to licence the property did they ever blame the £60 fee for making a paper application. The online system is streamline and designed specifically for applications to be made and we provide computers in the Civic centre and libraries for online applications to be made. The provision for paper application is only there for those very few people who cannot apply on line and the fee supplement covers the additional time and resource cost incurred to process paper applications.</p>
<p>U charge £50 missed inspection when Landlord has turned up as has inspector & tenant has let us down. Who do u think is paying that?</p>	<p>This fee would be applied with discretion and where appropriate. We haven't issued this charge at any point during phase 1 and there has been times when inspection appointments have been missed due to tenant, agent and landlords. This provision is in place if there is a persistent problem with inspections being missed and licence holders not taking proactive steps to address the problem. We would not charge this fee where it was clear the tenant</p>

	was the cause for the missed inspection and the landlord and/or agent had done all they reasonably could do to facilitate it.
This implies there are other hidden fees. What are they?	The fees are provided on the consultation document and proposal document.
All fees are an unnecessary burden, which will eventually be borne by the tenants. All costs could be avoided by simply not implementing a badly thought out scheme.	Please see previous comments, the proposal document, the online presentations on our website for the reasons for introducing the scheme and why the fees are set at what they are.
All fees are ultimately calculated into costs. Therefore any areas where it costs the landlord more are less likely to have rental properties in them....and this will increase over time as landlords change their housing stock, or as in my case I decide not to invest inheritance money into a property in these areas in case they join the scheme. It almost feels like Gedling are trying to get rid of people who rent from their areas in an underhand sort of way?!	<p>The proposal document explains that the scheme is necessary to provide the council with the resource to proactively target areas identified as having met certain criteria with a view to improving property management and standards to safeguard tenants. The fee covers the cost of this service provision.</p> <p>It may result in some landlords leaving an area however the licensing fee when compared to the relative cost of the property or rental income is very small so we do not feel that it will result in this in the majority of cases. Some neighbouring councils have similar schemes that cover much larger geographical areas so property licensing is something that all landlords should consider and be aware of in the future.</p> <p>Schemes are intended to improve property management and conditions within areas and as housing conditions improve so should house prices and desirability amongst tenants and potentially buyers. It would be wrong to take the view that we shouldn't try and improve areas within the Borough because some landlords might sell. We are looking at the bigger picture and improvement costs time and resource but the overall potential gain for tenants and property owners is huge.</p>
its all a money making exercise by the council	The scheme is a non-profit making scheme
I'm not sure how beneficial it would be to charge landlords additional fees when registering where information is missing.	This fee would be applied with discretion and where appropriate. We haven't issued this charge at any point during phase 1. It would only be used where an applicant was not cooperating in submitting information to a point where it was seriously jeopardising the whole

<p>Especially the first time this is rolled out, it unlikely to be a familiar process to them and information could be missing because of this.</p>	<p>process. It would not be issued where someone genuinely didn't know or misunderstood the process.</p>
<p>Financially punishing private landlords for not meeting minimum standards for rented accommodation is welcome, as long as safeguards are in place to prevent these from being passed to tenants in rent increases. Wasn't these sort of checks & balances carried out by the local housing authority in the past? Why do we need licensing for this? Feels, again, like stealth taxation.</p>	<p>The fee is a cost recovery for the service provision. The council needs the resource in order to provide the scheme and proactively address the issues identified and safeguard tenants.</p>
<p>I have been part of the netherfield pilot. I only got to know it was a pilot when I saw the presentations. I have some major concerns: 1. If the scheme is not approved through this consultation, do I get my £700 back please? 2. Why am I being made to pay this money when I am paying over £60 per month for a management company (leaders) to manage my property responsibly 3. Why is the council saying this scheme has been "successful" when this is clearly not the case with 256 inspections still to do. Were inspections done over the summer when we were not in lock down? 4. The major issue I have is the price for this. This licensing has cost me more than it costs me to have a management company to look after my house, and now I have to pay both. This means many landlords will pass the cost straight on to</p>	<p>The answers to your questions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presumably the fee you refer to relates to the licence application you made under the Netherfield scheme which came into force 1st October 2018. This proposal relates to extending the Selective Licensing scheme to other areas of the Borough so the outcome of this proposal would have no impact on the Netherfield scheme or any licenses made under that scheme 2. As mentioned previously in this document, having a management company does not guarantee that a property is maintained to the minimum legal standard and/or managed effectively. A large number of properties we have found to be non-compliant have been managed by managing agents. 3. The success of the scheme is measured in more than the number of inspections. Inspections had to be postponed due to the Covid pandemic which as we all know was unprecedented and unexpected. This is why inspections built up. All postponed inspections are being carried out retrospectively and the same action is being taken as would have occurred had they not been postponed due to the pandemic.

<p>the tenants and this is not fair on them. I would like to suggest that any house already managed by a property management company should be exempt.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. You state that you pay £60 a month for your management company. The cost of the licence for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. This is significantly less than £60 a month. 5. Paying a management company to manage a house unfortunately does not guarantee it is effectively managed. Therefore it would not be reasonable to exempt all houses managed by management companies from the need to be licensed.
<p>I believe that all fees should reflect the true cost of maintaining the scheme.</p>	<p>This is the case – the fee is calculated on cost recovery basis and does not make profit.</p>
<p>This is just money for council staff for no real benefit. Raise money by fines on bad landlords If necessary, not by in effect, fining everyone, good or bad.</p>	<p>The fee covers the cost of providing the service. The council will still carried out enforcement which can lead to fines being issued alongside the scheme should it come into force.</p>
<p>For the Council to send out a paper application pack and process the completed paper response, rather than submitting online. Clearly a punishment for not wanting to do things online.</p>	<p>The licensing fee is calculated based on the resource and cost incurred by the council in administering the scheme. This fee is based on applications being made on the website. Sending out paper applications and processing them takes time and resource over and above what is needed for online applications and as such this fee is added on to paper application made. The other option would be to average it out and add it on to everyone's application fee but we did not think this is fair as the majority of people apply online.</p>
<p>Seems to be a lot of fees and very expensive, I think this will cause problems. 1. Some will want to sell up and there are less that can afford to buy houses than those who rent, causing a rental property shortage. 2. Those who rent for business will see an increase in demand for rental properties and raise their rental prices to take advantage of the situation. 3. If there is an over abundance of houses for sale then demand will be less and prices will reduce. 4. Whilst I disagree with private rental businesses as it reduces housing availability for purchase, I don't think this</p>	<p>We take your comments on board thank you. Since you made the statement the housing market (for purchase) has increased significantly and demand far our weighs supply so there appears to be little risk of prices reducing as you state, at least for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The licensing fee is for an accredited landlord if split over five years is £2.25 and for an unaccredited landlord is £2.69 a week. To suggest a landlord would either not purchase a house or would sell a house because of this cost is debatable.</p> <p>Licensing aims at improving housing provision which in turn should make the area more desirable to tenants and buyers. Better maintained housing makes for happier tenants which has a knock on effect to all sorts of social cohesion and ownership of an area by it inhabitants. All of which has to be beneficial for an area, its residents and desirability which in turn should benefit house prices.</p>

will effect them. However I don't mind an individual owning a couple for a little extra income as this income is taxable, but such high fees all of a sudden will affect them massively and I suspect they will be forced to sell their property.	
People and landlords are struggling this will cause further economic downturn	We have delayed making a decision on the scheme until the situation with Covid has stabilised, which in part was taken due to the consultation feedback. It is hoped that now is seen as a more appropriate time to propose this scheme which is why we re-opened our consultation.
Fees or fines should apply to those who do not abide by the rules. Good landlords are providing a valuable and much needed service and should not be having to pay fees to do so.	Please see previous comments on this topic.
to many having financial problems tenants and landlords	We have delayed making a decision on the scheme until the situation with Covid has stabilised, which in part was taken due to the consultation feedback. It is hoped that now is seen as a more appropriate time to propose this scheme which is why we re-opened our consultation.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed designated area of the scheme in Carlton Hill?	
The boundary should not extend to both sides of Standhill Road. The anti social and problem areas you describe are always in experience within the Brickyard estate.	The Government's guidance for introducing selective licensing outlines the criteria that must be satisfied before a scheme can be introduced. The information available to the council demonstrates the criteria have been satisfied in the proposed phase 2 areas. Wherever the boundary is drawn there will be households who fall outside the scheme. The council will keep the areas under review if the scheme is implemented.
If you're going to subject the PRS to Selective Licensing it should be applied to the whole Area i.e. GBC's entire stock.	The provision for a local authority to designate a selective licensing scheme is prescribed via very specific requirement as set out in legislation produced by central government. This legislation states that Selective Licensing does not and cannot cover social housing such as

	Jigsaw Homes. Gedling Borough Council cannot change this or choose to include social housing within its scheme.
I don't believe the scheme should be brought in. Instead just find and tackle bad landlords.	The council already takes appropriate action where landlords are found to be in breach of their legal duties however the resource this scheme will provide will enable us to proactively target areas we have identified as being in need to bring about improvements to housing conditions and management and hold non-compliant landlords to account. We would be unable to do proactive work of this nature on this scale without the resource the scheme will provide.
Is the area for administrative/resource reasons or can it be enlarged on grounds of the number of rented properties in a wider area. Can it be extended to cover a number of wards?	There are a number of criteria when looking to designate a selective licensing area, one of which does relate to number of rented properties. The areas within this proposal have been chosen based on the criteria as outlined in the proposal document.
It won't change a thing other than making tenants worse off	We believe the conditions protect tenants by ensuring protecting and effective management of properties.
What is the rationale for choosing this area?	This is included in the proposal document on our website
Is anyone checking why this particular area has been chosen. Are those reasons valid and robust?	Please see the proposal document. The consultation then provides opportunity for stakeholders to pass comment on whether they believe it is valid and robust.
Why not Central Arnold?	The data we analysed, as presented in the proposal document supported the areas that have been covered in the proposal. The council will continue to review private sector housing conditions across the whole borough to determine whether selective licensing should be implemented elsewhere.
As stated previously, I think the council contradicts themselves by selecting areas of Gedling Borough. I can only assume the council have used crime and anti-social behaviour stats to come up with these areas, however I have already stated that a piece of paper with the landlords name on will not resolve these issues, it's a regional / national issue. The councils already have powers to enforce	Crime and anti-social behaviour statistics did form part of the proposal as detailed in the proposal document, however a number of other factors were also considered and had an impact on the decision to propose this scheme. Resolving antisocial behaviour issues can be complex, we recognise this. It requires joint working involving numerous stakeholders. The landlord/licence holder/agent are a stakeholder should ASB occur at one of their properties. The licence conditions ensure that licence holders have to engage in the process should ASB occur at one of their properties, it does not expect that landlords will resolve the issue on their own. We accept that a landlord alone cannot always address ASB but on the other

<p>action in these areas should they need to enforce them.</p>	<p>hand landlord's must take responsibility where appropriate and try to be part of the solution where ASB is occurring.</p>
<p>Gedling homes now the jigsaw group are unfit to own and run rental properties. The properties are run down. Any work done is of an unfit nature. Safety reports are ignored. Disability needs are neglected. Damage caused by their staff is ignored. Asbestos everywhere. Have got your safety officer involved David Jayne and he is powerless to help. No fully working toilet for two years is just one abuse in a list of many. Repairs dating back over thirteen years. Endless list of neglect and abuse. It's also a historical paedophile hot-spot that covers the abuse and doesn't protect the victim. See Bonds butchers closed it was selling human meat from Lymns undertakers . All covered up. The list is Endless and the local police cover the abuse. Carlton police wants shutting down completely. Corrupt, inept bucket of slime .</p>	<p>If you have concerns about your Jigsaw property we would advise you first contact Jigsaw homes to rectify the issues. If you are not happy with the response from Jigsaw you can contact GBC Environmental Health department for further advice and support.</p> <p>The council has no evidence of the allegations about Bonds Butchers but and does not believe this is the reason the premises closed.</p>
<p>Prove every street has problems and improvement street by street</p>	<p>The proposal covers areas containing certain streets that we believe meet the criteria for a selective licensing scheme.</p>
<p>This is not an area that requires it</p>	
<p>Not located in this proposed area.</p>	
<p>Doesn't need rolling out, gather learning from the other areas first. It needs a good 2 years and surveys to see if rental amounts have increased as a result</p>	<p>Phase 1 has been operating now for almost four years so we are confident in concluding it has had a positive impact on Netherfield. There is no way of accurately quantifying whether rent increases within a certain area are down to Selective Licensing or other factors. There are numerous other influences on rents, for example the Covid pandemic had increased house prices and rents significantly.</p>
<p>I agree that the proposed area of the scheme for Carlton Hill Ward reflects high</p>	

<p>levels of tenanted properties and therefore should prove effective in improving living standards and health and safety for all residents in the area.</p>	
<p>I don't think it applies to me but since I am not able to read the map given by the link above or the subsequent one which does zoom but doesn't show the boundaries so who knows.</p>	
<p>It should be rolled out across the board, not limited.</p>	<p>Some other councils have gone for this approach and whilst there are potential benefits to rolling it out across the whole Borough, we have decided that it is a more practical and sensible approach to target smaller prescribed areas that we know meet the criteria. This enables us to really focus our resource on these areas and bring about the improvements we envisage. It is also worth noting that some areas of the Borough would not meet the criteria as set by central government either in relation to the conditions that need to be satisfied (poor property conditions, low housing demand, high levels of deprivation etc.) or the density of privately rented properties.</p>
<p>The properties we rented were in Gedling Village and Mapperley so I view it should be throughout the Gedling area. Is the idea of the scheme for properties not rented through an estate agent, because they need to be as people are still not protected. It would be interesting to see if there had been other issues with tenants renting from estate agents in the area.</p>	<p>As mentioned in this document previously the scheme covers all privately rented properties, even those managed by managing agents. We agree that properties can still be found to be non-compliant with the basic minimum standards despite being managed by managing agents.</p> <p>Please see above for why we haven't opted to have a selective licensing scheme for the whole Gedling Borough.</p>
<p>I am in a quiet/good area, perhaps next to an area that might be affected. I think we have been 'lumped' in with that area which seems unfair.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of designating specific areas within a large geographical borough there may be some cases where a small section of properties have been included due to their location however every effort has been made to make sure that the areas chosen only include those houses and streets that meet the criteria based on the evidence available to us.</p>
<p>There is nothing to stop those carrying out the alleged antisocial behaviour from crossing Carlton Road to behave in this</p>	<p>The boundary needs to fall somewhere so inevitably there are going to be situations where properties on one road fall under the scheme whereas properties on the next road do not.</p>

<p>way but landlords on one side of the road are to be penalised by this postcode lottery.</p>	<p>This is unavoidable without including all areas under the scheme. Every effort has been made to make sure that the areas chosen only include those houses and streets that meet the criteria based on the evidence available to us.</p>
<p><u>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed designated area of the scheme in Colwick?</u></p>	
<p>As much as the quality of housing in the area is lower, what will the council do to assist and help willing landlords rather than tax, punish, and fine included landlords?</p>	<p>Licensing is not a punishment. Licensing is a way of providing service provision to areas known to have issues that would benefit from council involvement in order to protect tenants by improvement property management and standards. The service is there for landlords and landlord can benefit from the service by gaining advice and support in terms advising them on what needs doing in their house or on how to effectively manage a property. You recognise that the quality of housing in Colwick is lower, we do not think this should just be something that is accepted and nothing done to rectify this. Licensing will help to ensure that quality of housing in Colwick is brought up to a standard that tenants deserve.</p>
<p>If you're going to subject the PRS to Selective Licensing it should be applied to the whole Area i.e. GBC's entire stock.</p>	<p>The provision for a local authority to designate a selective licensing scheme is prescribed via very specific requirement as set out in legislation produced by central government. This legislation states that Selective Licensing does not and cannot cover social housing such as Jigsaw Homes. Gedling Borough Council cannot change this or choose to include social housing within its scheme.</p>
<p>As previous comments for Carlton. Why not extend to the whole of Colwick? With Colwick you have a discrete area to treat as one.</p>	<p>The areas have been chosen based on the criteria as set by central government. The reasoning and data is included in the proposal document. We have decided that it is practical and sensible approach to target smaller prescribed areas that we know meet the criteria. This enables us to really focus our resource on these areas and bring about the improvements we envisage. It is also worth noting that some areas of the Borough would not meet the criteria as set by central government either in relation to the conditions that need to be satisfied (poor property conditions, low housing demand, high levels of deprivation etc.) or the density of privately rented properties.</p>
<p>The scheme is not appropriate for this area. It will not tackle any of the objectives listed.</p>	<p>Duplicate comment</p>

Why not Bestwood Park or Top Valley? It really seems like the designation area's have been pulled out of hat.	The areas have been chosen based on the criteria as set by central government. The reasoning and data is included in the proposal document.
The scheme should be the entire borough of Gedling. It needs cleaning up properly. Social housing, so anywhere where the jigsaw group of scum are peddling their abuse and neglect.	Please see previous comments on why the proposed areas have been chosen and why selective licensing cannot cover social housing such as Jigsaw homes.
Gedling council appears to just be bullying those who live/own a home here. 2020 has been hard enough. We don't need our rent rates to be pushed hire to match west bridgford.	Please see previous comments on landlord increasing rents due to selective licensing A rented house needs to meet certain minimum basic standards both in terms of conditions and management irrespective of whether the rent of cheap or expensive.
Please provide detailed crime / anti-social behaviour statistics for the Colwick area. It's mainly business on the Private Road park and I suspect the level of ASB is migrated in from the surrounding areas.	All of the relevant data used for this proposal is contained within the proposal document on our website.
There is a terrible landlord on Balmoral Road, he needs sorting out!	Selective Licensing would help to address any poor landlord practices by providing additional safeguards for tenants which can be quickly enforced by the council.
<u>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed designated area of the scheme in Daybrook?</u>	
Arnold and woodthorpe will be next	The only proposal the council has made to extend selective licensing is this one and Arnold and Woodthorpe are not covered.
So you're just picking on the poorer areas?	Social deprivation is a criteria that can trigger the designation of Selective Licensing within an area as it is not uncommon for areas suffering from deprivation will have higher rates of housing disrepair and poor property standards. The criteria that were met for each area being chosen in this proposal are detailed in the proposal document
Looks like u included some good roads	Every effort has been made to make sure that the areas chosen only include those houses and streets that meet the criteria based on the evidence available to us.

<p>Why not Queens Avenue Estate in Gedling? The designations make no sense to me. We manage a significant amount of properties in these area's and virtually no problems. We are a responsible agent and insist on health and safety practices not required by law. These landlords already meet your requirements. My fear, much like when the NCC licencing scheme came into place is that many of these 'accidental' landlords will simply sell up and reduce the housing stock even further.</p>	<p>The areas have been chosen based on the evidence available to us as detailed in the proposal document.</p>
<p>We regard ourselves as diligent landlords who recognise whilst it is a property/asset for us, for the tenant it is their home. They deserve to be live as we would chose in our home and that is how we manage the property and tenant's expectation. This will not change because the council think they have jurisdiction over this.</p>	<p>This is how we want landlords to operate their properties and we would have no desire to change this. Unfortunately not all landlords operate in this way.</p>
<p>I know this area well - I grew up there & my mother still lived there until 3 years ago. It is generally a nice area, with well cared for properties.</p>	<p>We are not disputing that Daybrook is a nice area, we just feel that the private rented stock within the proposed area of Daybrook meet criteria for a licensing scheme to be brought in to protect tenants.</p>
<p><u>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed designated area of the scheme in Newstead Village?</u></p>	
<p>The scheme is not appropriate for this area. It will not tackle any of the objectives listed.</p>	<p>Please see previous response to this comment</p>
<p>Why not Calverton?</p>	<p>Please see previous comment on why the areas were chosen.</p>

<p>As stated previously, I think the council contradicts themselves by selecting areas of Gedling Borough. I can only assume the council have used crime and anti-social behaviour stats to come up with these areas, however I have already stated that a piece of paper with the landlords name on will not resolve these issues, it's a regional / national issue. The councils already have powers to enforce</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – please see response previously in this document.</p>
<p>Not resident in this area, but I would suspect that this is again, little to nothing stats-wise and migrated in from surrounding areas. Justification for this is slim to say the least.</p>	
<p>I do not live in this area so am not qualified to comment.</p>	
<p>These areas are low cost rentals & attract poorer families. As a landlord, you try to select tenants who will respect your property & their neighbours. Higher fees for Landlords will impact on the cost of rentals.</p>	<p>Please see previous response to landlords increasing rent due to selective licensing.</p> <p>It is not the council's intention to increase rents. Lower rent should not mean lower standards of housing conditions and management. Licensing is about protecting tenants, some of which will be the most vulnerable in society.</p>
<p align="center"><u>Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a licence scheme for all privately rented properties in Carlton Ward, Colwick, Daybrook and Newstead Village? (To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed...)</u></p>	
<p>If the scheme is to ensure that all landlords are reputable then this scheme should be extended to all wards in Gedling Borough. Current proposal disadvantage reputable tenants in poor areas and let's off shoddy landlords in</p>	<p>Please see previous responses explaining why the areas proposed were chosen and why other were not.</p>

poor areas. Feels like landlords are funding the solutions of bad behaviour in certain wards when this should be the accountability of the local councils	
The initial scheme in Netherfield did highlight lower quality housing, however there is a point in which it appears to be a money grab by Gedling Borough Council.	You comment that phase 1 highlighted lower quality housing which is a significant part of what Selective Licensing is aimed at addressing.
I'd agree if the prices were fair to the landlords , if you charge too much they will just up fee for renters	Please see previous responses that relate to the licensing fee, how it will be used and landlords increasing rents.
SL increases rent for tenants and at best pushes problems elsewhere. The LA already has powers to deal with unsafe housing and should use these instead of fleecing LLs and tenants to fund a new scheme.	<p>Please see previous responses made to the suggestion rents will increase.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is required in order to provide the resources to the council to be able to proactively address prescribed areas of the borough known to meet the criteria. Yes we do currently have powers to deal with disrepair, however we do not have the resource to do it on a scale that a selective licensing scheme will enable.</p> <p>You state that licensing 'at best pushes problems elsewhere'. We have seen no evidence of this and nor do we see this as a valid reason for not attempting to improve areas we know suffer from the criteria outlines in the proposal document.</p>
I don't believe the scheme should be brought in. Instead just find and tackle bad landlords	Please see above. We do already tackle the non-compliant landlords we become aware of but licensing will enable us to do it on a much larger and more comprehensive scale.
Scheme should not be brought in at all.	
We rent our house from our daughter, who lets us rent at below market cost, The property is fully maintained in great condition. The imposition of costs in our circumstance will have a bad effect on both us and our daughter and will achieve nothing, except to line the local authorities pockets. ALL situations	This property would be exempt from licensing as it is being rented to a family member so your daughter would not need to pay to licence the property.

should be considered for the negative as well as the positive implications.	
Actually there are other areas of the Borough that need regulating as rogue landlords own property all over and do no work to houses only reap weekly rents. Tenants afraid to complain of problems fearing losing their homes.	<p>Please see previous comments explaining why the proposed areas were chosen.</p> <p>We agree that one of the many benefits of licensing schemes is that tenants who are afraid to complain can have an officer visit and work with their landlord to bring about necessary improvements without themselves having to complain or be held responsible by the landlord.</p>
Selective license a failed scheme. It is simply a means of taxing proactive, responsible landlords. 'Bad landlords' will continue to operate without a licence.	Our statistics and findings from phase 1 suggest otherwise. Please see previous comments in relation to how many houses had improvements required to bring them up to minimum legal standards, how we encourage intel reporting regarding bad landlords and how licensing gives the council additional provision to address poor property management and conditions.
Totally disagree tenants will have to pay, causing unneeded raise in rent and living standards	<p>Please see previous comments in relation to rent increases</p> <p>We would argue that raising living standards to bring houses up to minimum legal standard absolutely are needed.</p>
I think that this a disgrace... up there with the hairbrained labour schemes like robin hood energy	
I agree in principal	
It adds no value to tenants or landlords	Please see previous comments on the benefits of licensing to tenants and landlords and the findings from phase 1 in Netherfield.
Overall I think all this scheme does is charge landlords that are already doing a good job. My landlord is great but had to register last year and it only resulted in my rent going up to cover his costs. You would be better having a confidential whistleblowing system to catch the worst landlords, who wouldn't bother registering on this scheme anyway	<p>Please see previous comments on varying views on what makes a 'good landlord' and the percentage of houses which were required to be improved to bring them up to the minimum legal standard.</p> <p>The council already has a reporting mechanism in place for tenants to report disrepair and/or poor management however a lot of tenants either don't know of this service or do not report it through fear of retaliatory eviction. Licensing removes this fear by enabling the council to check a property without it being in response to a tenant complaint. Tenants also have the opportunity to speak to council staff to gain more advice should they need it.</p>
I see no benefit in selective licensing. The laws to ensure tenants have a safe and	Selective licensing puts in place a number of conditions which the licence holder must adhere to. Some of these conditions are already what a landlord would be expected to do

<p>legal home already exist. I do not see how selective licensing will improve rentals.</p>	<p>but some are over and above. It is clear to the licence holder exactly what they are required to do when managing their property (whilst one would think landlords would already be aware of their legal duties, not all are) and it is a quick and streamlined process</p>
<p>Only the honourable landlords pay this fee. Dishonourable landlords choose not to pay and the authorities cannot be bothered to chase the bad boys but are happy enough to scoop the easy money from the good boys. I have not seen a single case where a 'bad' landlord has been tracked down and stopped from operating. This is purely a money racket, unfortunately, at the Tenants expense.</p>	<p>Incorrect. A number of properties have been and continue to be the subject of investigation. The team has issued 7 CPN notices in relation to 16 properties totalling £18,612 with one landlord receiving a fine of £9,512</p>
<p>Not required if landlord pays an agent to look after the property</p>	<p>Please see previous response in relation to properties managed by agents</p>
<p>The existing scheme was badly implemented, an extension is not appropriate in the current climate, and there are no key performance indicators in place to show any actual benefit in the existing scheme, beyond unsubstantiated claims.</p>	<p>We feel that the outcomes from the first scheme as detailed in this document and via the presentations given as part of this consultation process which are on our website show that phase 1 has shown great benefits to protecting tenants. 78% of properties inspected under the scheme in Netherfield as of April 2022 had repair works required under HHSRS, this is a clear and precise KPI that shows that 78% of properties fell below the minimum legal requirement and works were required to protect tenants. 40 properties identified as having disrepair presenting imminent risk – again a very clear and specific KPI showing that the occupants of 40 properties were living with disrepair that is likely to have contributed towards serious harm.</p>
<p>The scheme in Netherfield is flawed and not working. Good landlords like myself are being used to imply that this expensive scheme is making a difference... but I believe its only on a superficial level. Is it best use of time and money (both mine and the councils) The negative impact has not been considered because those working in the scheme cannot be objective. Their only</p>	<p>See comment above. The team is able to be objective and there are numerous things learned from phase 1 that we would take over should phase 2 come into force. The purpose of the scheme is to protect tenants, improve property management and standards and improve areas.</p>

<p>goal is to justify their time and paypacket. Do not extend the scheme before it is working in Netherfield. Its not fair on any of the parties involved.</p>	
<p>There is not enough affordable family homes to rent in this city. Go onto Rightmove, put in 3 bed houses in NG5 and let me know how many are available? I'll bet its less than 10. Now go and speak to housing aid and ask them how many families are currently looking for a home. Licensing will worsen this problem significantly based on the last two years worth of experience with NCC. The problem you need to sort out is reducing the number of HMO's and house shares available. We do not need more single occupancy properties. We need significantly more family homes and licensing will not solve this problem.</p>	<p>A search on 20th May 2022 brought up 26 results.</p> <p>The data held by housing aid in terms of who is waiting for a home is Borough wide and would also include people who are currently in accommodation, looking to move on.</p> <p>Single occupancy properties are 99% of the time family occupied properties. Selective licensing covers single/family occupied properties and ensures that they are well managed and safe. Licensing may not increase or decrease the number of family occupied housing available but what it will do is ensure it is safe and fit for purpose.</p>
<p>It will answer each point with regards to the conditions the council are trying to improve and why licencing will do nothing to improve them; A. Gas, Electrical and Fire Safety - It's already mandatory for landlords to carry out a gas safety check every year and it will also be mandatory for all existing tenancies to have a satisfactory EICR (or EIC if re-wire or new build) by April 2021. All properties must also have a working smoke alarm on each floor. These are basic rules that apply to ALL rental properties country wide, councils already have powers to enforce action against landlords that don't</p>	<p>We have responded to each point you have raised by following the referencing system you have used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. It is correct that gas and now EICR certification is a requirement for rented properties. That does not mean that all landlords do them unfortunately. As is the case with the requirement to have fire detection on each level of the property. Under the fire detection regulations if there isn't a smoke detector on one level of the property the landlord is given 28 days to rectify this. If the property is licensed and there isn't a smoke detector then the council can take enforcement for breach of licence condition immediately and this can then be taken into account on the licence holder's fit and proper status, thus having a potential impact on their status as a licence holder. B. The conditions within the licence all relate to property management but do not just cover maintenance and repair. Whilst we accept maintenance and repair is a large part of effective management, there are a number of other requirements that must be

comply with these regulations, therefore licencing is not required. B. Property Management - Depending on the tenancy agreement, it's a landlords obligation to maintain and repair the property during the tenancy. If the landlord does not fulfil these obligations, the council already has power to enforce action against the landlord, therefore a licence is not required. C. Tenancy Management - The same rules apply with property management with Tenancy Management, if the landlord is not fulfilling there obligations then councils have the powers to enforce action against the landlord, therefore a licence is not required. D. Tackling Antisocial behaviour (ASB) - As stated earlier in my response, these are regional / national social issues and it's disgraceful that the council are discriminating against private tenants for this, private homeowners should be held just as accountable. There is no evidence to suggest that a piece of paper with the landlords name on would do anything to tackle these complex social problems. I strongly suggest the council re-consider this condition and remove it from their proposal to government as a proposed benefit of licencing. E. Notifying the Council of changes of details or circumstances - A simple online landlord register for all landlords in Gedling Borough Council areas would surely be sufficient? It could be made a mandatory

followed to effectively manage a rented property. On the topic of repair and maintenance, if the landlord does not carry out his/her duty in this regard to a satisfactory level without licensing then the landlord can be prosecuted and/or fined. In a licensing area the landlord can be prosecuted and/or fined and his/her licence revoked meaning that a separate fit and proper party must take over the management of the house in order for it to continue to operate legally.

- C. Not all of the tenancy management issues covered in the licence conditions are enforceable without licensing and having them in the form of licence conditions makes it much easier for councils to take action when needed.
- D. There is absolutely no discrimination whatsoever in the council proposing to introduce a selective licensing scheme on the basis of ASB, quite the opposite. The council is committed to taking proactive and positive steps to try and help in areas where ASB complaints are high and selective licensing is one tool available. Selective licensing can only be applied to privately rented properties as per the legislative framework as set by central government. Private home owners, if committing ASB would be held to account in the same way as a private tenant it just wouldn't be via the selective licensing scheme. The 'piece of paper' requires landlords to take a proactive role in addressing ASB if it is reported at their property, thus preventing them from claiming it has nothing to do with them and not providing any assistance. Clearly the landlord is a significant stakeholder should ASB be occurring at their property and as such we would expect that they form part of the solution via a joint working partnership with the council and police where appropriate. It is the landlord that has the contractual agreement with the tenant and therefore the landlord needs to be involved if ASB is occurring at the property. We are not saying that all ASB is the sole responsibility of the landlord, we are saying that the landlord needs to engage in finding the solution.
- E. You may be in favour of an online landlord register but it is likely that others would not be. There is also no legislation that would enable the council to require this or take action should people refuse to be on it. We have to work in line with the legislative framework. You state that this could be done at minimum expense – ensuring that all people had submitted information, chasing up those who haven't, taking action against those who haven't and maintaining the database, including making changes as they occur for the whole Borough would not be a minimal expense.

requirement that all landlords or agents submit details of private rented properties at the start or end of a tenancy, the council would then have a registered list of all active tenancies with a contact number of the landlord / agent if required. You could even request to inspect properties at random if you wanted too! This could be a simple online form done at minimum expense. Licencing will take years and hundreds of thousands of pounds to put in place, so the council should consider all options before increasing tenants rents and wasting your valuable time. F. License holder training - If the tenancy is managed by a regulated agent and is listed as the property manager on the licence then they should be exempt. If they insist on managing the property themselves then some form of landlord training should be provided if they are not accredited. In summary, the council should be looking for ways to enforce the powers they have to improve private rented accommodation for ALL of Gedling Borough council. I disagree that your Netherfield scheme has been a 'success', as the council had powers to enforce the actions they took against landlords before the scheme was introduced. I personally submitted licence applications as early as 2018 and you are still processing them, it further re-enforces my point that you spend all your time administering the scheme, the

F. It is the licence holder who is bound by the conditions of the licence and it is the licence holder who we would take action against should there be a breach of licence condition. If a property owner wants to have a regulated agent as the licence holder and they regularly undertake training then we would have no issue with that. If a landlord opts to be a licence holder but claims that it is the agent who has real control of the house then we would dispute whether the landlord is the most appropriate person to hold the licence. Please see previous responses in this document relating to properties managed by agents and how this does not always mean compliance and good property management.

Your summary:

Please see previous comments in this report as to why the proposed areas have been chosen and why we have opted not to do a Borough wide scheme. The licensing scheme is required to provide the resource to the council to carry out a large scale proactive approach to improving housing conditions and management. We do currently have the powers to deal with disrepair but we do not have the resource to proactively target areas on this scale without a scheme of this nature.

The licence is more than a piece of paper with the landlords name on it. It is a set of conditions that must be followed and if breached the licence holder can be fined. This could also lead to the licence being revoked where appropriate, thus removing a bad landlord from the management of a property.

<p>council could have inspected every property in Netherfield 4 times over if there was a more simple process in place. I believe an online landlord register for all private rented properties would be the fairest most economical way of giving the council a clear record of all the private rented housing in your district. Tenants already have the power to report rouge landlords to councils and the government has introduced a number of protective measures to protect tenants in these scenarios, such as protection from being counter served notice as a result of councils getting involved. The government has also brought in 6 month section 21 notices to protect tenants during the pandemic, new electric safety measures have been introduced which applies to new tenancies now and existing from April 2021 and new EPC regulations are due to come into force - so why the need for a piece of paper with the landlords name on that gives you the some powers you had before? I look forward to voicing my concerns on this matter at any further consultations you have arranged in the future.</p>	
<p>There should be no scheme it offers no value to landlords its just the council stealing/taxing us further. I will have to pass the cost to the tennant in increased rent or get out of the rental market. None of the things the scheme addresses to me or other landlords I know as were</p>	<p>Please see previous comments relating to landlords increasing rents and only targeting bad landlords</p>

<p>responsible so instead of taxing everybody and negatively affecting the rents why not get your act together and take action against the few problem landlords.</p>	
<p>We regard ourselves as diligent landlords who recognise whilst it is a property/asset for us, for the tenant it is their home. They deserve to be live as we would chose in our home and that is how we manage the property and tenant's expectation. This will not change because the council think they have jurisdiction over this.</p>	<p>This is how we want landlords to operate their properties and we would have no desire to change this. Unfortunately not all landlords operate in this way.</p>
<p>I would welcome this. On a personal level, it would help me as social worker in housing to have links to reputable/reliable landlords. Such a scheme may be beneficial to those that I support and try and obtain housing for. Having information about good, fair landlords can't be a bad thing and knowing about those who are questionable would be equally helpful from my perspective.</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive comment, we agree with your thoughts</p>
<p>Although this is is a good idea I believe it should be delayed this is not the right time to put extra costs on landlords my property is currently empty and costing me a fortune due to COVID I would not be able to pay these fees.</p>	<p>We understand your concerns and we did delay making a decision on whether to designate the phase 2 scheme until the Covid pandemic was under control. We believe that now is a more appropriate time (May 2022) which is why we have reopened our consultation for four further weeks to seek views again.</p>
<p>To protect rights of tenant and also landlord</p>	<p>We agree that licensing will do just this.</p>
<p>Blanket licensing for Private landlords in the Colwick, Carlton, Daybrook & Newstead Village area is not justified in my opinion. There are no safeguards for</p>	<p>It is not blanket licensing, it is in prescribed areas of those four wards known to meet the criteria as laid out in the proposal document.</p> <p>Please see previous responses to landlords increasing rents or selling properties.</p>

<p>landlord license costs on to the tenant in rent increases and / or simply putting the property up for sale as they do not want to be forced into this sort of scheme. More work can be done to educate private tenants on their rights and the expectation of the landlord before compulsory licensing is enforced. The ASB / Crime statistics make the inclusion of Newstead Village & Colwick tenuous at best and unjustifiable at worst. More visible beat PCSO and Police would be the smarter way to go about this, to create community relationships again. Stealth taxing Private Landlords does not achieve this.</p>	
<p>I believe that the license scheme and proposed conditions is necessary in the areas as detailed previously as it should raise the standard of properties and therefore improve conditions for all residents in those areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, we agree.</p>
<p>It is important that all rented property is registered in some way so that the landlords can be easily identified in the event of problems. We found as a residents assoc. in Birmingham that it was too easy for landlords of poorly maintained property to intimidate tenants and hide their identity making it difficult and costly for Council Officers to take appropriate action.</p>	<p>Licensing will address this issue by forcing the people in control of properties to engage with the council and the council can then check if they are fit and proper to hold a licence. Then during the term of the licence if the tenant has issues the council has more provision available to take quick and decisive action to ensure tenants are protected.</p>
<p>To much regulation.</p>	<p>Ensuring that properties are well maintained and managed is a complex area and legislation is required to make sure tenants receive the service they deserve and that properties are</p>

	safe and free of hazards. All areas of private business have regulation that must be complied with and private renting is no different.
Landlords should have a licence and should be able to be seen when looking at a property	Under this proposal all private rented properties will be required to be licensed. Tenants can find out if their property is licensed either by contacting the council or by requesting a copy of the public register which holds the details of when the licence was issued and the contract details of all licence holders and agents involved in the management of the house.
This is a way to take money from landlords. There are rules that are already in place to protect tenants and ensure good standard of rented properties. If they were used properly, there is no need for good landlords to have to pay for a licenec. The bad landlords would be made to pay. Responsible, good, innocent landlords would not be being penalised because of the bad ones.	Please see previous responses to ‘good landlords’ not being included in a licensing scheme and why a scheme is necessary to bring in resource to proactively target properties on a much larger scale than would otherwise be possible.
Where a problem exists it is the responsibility of the council to address it. This scheme will not address any of the issues in a way that cannot be achieved through the application of existing legislation and regulations to control rogue landlords where the council should rightly bear the cost from general taxation in relation to investigation and from and the levying of fines on guilty parties in relation to enforcement. This scheme seeks to pass the responsibility and crucially the cost to a small number of responsible residential landlords and as such represents an abdication of responsibility on behalf of the council.	The council is the enforcing body for housing standards however we would argue that all stakeholders have a responsibility to address issues in the sector. The council’s first thought is always to work with landlords and tenants to bring about improvements, enforcement is a last resort. Licensing is a way of working with landlords by laying out a list of conditions so both parties are clear on what is expected. The licensing scheme provides the council with the resources to proactively address a large number of properties in a number of different areas known to have issues as covered in the proposal document. A far larger number of properties than would be possible otherwise