

## Q1. Closed Housing Register

### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to close the Housing Register to applicants from outside Thanet?**

139 (78.1%) *Strongly agree*  
18 (10.1%) *Agree*  
4 (2.2%) *Neither agree nor disagree*  
3 (1.7%) *Disagree*  
14 (7.9%) *Strongly disagree*

### **Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

58 (32.6%)

### Strongly Agree

thanet residents should get first choice over people who dont work or live in thanet

1. There may be exceptional cases of applicants with family ties to Thanet.

Only individuals from thanet should be on the housing register

I was born & bred here & i could not get housed at all as outsiders were getting housed as the amount of children they have also i think people who are debtors should be made to prove they can clear their debts no matter their circumstance,i beleive a lot of people are finding a way to fiddle the bidding system as well

Unless they have good reason, i.e. relatives need help from one another, so have to be nearer to look after relatives.

It's an appropriate time to start taking control and focus on our local residents. I think the current system is extremely unfair. We have a lot of people coming into the area who fancy living by the sea or who think it will be cheaper. Also a lot of eastern europeans have moved to this area knowing that they could get council housing and benefits.

This is only common sense and will stop undesirables from other parts of the country settling among us in Thanet. Unless of course they can pay for accomodation here. strongly agree as i have been on the housing register since december 2011 i am in band c and have been informed by a council employee that even though my circumstances have changed considerably in the past 4 weeks my band will not change as i have enough in savings and monthly incomings due to a private pension to rent in the private sector.i have just under 5 thousand pounds in savings and receive around 1,150.00 per month in pensions so i feel the changes would benefit myself and other persons in my position,at my time of life i am 65 next month there is a need to have some savings so as not to be a burden on my family i worked for croydon council for over 25years and joined the pension scheme to give myself a better quality of life in later years and feel i should not be discriminated against because of this.the private sector have very few properties for mature tenants and are very expensive the housing association seem to have a great deal of properties for fifty pl us persons.

It's hard enough as it is to obtain a home, without the need for applicants from other areas.

Would be a great approach for other social landlords to take also. Would also be helpful if the private sector would follow suit to reduce the burden being placed on the area by London boroughs and other areas more affected by the Welfare Reform proposals.

The Highest Priority should be given to those who were actually born in Thanet if they have children, so that they can stay close to their immediate families.

This should have been done years ago

Hopefully this policy will stop the transit to this area of "Dole by the seaside" unemployed. Local people who have a commitment to Thanet will stay long term in the housing provided.

I believe parts of Thanet (particularly Cliftonville West) have become "dumping grounds" for persons from other towns and cities ie London or elsewhere, in particular single persons. This is still going on and it creates an unfair pressure on one bedroomed accommodation in Thanet.

Please also remove from the register any applicants currently on it who are from outside the area.

Thanet has been a dumping ground for other boroughs 'problem' residents for too long. This should have been sorted years ago.

thanet is a small place, residents from within its boundaries should not have to wait longer than people from outside the area. this is a welcome change in housing policy.

As a council, there is a responsibility to ensure that those within our own district are given a priority.

We need to look after the area housing as others from outside the area who just want to live by the sea has to be stoped

Local schools, doctors etc are already heavily over subscribed. People should not be encouraged to move to Thanet for a ride!

Thanet needs to have an opportunity to stabilise and sort out many of its problems. This is a step in the right direction

i was put into band d cat with no explanation.and have been on the list years and years.properties are rarely given to band d so i am slowly loosing faith with the council.so why on earth do we give priority to outsiders of thanet when you cant house the people already here

Whilst I agree with this proposal I hope that TDC will not support any Government proposal to require those with "unoccupied" bedrooms to house immigrants.

Whilst I agree with this proposal I hope that TDC will not support any Government proposal to require those with "unoccupied" bedrooms to house immigrants.

I think it is brilliant that they are now only going to give local housing to LOCAL people! it means us that live here will have a greater chance of finding a property within the area we choose to live and having to live here for 3 years first is even better.

As a homeowner some might think I'm not in a position to make any judgements about this proposal, but being able to walk into your own house and shut the door is the fundamental need of any human being, be it rented or owned, and how disheartening it is for so many Thanet born people to see "outsiders" arriving here and seemingly taking priority! So yes these are positive proposals, my question is, why has it taken so long?? I think it's great that the people who live and care in Thanet are given priority over outsiders

Thanet housing needs to be kept for Thanet Residents. Far too many migrants being offered council housing when local residents on the register are not prioritized for their needs. Too many dodgy private landlords who don't upkeep the properties just grab the rent!

The council should not allow Government pressure to take more immigrants. The next step for this Government would be to suggest that those in under occupied accommodation should take in immigrants.

This area is drowning under the level of claimants and benefit recipients and yet we allow people from other areas to continue to come into the area and add to the numbers of those in need.

Local homes for local people should be the priority. People in more 'need' from other areas should be prioritised in the LA area they live only.

Maybe East Kent Housing area?

Thanet cannot support its own residents already. There is a lack of jobs, schools, doctors etc so why would we want to continue to increase the housing register from outside the area, thus putting more strain on our limited resources? People of Thanet do not want Thanet to turn into an urban grotto and that is exactly what is happening because all the councillors of the area give a damn about money in their own pockets, they don't give a damn about the area themselves. Truth is most of them probably don't even come from the area and I would bet my last £1 that a good number of councillors don't live in the area! How the hell are we supposed to turn the fortunes of a town like Margate around when we keep filling the area up with people claiming benefits? The gap between the income levels in Thanet and the cost of living in Thanet purely because we are in the south is becoming too great and honest, decent workers are struggling to find a point to it all. I think changing the banding systems and finally showing equality to the people who actually pay their taxes is long overdue and only fair. Why should people who don't work be the only ones to benefit where housing is concerned? I'm pretty sure that wasn't the original point of the social housing ethos in this country! It is almost impossible for anyone to get on the property ladder if they live off a single salary anymore so why shouldn't this long discarded section of the society benefit from the right to buy situation with council properties they could rent, if they were offered them too? Surely it is more financially beneficial to Thanet District Council to have a balanced quota of private paying tenants to housing benefit tenants to even out the cost of supporting people on benefits? With all due respect to the current government the Right to Buy Schemes available only offer properties in the middle of the Newington Estate or in Canterbury and they are still too expensive for what people earn around here... and I know, I've looked! This area deserves more. The workers of this area deserve more.

It should always have been this way.

I am in my 3rd year of waiting for a council house & of course ill agree with anything that benefits Me & my daughter

I agree that a local policy should be in place. I have lived and worked in the Thanet area all my life. I have little chance to affordable housing in the area I contribute to. It seems unfair that the banding policy means that people with no connection can be housed in a new affordable property because they have been "dumped" in Thanet by other authorities, in refuges ect.

It is unfair that local people are not housed first from the Housing Register. This area has for a long time has people "dumped& here from other areas (notably London areas) as well as immigrants coming in. It is important that agricultural land is not used for housing as once that is gone, Thanet will lose some of its charm. Therefore, make any housing only for local poeple and renovate old or empty housed after warning any owners.

we live in the area and its our councils money that is being spent so we deserve priority. personally i have been waiting 3 years to be moved after living in thanet all my life

### **Agree**

Special cases should be allowed to join register, eg to unite a family

although i think people who have very strong links who have moved away ahpuld still be considered. for example if someone moved away but are now divorced and their parents and children are here they should still count. I think a minimum of five years should be considered with people who have been here or at least went to school here being the highest priority.

If we can not house the people in Thanet then surely we can not house the people that is not in Thanet.

However, there may be certain circumstances where a non-resident has a valid reason to want to move to Thanet, eg. to live near family for health reasons.

I think there should be residential criteria as there is such a housing shortage in Thanet

### **Neither agree or disagree**

The people from outside Thanet may wish to work here but would leave property in their area for others. The vast number of new lettings to people from abroad is much more serious as local people are not able to get a place within a reasonable time.

### **Disagree**

I think that this needs to be flexible and looked at on a case by case situation. For example, I am aware of a case where an elderly gentleman (over 80) living in London in council/housing association accommodation wishes to move closer to his son who lives in Ramsgate. His son has a partner and two small children and can not move out of Thanet to move closer to his father.

There is a concern that Children who are cared for by the local authority and resident in Thanet that are not resident for 3 years but have made strong local connections will be disadvantaged from securing a stable and long term home in an area where they have developed social relationships and secure attachments to the community

I agree in general with this proposal, however discretion should be allowed for special circumstances, for example, an elderly parent or parents wishing to move back close to their family from outside the area. This would not only be morally correct but would ensure family care for older people and would off-load the social services and NHS on a national level. there would be real cost benefits at national level or though they may not be seen locally. Perhaps government could recognise this and contribute to Councils implementing such a policy.

### **Strongly disagree**

I feel that this will impact upon those clients who are fleeing another area, for example where they are victims of domestic abuse

My elderly father has lived in Thanet for quite a number of years, after my mother died he has got progressively ill,so I need to move from Wilts to be near him. I am 61 and would need social housing for I would need security of tenancy that I would not get with private lettings. Being on pension credit I could not afford private letting.

Stops people (on low incomes) having the freedom to move around. This is what councils have done to traveller people and are now exercising this same policy to poor people. housing should be open to all and be undiscrimitory. people should be allowed to live in what are they choose as they could have a very valid reason for wanting to live in a different area

I lived in Thanet for 23 years. I moved away and got married and now I want to return but unfortunately cannot buy a property therefore I need the council's help.

I have been on the housing list for 2 and a half years and bid regularly. I desperately want to move back to Thanet and due to your new rule changes that's going to be completely unaffordable. I want to work but will not be able to afford the private landlords rents. This will now result in me staying where I am and remaining here whether I like it or not, I'm devastated at this change. I understand the practicalities of the rules but still think they are totally unfair and biased. Could you not change it so as not to add anymore from outside Thanet but include existing applications? If I now move th Thanet I wont be able to work as I wont be able to afford the private Landlord rates

I think that exceptions should be allowed. Each application should be considered individual and considered on the grounds of the reason for the application. The applicant needing to move out of their current borough due to their welfare and have local connections such as family or work should be considered and given priority if necessary.

The policy stated that those eligible are Thanet residents who have been living within the Thanet district for a continuous period of 3 years immediately prior to date of application. Does this apply to those fleeing Domestic Abuse, who may have come to Thanet to live in the Refuge or have fled DA to the Thanet area to be with a support network; or those that have fled the area and returned with legal protection. Many clients are unable to live in the area with which they have local connection as this is simply their danger area, this excludes them from being on the housing register.

There maybe many varied reasons for a person wishing to be accommodated in Thanet - family connection, one's only friends being already resident, etc,

## 2. Residency Criteria

**How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce new residential criteria which requires applicants to have lived in Thanet for a minimum of three years in order to qualify for the Housing Register?**

127 (71.3%) *Strongly agree*  
19 (10.7%) *Agree*  
5 (2.8%) *Neither agree nor disagree*  
9 (5.1%) *Disagree*  
17 (9.6%) *Strongly disagree*

**Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

55 (30.9%)

### Strongly Agree

I hope this means priority is given to residents of Thanet and not non-English families.  
minimum 5 would be better

I strongly agree that there should be a 3 year residential criteria as long as it does not affect homeless applicants.

about time there are to many people that have never lived in thanet that get a house just like that where people that have lived here all there lives are still waiting years

Unless relatives are needed to be closer to look after relatives, flexibility for qualification

We need to stop accommodating people from all over the South East.

This is a very good idea as it will dissuade people from moving to be near the sea or because they feel it is a cheap area.

This has been needed for many years now. I am glad our council has grasped the nettle!  
I have lived in Thanet my whole life, and people who have just moved here are being prioritised over me. Disgusting

Would prefer to see five years' continuous residency.

This should be five years.

We need to safe the true residents of thanet

With this criteria, there will already be commitment to the area.

An excellent suggestion for which Members and Officers alike should be commended.

You should add people who have previously lived in this area and have direct family here too. I was a council tenant in thanet for 15 years before I went into the military. Upon return found that I could not get council housing.

Should be longer

i think that 5 years should be the minimum and then only applicable if in full time employment

I think the minimum should be increased to 5 or more years at least though in order for the person to have made some kind of contribution to the area they wish to settle in applicants should also prove that they have worked for the minimum of three years to qualify

i feel that it is a very fair way to allow people who have lived in the area a long time to be housed first. As the real residents end up getting pushed to one side and never seem to get a look in as people come to the area and they know how to work the system so they get straight to the top of the list and housed first.

For too long Thanet has been a dumping ground with all the socio-economic problems that that brings. We are trying hard to rejuvenate our area and need people keen to develop a sense of belonging and community spirit.

here here

Thanet residents are already concerned regarding the amount of persons being relocated to Thanet from London and districts to free up London housing stock for more rental money.

For far too long Thanet has been a dumping ground and all the socio-economic problems that that brings. We are all trying hard to improve our area in many many different ways, so it is vitally important that all residents have a genuine need to live here. Supporting and showing an interest in their local community allows it to grow and develop into a pleasant place for us all to live in.

Personally I would like the time period to be a minimum of 5 years.

Longer - 5 to 10 years

This is a good starting point as TDC is not saying we won't accept people from outside the area but that people who wish to move here or are placed here by other councils have to show that they settled into the area and are supporting the local economy.

Local residents should always have priority.

Once again I have lived here since 2005

I believe that this will enhance the social housing estates as a lot of the 'local' residents take more pride in Thanet and its future .

At least three years should be a criteria for anyone to be considered but not at the expense of anyone who has born here or lived here much longer. There should also be checks to make sure there is no 'cheating' and the people being considered to try to integrate (learn English if necessary) and do contribute.

### **Agree**

people should be living in thanet a lot longer before they can qualify for housing

This would be good for the community

I agree with this but do hope there would be put in place a special circumstance prior, for example : A mother/father feeling there home from a different area due to domestic violence, a family member having come to the area and care for an elderly relative.

Some cases must be based individualy.

I agree to a point, but there is always the possibility that someone who has not lived in Thanet for three years will require emergency accommodation or otherwise due to unforeseen circumstances. Perhaps if they can prove that they already had plans to remain in the area long term? Through a job contract or something?

There should be some discretion to this rule ie if you have left the area with 12 mths for a valid reason & return

Agree, however there should be allowances for exceptional circumstances.

please clarify this for people who are already on the register. Will they remain on the register?

### **Neither agree or disagree**

i would recommend living in thanet for at least 5 years. you should be moving to the area for other reasons than to find housing

How does that work with the people already on the register that have not lived in Thanet for 3 years? I will have lived here for 3 years in July.

Moving because location is liked or ethnic groups exist should be discouraged. The private sector is not an option if you need to work here.

### **Disagree**

add 'or no connection with thanet' to criteria .. eg if someone from Whistable works in Thanet they should be allowed to join the Thanet register, likewise to unite families

Similar to comments on question one



Should be a minimum of 2 years some residents if in an emergency situation would have to go to a private landlord or homeless (and homeless is to be changed according to circumstances). No 2 years is enough. If your on the register like myself I've got to wait till Sept 2013 when Ive been in Thanet 3 years not acceptable.

### **Strongly Disagree**

3 years is not long enough to demonstrate a real connection to the area. This proposal is too simplistic. We should be looking at a larger picture, ie: is their a solid and long term ( many years) family connection with the area and more importantly, with a specific village if this is where they are trying to go. We should be looking at overall family history and not just requiring individuals to have been "in the area" for a few years.

Residents of Supported Housing (for which there is no local connection applied) may have only been resident in the district for a short time (up to 2 years) before being ready to move on to independant accommodation. In applying a 3 year local connection requirement, these tenants will not be able to access social housing which may 'silt up' the scheme and have a negative impact on throughput in supported housing. This is particularly pertinent in cases such as domestic abuse and accommodation for offenders where it may not be possible or desirable for the client to reconnect to their area of origin.

should have proof that they have worked in this area already and show that they have indeed already contributed to the local area by paying their taxes and their own rent before they can apply for housing in the area. Too many people think they deserve homes just because they are humans and exist, a large number of people in this area need to be reminded that they are required to earn the privelege of social housiong because that's what it should be - a privelege, to help out those truly in need of some help. I have a friend who has had a council property in Thanet since she had her first baby when she was 17, she's now 38 and she's never worked, she's sitting pretty in a 3 bed house that is furnished a lot more expensively than my ridiculous privately rented 1 bed flat, her kids want for nothing, and as far as she's concerned she's covered by TDC until her dying days. Due to the fact I have worked since I was 15 and don't have this lifestyle I find that attitude s hocking and it's the root of many painful arguements between us old friends. I also know of old school friends from the Newington Estate who have somehow been able to 'take over' the houses they grew up in just because their parents had the tenancy before them... What the hell is that all about? Needless to say most of them don't work either. Most of these people that I know of have no desire to work because they get more if they don't. It's a ridiculous system that needs completely overhauling. Make them work for it first!

This will impact upon clients who are presented with a need before they have lived in the area for three years, for example where they experience domestic abuse, become medically unwell or are evicted from their property by landlords for no fault of their own. Keeps people in their place of origin. Stops poor people travelling to look for work. Makes people fleeing domestic violence return to the place of their abuse. Makes people with substance misuse problems moving away from their place of abuse, stay in the place where they got caught up and near the people they used with.

i disagree with this as in this day and age why put so many restrictions on how long you live in an area .it should be equal opportunities and to change areas when needed

I think 3 years is too long

I think that each application should be considered an individual case. Someone who has lived in Thanet for three years or more may not need housing as much as someone who has not.

As above. Those in the local refuge may not have originally made the choice to move to Thanet, it may have been the only available place of safety. However, when making an application to live in Thanet, they are making a choice to live in and contribute to the Thanet area. Likewise, those fleeing abuse, who have come to the Thanet area to be among a support network, have a connection to the area and yet will not be considered in the application

As answered in proposal 1, Would suggest an individual would have genuine reasons for applying for housing. They would be expected to be very genuine, given the uninviting employment scenario.

### **3. Unacceptable behaviour**

#### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to provide specific guidance on excluding households who have been guilty of unacceptable behaviour?**

141 (79.2%)	<i>Strongly agree</i>
23 (12.9%)	<i>Agree</i>
7 (3.9%)	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>
2 (1.1%)	<i>Disagree</i>
4 (2.2%)	<i>Strongly disagree</i>

#### ***Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters***

43 (24.2%)

#### **Strongly Agree**

Why should people with unacceptable behaviour be able to move.

Badly behaved neighbours can be a blight to people living near them, creating stress in their own home.

I believe that many social tenants in Thanet have got away with poor behaviour (particularly that of their children) for far too long and that the Council is just not tough enough on this poor behaviour.

With an appeals procedure if there are special circumstances, but it's a good approach

Any person committing ASB should be evicted not rehoused fined up to 5000 and given a 5 year prison sentence (no bail conditions). A zero tolerance approach is required. And the housing should implicate this to the residents when signing them on the tenancy they should be made to sign an agreement to that effect if broken they're out.

Anyone who has already been evicted or in prison should not be able just to move to get away from their past errors.

Long overdue.

Other councils particularly in London do exactly this. Thanet needs to send out a clear message. Tenants who behave badly should not be entitled to have council property.

Definitely. I don't want any undesirables taking up residence in my street!  
WE ALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO LIVE IN PEACE AND NOT BE AFRAID OF OUR NEIGHBOUR.SOME  
TENANTS DO NOT RESPECT THEIR NEIGHBOURS AND NOT ENOUGH IS DONE TO PROTECT  
THEM.

Anybody who has a criminal record or debts should not be given a home against  
somebody who has behaved, and who pays their tax every week.

It is hoped that this will help make people accountable for their behaviour and accepting  
that with rights, come responsibilities to others.

Be careful of refusing problem families as they will turn to a private landlord and in certain  
areas this will be detrimental. They should be sent back to the area they originate from.  
Pay their fare and inform their local council this would be cheaper in the long run. This  
includes Drug addicts, ex-prisoners and alcoholics who are sent here by their local  
council or prison, as we have the facilities to deal with them here.

If people abuse the system & cause upsets they should not be allowed a local authority  
houses

This is the right course. With no regulation of letting agents/estate agents,and too many  
uncaring landlords, it can effect a whole neighbourhood adversely with just ONE  
unsuitable tenant.

Another excellent improvement. I am impressed. Well done Thanet!

As an owner occupier in Cliftonville I and many other residents are sick to death of seeing  
rubbish thrown into gardens and the street from some of these in social housing.We have  
a single mother on benefits living next door to us who has loud late night parties most  
nights and a constant string of drug dealers going in and out. Social services and the  
council have done nothing to sort this problem out and we have all but given up trying,  
being constantly stonewalled by officialdom.

Don't see why the council should take on problem people it only costs the taxpayer more  
money. This might make people pay their rent and sort their behaviour out. This is good,  
makes people responsible for their actions.

Wholly agree. You do not want to be raising children in the vicinity of such families if it can  
be avoided

any persons who behave badly wether residents or not should not be provided with any  
form of housing or benefits

strongly agree, as alot of people abuse their tenancy and have no respect for there  
homes or their nieghbours around them, so they dont desevre to be living there,  
sepecially when there are genuine people who are desperate to live in affordable  
housing!!!

Thanet needs strong emphasis to improve all social behaviour and this is a step in the right  
direction

It must be very hard for the law abiding residents to live adjacent to those who feel they  
are untouchable and behave unacceptably.

If any event is considered to have unacceptable behaviour then i totally agree. However if the event was a 'one off' and the household has not repeated the event or any other for a specific time, say 2 years then they should be re considered.

In previous decades having a local authority home was a proud sign and somewhere along the way that proud sign has been replaced by a yob anti social culture who feel it is there right. A social housing estate should be a place of community once again, as it was in days gone by. This should also be extended to domestic violence victims who continue to bait their partners/ex partners which causes a blight on current residents. It is far too easy to get away with inappropriate behaviour. Most of us are law abiding citizens so to live adjacent to a household who have no care or respect for themselves or their environment must be a nightmare. Life isnt easy for many but that doesnt mean they are exempt from sorting their own problems and responsibilities. They must be encouraged to prioritise their needs budgetary incomes and not depend on outside agencies to bail them out every time.

Benefits should help those in need and not cause hardship to anyone else as a result but it is long over due that people be held accountable for their actions.

They don't change

Why should the law abiding majority have their lives disrupted or live in fear because of some anti-social people who basicaly don't give a damn about others

Slums aren't built.... They are made. If you behaved badly in private accommodation you would be evicted and the landlord would not allow you another tenancy. Bad behaviour has a negative effect on so many people. I hope that with this being in place people will have to take responsibility for keeping a roof over there heads. Also gives other tenants reassurance that any people causing others nuisance will be dealt with.

If people are moved because of reasons given above, checks should be made to make sure they do not continue the same behaviour elsewhere. If rent arrears are due to unforeseen circumstances eg illness, redundancy, unemployment help should be given. If households were from out of area to begin with, they should be returned to there previous authority.

TDC needs to stop rewarding bad behaviour. It's not the responsibility of private tenants in the street to keep unruly neighbours under control, it's the responsibility of the council who keep handing everything to them on a plate regardless of their social behaviour.

its about time this sort of behaviour coming from council estates is controlled....the councils concerned can do something about this problema and they dont deserve a property if they dont know how to abide by the basic social rules

Continued social behaviour obviously contrary to the well being and comford of others, should be dealt with swiftly. anyone genuinely unfortunate enought to fall fowl of keeping up rents due should be extended consideration for a reasonable time in accordance with their circumstances.

## **Agree**

In todays economic times I do not believe everyone should be automatically unable to apply for housing due to rent arrears. However nuisance neighbours etc should not be offered alternative housing by the council.

Continuous episodes of anti-social behaviour need to be addressed seriously and not moved on elsewhere to make another council estate area become the next trouble spot - Also if rents for these people who persist with this unwanted behaviour increased maybe they would be less inclined to cause such issues and problems - make them pay for their own wrong doing.

depends on type of behaviour

### **Neither agree or disagree**

WHAT DOES ONE CLASS AS UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR ?

Although I am aware that all people have a right to housing, it is a shame to move people who are guilty of unacceptable behaviour to a place where residents are not guilty of this. This often has a detrimental effect upon those residents who are not problematic. They will often, and rightly, complain about a noisy/bad tenant's behaviour which sometimes results in said tenant being shipped around. A vicious circle, as tenant is never settled...More adequate help could be provided in the form of support to help prevent bad behaviour reoccurring? Equally, there should not be a build up of 'problem' tenants in one area. A very tricky issue!

### **Disagree**

It is unacceptable that Young People who are looked after by the local authority might be disadvantaged from securing their own accommodation via TDC on the basis of any current presenting behaviour. Young People often demonstrate developmentally delayed behaviour which given time and support will improve but to omit an application on the grounds cited under proposal 3 is discriminatory

### **Strongly Disagree**

I strongly disagree that there should be an exclusion for household members who have been guilty of unacceptable behaviour/rent arrears within the tenancy as some applicants have lived within a household where there could have been in a violent/controlling/financial relationship and not been able to get away from the abuse. The client's partner or child may have been guilty of the unacceptable behaviour and the client will be punished for this as well as having to deal with the behaviour and other consequences

The policy states that Where a person has previously been found not eligible due to unacceptable behaviour, but now believes this should no longer be held against him, the applicant can make a fresh application. The local authority can allow an application if they are satisfied that the persons behaviour has improved. This would be accepted, where an applicant had held a tenancy and a good tenancy reference was received or if specific satisfactory documentation was received upon Thanet District Councils request. What therefore happens to those clients who have been found ineligible based on the behaviour of their partner or behaviours forced upon them by an abusive partner. A good tenancy reference would not be available if the client has not been able to live independently of the perpetrator. This again furthers the abuse already suffered at the

handsof a perpetrator

#### **4. Additional bedrooms for children**

**How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to provide additional bedrooms for families with two children of the opposite sex only where the eldest is over 10 years old?**

79 (44.4%) *Strongly agree*

45 (25.3%) *Agree*

19 (10.7%) *Neither agree nor disagree*

19 (10.7%) *Disagree*

13 (7.3%) *Strongly disagree*

**Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

39 (21.9%)

#### **Strongly Agree**

Why not indeed? When I was young we had no choice in cramped accomodation.

People in owner/occupier circumstances have to make do and live within their circumstances. The same should apply in the social rented sector.

Again; this makes perfect sense.

People are choosing to have more children even though they are not in a position to support them because it means they can get a bigger property.

grew up in the 70's and 80's in a 3 bedroom house with no central heating and with 2 parents and 3 siblings. We had to share bath water heated from saucepans on the gas cooker and 2 bedrooms between the 4 of us the entire time we were under our parents roof. It never affected us mentally and all of us work hard and appreciate everything we have. The truth of the matter is - if people want children then they should be able to pay for them before having them or acknowledge that things will be tight. It is not the responsibility of hard working people to compensate for others' inability to use birth control properly and to bow down to their demands of a bedroom for each child they pop out! Quite frankly they're lucky they get more than 1 bedroom for knock down rental prices at all. Again, it's all about society needing to be reminded that they don't automatically deserve money for nothing and that just because they have children it doesn't mean we all have to bend over bac kwards to accommodate them, especially when it's at the cost of the taxpayers.

#### **Agree**

Makes sense until there is more affordable housing stock on the market.

They still have to pay the rent and not get let off. To many families getting away with this issue. Again it should be made clear to families at the time of signing the tenancy agreement.

but i do think size of bedrooms should be taken into consideration when allocating properties as even when sharing rooms a child still needs its own space.

Difficult because children of different sexes older than 10 need their own rooms but I ask what would people in the private sector/people with mortgages have to do..... make do! This is ok for families with opposite sex children but there is no guidelines for those who have same sex children as there should also be a limit on the age gap for these families, the age gap between the children should be taken into account not just the fact they are the same sex.

It is ideal for a family with children of different sexes to have their own private space I don't see that this should cause any problems. Children if grown up sharing a bedroom probably don't see a problem.

I think given the shortage of larger housing this is a wise decision.

### **Neither agree or disagree**

This is not a reason to allow some single parents to have a larger house when a new partners children move in.

Not sure of my views on this one

Unfortunately, having two children of the same sex I fall foul of this. My 14 year old son desperately needs his own room to do homework in. It's not fair on him.

This is a difficult one... But due to the empty bedroom reform I think that the council have to take some responsibility in making sure the family will be able to afford the property. Also many hard working families who have brought there homes are over crowded and do not have the luxury of there children having there own rooms.

I think that this might be too restrictive if the mix of sized accommodation available might allow the Council to allocate a larger dwelling to a family with children under 10 provided they understand that they will not get the max in terms of HB.

### **Disagree**

Needs to remain at 8 years as schools will need to be considered for secondary education

if the oldest child is a girl i think 10 is to old, some hit puberty by then

Children develope at different ages and 8 years olds should have a different room.

Children mature more quickly these days and I do not feel it is appropriate for boys and girls to share. Certainly foster carers have to provide separate bedrooms over age of 7.

The children should be younger than 10 years old

I agree that it should be in line with HB, I feel that 8 is a more appropriate age.

I can see your point about housing benefit. But it is still not acceptable for only 10 years age children to have their own room. It should be younger It should remain at eight years old. You have allowed too many one and two bedroomed flats to be converted. Families, like everyone else need space and a garden!

beraing in mind that some people produce larger families so that they can get coucil funded accomodation at the tax payers expence

It is wrong to put a 10 year old boy in the same bedroom as an eight year old girl

Think this should be done on a case by case basis just to cover any issues over disabled children that may need a room for themselves.

Children mature much younger these days so I think 8 years old should be kept This is an ill considered idea and the Housing Benefit criteria are at fault as well. This is a panic response to shortage of money.Ten year olds now, and particularly girls can fast be approaching puberty and should be able to expect privacy. their will most certainly be repurcussions to this policy and they will include the social services, the police, child welfare and family breakdown.

There will be circumstance where children are unable to share a bedroom of any age. Disability, illness or behavioural issues may result in a child needing a bedroom of their own. It should therefore be the choice of the parent to pay any additional costs, which may be financed using moneys granted for the purposes of supporting those with disability such as DLA.

### **Strongly Disagree**

chikdren need space I feel that 10 is too old for children of the opposite sex

This could be very distressing for children exspecailly as some you girls start their menistration earlier and earlie, nine years old is not uncommom .

Two children of different genders can perfectly easily share until the elder is 10. This needs to be more rigorously enforced as it would free up homes with more bedrooms for families who genuinely need the extra rooms.

It seems short sighted to me, those children will need rehousing after two years.

A child of ten is fully aware of their body and from my own experience should not have to share their bedroom with a sibling of the opposite sex. The younger sibling should not see their brother/sister naked, possibly in the early stages of puberty. Similarly a pair of same sex siblings with the eldest being in their teens should also not have to share with their younger sibling, for example, a 16 year old sharing with a 5 year old. I feel this is wrong. Children are maturing at an earlier age, plus they are being taught sexual education in school from 5 years old in England, this means that they will have a greater awareness of differences between the sexes, therefore, the younger age should be maintained. We are all aware that this will impede on housing stocks within Thanet, but TDC need to weigh up housing against sexual abuse/incest.

Do you take in to account a child with a disability I.E Autism where sharing a room would just not work.

i am in this situation now but yet NO HELP. this is a contridiction on the letter i received today. my eldest is 12 and my son 10, my youngest 7 but yet all in one bedroom..... the letter stated i will not be getting any help with my situation any time soon,(but yet im



a WORKING MOTHER) and dont scrounge of the goverment

### **5. Additional bedrooms for carers**

#### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce guidance on additional bedroom requests for carers in line with current Housing Benefit guidelines?**

76 (42.7%) *Strongly agree*

51 (28.7%) *Agree*

35 (19.7%) *Neither agree nor disagree*

11 (6.2%) *Disagree*

3 (1.7%) *Strongly disagree*

**Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

18 (10.1%)

#### **Strongly Agree**

i agree as it much be much more cost effective for a person needing care to be able to stay in there own home the alternative being a residential setting which is very expensive. Need to make sure you look after the people that need it but stop others from taking advantage of the system.

Rooms could be adapted for carers if family members. However there could be valid reasons why the carer may need their "own space" All applicants should be assessed on a case by case request

I have a disabled daughter, and work with people with disabilities so qualified to comment on this.. I don't believe for a moment that many if not most are using this to their advantage! If over night is required the carer should not ideally be asleep. I have to get people to care for my daughter at times over I have to make use of what I have, usually involving my lounge! If constant over night care is required then maybe they need to approach other agencies. I think the currant criteria is open to abuse and should be changed.

We can't afford to house carers in these hard times.

Clear guidance will help those who need carers, enusring they have fair access to accommodation that meets thier needs, removing ambiguity and helping prevent abuse of the system from fraudulent attempts to under-occupy.

You should introduce an effective register of adaptated properties and consult with OT's regardibng allocation of these properties.

Again if the person with the disability was actually born in Thanet or have been here for more than five years they should have priority over those who come into the area from outside because we have cheap accommodation which is not always suitable.

But what will happen when the medical circumstances no longer apply?

#### **Agree**

as long as it is long term care needed

With the many cuts in social care, any prospect of assistance in some way, even in the form of the simple provision of an extra bedroom, is more than welcome!

Agree providing they relay are disabled in some way. I have lived all over the UK and have never seen so many so-called disabled people wandering around on crutches as I have in Cliftonville. The new government assessments should hopefully sort this nonsense I and other taxpayers have to support.

### **Neither agree or disagree**

Don't know enough about it.

This is for an independent body to decide not the council.

### **Disagree**

What is the criteria for over 60's who are seriously ill and only have a 1 bedroom unit.

Where's the carer gone sleep on the sofa. This needs more consideration given.

In a lot of cases, carers need their own room to be able to have proper rest. The bedroom of the person being care for may also have equipment in therefore less room and due to medical reasons the carer may not be able to share the same bedroom.

surely it depends on each persons needs

### **Strongly Disagree**

My father has motor neurone disease and has been deteriorating for the past 2 years. There are occasions that his family have needed to stay at his flat and this is going to increase in the future. We sleep on his 2 seater sofa and spend an uncomfortable night and then pass to the next family member when we go to work. As an occasional measure this is of course fine but as this becomes a nightly issue someone will have to move in with him as he is adamant that he will not go into a home. Under those circumstances I feel that family members should be afforded the same consideration as paid carers particularly as we are not being paid but are acting out of love

## **6. Re-categorisation of Bands**

### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to re-categorise the housing bands?**

88 (49.4%) *Strongly agree*

45 (25.3%) *Agree*

25 (14.0%) *Neither agree nor disagree*

9 (5.1%) *Disagree*

9 (5.1%) *Strongly disagree*

**Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

53 (29.8%)

## **Strongly Agree**

although i think it should only be for people who have lived here for a minimum three years.

However, I think the Council should go further. There are a lot of people sitting on the list living in suitable accommodation who just fancy a move and yet they are able to get Band B/C. If people are not bidding regularly then they should be removed from the list.

New applicants every week join bands A and B, and get homed before anybody in band C and D. Which effectively means people in bands C and D will never be homed. So what is the point in us applying for this? Completely agree with this, and this should be enforced as soon as possible and give people like myself in band C a better chance.

An obvious solution to stop people making themselves homeless to get a house.

I strongly agree if this makes it fairer for all, however, stringent checks should be made especially if out of area, to make sure applicants are telling the truth.

when i was assessed by housing benefit for the property i live in he said it was classed as one n half bedrooms.so why was i put in band d,which you rarely give a property to I think it was made quite clear at our meeting with Vicky May on Friday 15th February. band c gets housed probably 3 maybe 4 times in a year if lucky! 3yrs i been waiting in band c even thou i have children of 3yrs & 18yrs opposite sex. its to long

because of finacial situation and no family ireally do need help ihave lived in thanet fo nearly 40 years and iam on band d which is ridiculous i need help no wonder i havent had any response iam in the wrong band please hurry up and change this

I live in a house that is currently making my children ill.

i strongly agree with giving people in band c and d more of an opportunity to be housed as i have been on the waiting list in band d for 7 years and i am desperate to be re housed before i am forced into a shared or one bedroom property as i am a single working mother who is renting privately and i am really struggling to cope with my rent and other out goings, and i just want to be given a break and be able to give my son a better lifestyle of living.

i agree as being in band c there are several times after bidding that you are not even considered which makes you feel there is no point in bidding.

Fed up with people working the system by making themselves deliberately worse off. About time people were forced to try and look after themselves first rather than expecting the council/contry to do it for them. Think the services need looking after as when they are finished in their service to the country they need help think the Council is right to put these people above those that haven't done a thing for their country other than take.

Agree in principal. But would someone in band b because of medical needs automatically be upgrade to band a.

This may or may not work but the fact of the matter is every family is different and this should also be taken into account.

It does seem unfair that a single person who has been on a waiting list for a long time doesn't ever get to the top of the list because they don't have dependants. Girls who fall pregnant seem to get priority which doesn't always seem fair  
I am still not sure if this will personally benefit me... But yes I agree that the old banding was unfair due to the reasons in question 1. Also the old banding which I have been on for 4 years means I will not be housed. I work hard, my eldest daughter works hard we both care for my youngest. I have to find £650pcm I do get a percentage paid by hb. The house is full of problems and not suitable for my youngest needs. But I won't be housed by tdc. If I had a decent affordable home it would make a huge difference to us as a family... I need help to cope. Sadly because I am not a alcoholic or my children haven't got social workers I have to struggle each week to pay such a high rent. Hopefully the new banding might help families like mine.

I believe that the people who are to be placed in Band D (intentionally homeless, those who have deliberately worsened their housing circumstances and those homeless by another authority) should not be placed on the Thanet Housing List at all.

There is no reason to make things too easy. The council needs to think about its council tax payers - too many hard luck stories these days!

Appendix 2 (housing criteria) has accidentally omitted Armed Forces Personnel under category B. It is also good to see deterrents for people to make themselves intentionally homeless to get an unfair foot on the ladder.

seems a sensible idea

Band C, your referral to 'unsanitary' conditions could be interpreted as 'dirty' property, this should be clarified/brought in line with the HHSRS.

I am currently in a band C and on the website it says reason urgent medical need. So shouldn't I be a band A?

## **Agree**

I think the Council should concentrate on Bands A, B and C and drop Band D altogether. What is management transfer? And why is it banded urgent?

What about the people who can't afford to live in their homes who have to privately rent? what band would that come under?

Agree generally but not sure about the justification for prioritising Armed Forces personnel above other deserving categories. Also, does that mean only Armed Forces personnel who have a local connection? Whilst I think that Armed Forces personnel do an outstanding job, so do our police officers, doctors, nurses, and firemen. Should we therefore give priority just to Armed Forces personnel? I think on balance perhaps that should be removed. Clearly if the member of the armed forces personnel have been disabled out of the service, then they will presumably be in Band A under urgent medical needs anyway?

band d needs looking at as if someone has been made homeless by another local housing authority I do not see why we should have to house them at all. Members should not allow the Government to put pressure upon those in accommodation with under utilised bedrooms to take in immigrants or the homeless. Members should expand any scheme that allows existing tenants to move to accommodation with fewer bedrooms, previous schemes paid the elderly £500 to move out of family accommodation to single bed roomed units. provided the 3 year resident rule still applies

Agree generally but not sure about the justification for prioritising Armed Forces personnel above other deserving categories. Also, does that mean only Armed Forces personnel who have a local connection? Whilst I think that Armed Forces personnel do an outstanding job, so do our police officers, doctors, nurses, and firemen. Should we therefore give priority just to Armed Forces personnel? I think on balance perhaps that should be removed. Clearly if the member of the armed forces personnel have been disabled out of the service, then they will presumably be in Band A under urgent medical needs anyway?

band d needs looking at as if someone has been made homeless by another local housing authority I do not see why we should have to house them at all. Members should not allow the Government to put pressure upon those in accommodation with under utilised bedrooms to take in immigrants or the homeless. Members should expand any scheme that allows existing tenants to move to accommodation with fewer bedrooms, previous schemes paid the elderly £500 to move out of family accommodation to single bed roomed units.

### **Neither agree or disagree**

Having been on the list for over 13 years, and with 3 children in a single bedroom (one Autistic, and one over 16), we believe we should be in a Band higher than C. However that is where we are placed. If the changes move us up then good, but looking at the information this doesn't look likely.

This is just playing with numbers as you well know. you will still have x amount of property and y number of applicants. All this will achieve is to move a large number of people into the lower bands. The end result will be that people in bands C and D will still have little or no prospect of being housed. the council has just increased it's ability to juggle. For example, "management transfer" is a totally neutral exercise so band A is actually just "urgent medical need" And how come "homeless" is not in Band A ? you can't get much more urgent than that !

There does not seem to be a mention of people who struggle financially to pay private rental costs. I have lived in Thanet for 31 of my 39 years and due to a disability which is not recognised by the benefits system, my family have to spend all available income on living costs. Very wrong I think

A start would telling some of the fifteen year old girls round here who deliberately get themselves pregnant to get a flat and all expenses paid for by we hard pressed tax payers that it is their responsibility and not ours.

im not sure how to answer this as i have been on the council housing for 14 years and if i agree i could go down the list as i live in a 2 bed flat with 3 children who are now teenagers and we struggle every day and i have lived in thanet my whole life it would be unfair for me to be put down the list after 14 years

Management transfers should be given only in very serious circumstances. Medical should be a priority Homeless by another authority stop them coming to Thanet. Peoples incomes need to be taken inoto consideration Im 60 live off a tinu private pension and have small hsg benefit I got told to move, how the hell can I up and move at 60, Ive no husband or kids and Im not living in a sub standard accommodation either.

Need to study this more - haven't got enough time now.

How can you define a person making themselves intentionally homeless? Each persons situation is very different & of course there are those that want to play the system but there are also those that try hard to but simply are unable to manage.

There does not appear to be any reference to people moving on from supported housing. If these households are not given sufficient priority on the housing register there may be lack of throughput in supported housing, negatively impacting the availability of such services to the district.

The assessment of the banding should be done more often by an independent body not on paper by form filling.

I don't agree with the Band D, as you have stated that you have to have lived in Thanet for 3 years to qualify for housing, but you have put that people who are homeless by another local authority will be able to apply and go on the housing register in Band D. How does this work? You have also put into the Band D group people who have made themselves intentionally homeless? they have obviously caused a problem whereby their Landlord has had to go through the trouble of getting them out of their property, yet you are rewarding these people with housing.

## **Disagree**

People who are unintentionally homeless surely should be of higher priority than C. Surely those that are homeless from other authority areas wouldn't qualify for housing here as they are form outside Thanet. Seems contradictory.

I would like to see a policy that rewards those who have an excellent record in terms of payment of rent etc and who have maintained and even improved their accommodation. New or more desirable accommodation within the District should be allocated to those that have earned it. Social housing should be a ladder of opportunity not a lottery. To my mind it is scandalous that a newly arrived immigrant family can be allocated a very desirable property. This creates envy and a sense of injustice.

Band C 2) should be in Band B

People who are homeless or who need to move because of disability should be in a higher band. Also how is the criteria between unsatisfactory and very unsatisfactory

made? Who makes these decisions?

### **Strongly Disagree**

No changes made to facilitate current tenants mobility unless they have a spare bedroom.

Band D also contains Transfer Applications that do not have reasonable preference which means absolutely no chance have getting a move although we may be good , paying tenants with no ASB just wanting to move from a bad area to better our circumstances. Many probably like myself that where not given an option with choice based lettings and were put in this situation in the "take it or leave it" days.

There is no consideration for Young People who are looked after by the local authority who are already significantly disadvantaged. If this group are not considered as priority within bands A & B there will be a demonstrable increase in homelessness as the supported accommodation and local authority responsibility for supporting these young people ceases at 21.

i think each application should be taken on its own merit as everyones circumstances are different and affect people differently and should then just be put in a set order on one list. also in order of applying .

I feel that with applicants being placed into band C when they are homeless will mean that it will take longer to be rehoused. even though applicants that are homeless are in need of housing ASAP.

Where are the provisions for victims of domestic abuse? Is this no longer a priority for the Council?

Band B serious housing need include those living in supported housing and needs to move as the support is no longer required. Will this apply to all clients living in the refuge who are being part funded by supporting people? Other allocations policies, including Kent policies, use a different assessment criteria for those suffering Domestic Abuse and, if appropriate, place clients in band A. Why the discrepancy within the Kent area alone? While appendix A suggests that a management transfer is an option for those suffering violence, living in social housing, as previously stated, historically this has rarely been an option for TDC clients. This is clearly not though an option for those not renting social housing. I fail to understand how being homeless can take less priority than any of those highlighted in band B. Over or undercrowding and those in the armed forces cannot reasonably be in a higher priority than those that are homeless surely.

Armed Forces personnel who have lived in Thanet for three years before being in the Forces should be top Band A, I would like to say I have no family in the Forces.

## **7. Armed Forces Forces**

### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce specific guidance around housing allocation for Armed Forces personnel?**

71 (39.9%) *Strongly agree*

46 (25.8%) *Agree*

39 (21.9%) *Neither agree nor disagree*

10 (5.6%) *Disagree*

11 (6.2%) *Strongly disagree*

**Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

33 (18.5%)

### **Strongly Agree**

I agree with this its about time the Army arrived in Thanet! However this policy should be for NCO's and other ranks. Officers should pay their own way.

before my ex husband and myself came out of the army, we were allocated a council property in margate,it was a relief to know we had somewhere to live, especially with all the other worries we had to face in civvy street, we were 22years living army life, and was not prepared enough for civvy life. but thats another story

When i came back from military service I was informed that you did not have a military housing officer and informed that TDC did not need one. Due to your lack of understanding my and my partners needs, we were forced into renting in public sector. I now have a home where the landlord makes no repairs and has not done so for a year. We've been in accommodation where the heating has never worked and the landlord point blank to make repairs. My medical condition has now worsened as has my mental state.

as long as they have strong links to the area and have served the minimum four years. Priority should be given to those injured in combat. Perhaps band A.

Thanet should have done this long ago.

Armed Forces are having to deal with a lot of stress without the worry of housing allocations. So I think they should be given help in this area without discrimination.

See comment 6

We were ex army when we ended our tour. We were offered accomodation strait away. If it were not for TDC we would have been on the streets with a child.

Good to see the Council supporting service personnel and their families. Excellent example to set others.

Forces personnel should always have priority when it comes to housing needs

help our heroes they deserve it

Armed forces should receive additional priority as they make a huge contribution to the country.

Armed Forces should get additional priority for housing for their contribution to the country.

Armed Forces personnel who have lived in Thanet for three years before being in the Forces should be top Band A, I would like to say I have no family in the Forces.

### **Agree**

are the armed forces discriminated against ? , the 3 year resident criteria should still apply For any injured personnel.



Armed forces personnel should not be discriminated against especially if they have family in the area

If the personnel are from Thanet, then they should have priority in Thanet, if not, the priority should be given by the Authority where they have a connection. Also priority should be awarded to those, for example, who have served on the frontline/served for 12 months or more. Just simply serving at some stage in some area should not give priority to any authority (Thanet)

### **Neither agree or disagree**

Savings and investments should be used first in part where ever they come from.

I don't know enough personally to comment....

they should be treated the same as anyone applying for housing

### **Disagree**

Tough one - i know that people are fighting for our country but surely the army should help these people not the council?

I am not sure about the justification for prioritising Armed Forces personnel above other deserving categories. Also, does that mean only Armed Forces personnel who have a local connection? Whilst I think that Armed Forces personnel do an outstanding job, so to do our police officers, doctors, nurses, and firemen. Should we therefore give priority just to Armed Forces personnel? I think on balance perhaps that should be removed. Clearly if the memner of the armed forces personnel have been disabled out of the service, then they will presumably be in Band A under urgent medical needs anyway?

I think the armed forces should house their own personnel.

I strongly respect and value the armed forces personnel. However, these men and women come from a home town or village, a family area, a place where they grew up and where their family and friends are. There is no logical reason why the residential criteria should not be applied, except of course that we must get rid of the 3 year nonsense which they clearly cannot satisfy. Yes, they should get help and their contribution to their country must be recognised. We should ensure that they get "fair access to housing" but it should still be in the area that they call home.

### **Strongly Disagree**

This group should be treated the same as anyone else

i strongly disagree as im sure these make enough money over 16000 a year to be able to rent or buy

Why the special treatment? Were they being discriminated against?

I can see no reason why they get special attention, after all these people volunteer for the forces, not like after the second world war when people who had been called up forcibly came home.

I strongly disagree that members of the Armed Forces should be in Band B. they should have to meet the residential criteria rather than being placed directly into Band B. they should also be assessed regarding their financial situation the same as everyone else. Why is this group being given a specific dispensation? Why not also local nurses, doctors etc?

Those made homeless because they are not able to continue their work in the armed forces need to be prioritised because they may be homeless, not because of their job or lack of it. We have many men and women who serve their country, such as police and medical staff, they are not afforded the same consideration. Applications need to be processed based on the level of need, Those who have lost their homes due to being medically discharged should surely be prioritised over those who have ended their tour or duty as predicted years before. They have had the time and opportunity to save and plan ahead for the future.

## **8. Former and current rent arrears**

### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce tighter guidelines on former and current rent arrears?**

124 (69.7%) *Strongly agree*  
32 (18.0%) *Agree*  
11 (6.2%) *Neither agree nor disagree*  
6 (3.4%) *Disagree*  
3 (1.7%) *Strongly disagree*

### ***Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters***

35 (19.7%)

#### **Strongly Agree**

If I miss a payment on my council tax the council will send the bailiffs after me. Why should they be any different?

Taking responsibility for our actions is something the majority do. Hopefully this proposal will deter those who feel there is always someone out there to sort out their mess but at the same time help those genuinely in trouble.

It's a ridiculous situation where debts have no consequences, unlike in the real world. Increase rent arrears until rent arrears are cleared.

I am able to pay my rent and have always paid my rent. I fail to see why someone who refuses to pay and gets into arrears with their rent should be given housing!

Why should people who are in debt to the council have a home provided to them? There are lots of people who require social housing, but perhaps can't get one because these people with arrears are on a higher housing scale. Some people really appreciate that they have a home and never get into arrears.

Should this include deposit/bond debts. At present no responsibility is taken by the applicant & debts are accruing in their name, that they should still be responsible for. Debts should not be written off and people should pay rent arrears back from their benefits automatically

We must ensure that our fellow resident accept responsibility for their actions and if they do not or have previously not paid their rent then that should be taken into consideration on all future applications. I would suggest that all former tenant arrears must have been cleared prior to an applicant being accepted onto the housing list.

The council have a duty to everyone to ensure that everyone pays what is due. Affordable housing is just that so not any excuse to get into arrears.

As I outlined in my comments for proposal 3, it is so important that those tenants who owe money, must be encouraged to budget their monies and spend it more appropriately. as long as it is proved not their fault.

People with rent arrears should not be able to move until the arrears have been repaid. Tighter guidelines should ensure support is given early on to nip any problems in the bud, thereby hopefully preventing higher debts, which will be of benefit to both applicants and council.

don't pay your way, don't get anything back is my view. Make people responsible for the choices they make, paying for fags, booze and staffordshire terriers isn't more important than keeping a roof over your head.

So pleasing to see that finally, people will be made accountable for their actions. Housing those with a history of rent arrears and non-payment only pushes the Council's debts up creating an un-necessary burden on the Council's resources and rule abiding tenants who pay every month. Hopefully people will start to learn that if you don't pay your way and prioritise other things over paying your rent that you will lose your home or right to access to social housing. It wouldn't be acceptable in the private sector! Also good to see unacceptable behaviour being addressed through these sanctions. Finally, some accountability!

This depends on whether the applicant has consistently refused to manage their affairs and if by paying back what they owe will keep them behind and unable to pay in the future.

every effort should be made to ensure that accrued debts are paid within as short a time as possible and not moving just to avoid their obligations

Everyone else has to pay their way and pay their debts. As I've said already - too many people in this area think they deserve everything for free and get away with not paying their debts. We need to free up money to help those who truly need it, who find themselves suddenly in trouble because of ill health / family bereavement / redundancy etc.

Why should people who have not paid their rent previously have the same rights to housing as people who make the effort and pay their bills.

## **Agree**

The council has a duty to ensure that they are able to collect monies owed, providing this does not place those who owe the money in a situation that would be detrimental to their well being.

A tougher line should also be taken upon tenants who do not look after the decor or gardens of their accommodation.

The system of informing tenants of their housing benefit and how much they need to pay needs to be set out clearer, that way those who owe money in arrears will have a better understanding of how much they actually owe. The amount of paper work and calculations that are sent out now are very confusing and not clear, especially to those with learning problems or the elderly.

to be applied with compassion but not softly so taken advantage  
Agree with appropriate support

### **Neither agree or disagree**

YOU CAN TIGHTEN GUIDELINES BUT IT STILL DOES NOT MEAN IT WILL SOLVE DEBT IT WILL JUST CAUSE MORE CONFUSION TOO MUCH IS HAPPENING TOO SOON AND A LOT OF PEOPLE DO NOT UNDERSTAND ANY OF IT ALSO ITS THE GENUINE PEOPLE THAT ALWAYS GET TARGETTED NOT THE ONES WHO DELIBERATELY GET THEMSELVES INTO DEBT

i think if its a small amount then evicting them is wrong cos everyone is struggling in this economy but if were talking thousands then yes

### **Disagree**

There is a need to recognise that some Young People who are formerly looked after by the local authority are at high risk of being disadvantaged if their developmental delay impacts on their capacity to manage - there is a need to have specific policy aimed at engaging with the Young Person and their support network to negotiate in this area rather than disadvantage them further

Peoples incomes need to be taken into consideration Im 60 live off a small private pension retired have no husband or kids, I cant afford all the costs to move it cost me 7000 when I moved from London to Thanet 3 years ago, I dont have the money now Im lucky to have the heating on and get food let alone move to smaller units Im in a 1 bed flat got no rent arrears.

Debtors should not be able to escape payment by moving.

maybe if have outstanding arrears but unfair to penalise former arrears as everybody can get behind from time to time

This should not be given priority over the needs of the client

### **Strongly Disagree**

Rent arrears should be look at and consideration taken into account. rent arrears are not always the applicants fault sometimes it is circumstances that are beyond the applicants control that cause rent arrears. every case should be looked at rather than a blanket policy

Those with Rent arrears and former tenancy debts may be deemed ineligible for housing on the housing register. Financial abuse is as much an issue for those suffering DA as physical abuse and this offers no opportunity for clients who are now in control of their own finances to be accepted on the housing register. Owner occupiers may, unless there is a substantial reason to move, will not be considered on the housing register. Does DA offer a substantial reason? Under the new Legal aid guidelines, funding for the application of Injunctions is less likely. The criteria for funding is far stricter, requiring specific proof of DA, excluding many from the right to apply. When the sale of a property is dependent on the cooperation of the perpetrator, it is likely that the sale will be jeopardised making the client homeless for prolonged periods of time. This is particularly unfair when the proceeds of the sale of the house may not secure further accommodation.

## **9. Savings and Assets**

### **How strongly do you either agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce restrictions on income, savings and assets?**

105 (59.0%) *Strongly agree*  
39 (21.9%) *Agree*  
14 (7.9%) *Neither agree nor disagree*  
11 (6.2%) *Disagree*  
6 (3.4%) *Strongly disagree*

#### **Any other comments - you have space to provide a response of up to 1,000 characters**

39 (21.9%)

### **Strongly Agree**

Social housing should be for those who need it most, and those who earn or possess assets in excess of 16,000 should, all things considered, be eligible to rent privately.

If you can pay for your own accommodation you should so. Don't expect the tax payer to fund your lifestyle.

As there aren't enough houses to go round I think this is important. Social housing should only ever be a temporary safety net and people need to move on. This will release housing continuously.

Oh absolutely. Why on earth would anyone with any decent income want to live in a Council House? They should be there for those of us who cannot afford decent housing.

we need to ensure: - people don't own other properties - receive income from other sources that aren't taxed e.g. fostering - what happens when circumstances change over time as people move into employment or gain savings

This seems to be common sense. Social Housing is clearly for those in most need. If applicants have savings, income or assets then they should seek housing in the private sector.

Social housing should be for people in genuine need. There are lots of schemes available if you have capital, homebuy ect. And can afford local rents with that income

Housing should be for the poorest.

i think the cap should be lower around £8,000

I think the cap is an excellent proposal, however i feel that 16,000 is still very high bearing in mind that with a 10% deposit on a mortgage that would mean that the applicant could potentially purchase a mortgage for 160,000. Could this not be lowered further? Also i think the salary cap is again too high, could this not be lowered? The higher rate tax band is for those earning 35,000+ so if you earn 34,000 (well above the national average) you can apply for a council house. Could this not be done on individual circumstances? As i would have thought an individual with no dependants who earns 20,000 per year would have enough of an income to afford to privately rent a house and therefore not need the authorities help.

There are a lot of people in Social Housing who are very well off, able to run two cars etc. This is grossly unfair to those in genuine need sitting on the list who can't get anything. There are also lots of people living in houses too big for them. They should be automatically moved.

If you can afford savings or have a good job, buy a house or rent privately, leave affordable rents for those on low pay.

Too many people are housed in council/housing assoc when they could easily afford to rent or buy in the private sector

I think the cap on assets should be much lower.

Would be good to see a stop to right to buy or at the very least people having to pay the market rate for their properties rather than enjoying unacceptable discounts that those in the private sector wouldn't.

I agree if people who earn a decent wage that would allow them to buy or pay a decent rent should do so. Be careful of pensioners who may have £16,000 or more in the bank as they are living longer and need a nest egg to pay for replacing goods and providing for their funeral. Living from 65 to 85 years, £16,000 is not a great amount to cover 20 years.

people I know who work cannot afford to get on the property ladder and also do not have savings anywhere near £16,000. These same people - if they had saved enough, wouldn't dream of apply for housing anyway as they would have too much pride for that so why should anyone else? I think it's bad enough that people earning upwards of £50k a year can claim benefits for children they have. Again, this country needs to be reminded that social housing / social funding is limited and should only be for those who need genuine help. Something like this would be a start to sorting out a big issue in this area - which is people sitting pretty in council houses they were awarded as young people on the dole with babies, who now have older children and are 2 working parents - but still reside in a rent controlled council house! If both parents are now working then they need to go private, not fill their council house parking spaces with new cars, their council house lounges with large screen tv's and their council house bedrooms with laptops and tv's for each child!

People who have the means to comfortably rent privately should not have access to social housing.

Seems to be mere common sense, like most of these proposals - who could possibly object? Ignore the bleatings of the do-gooders and install a fair and sensible system.

**Agree**

Where any existing tenant is proved to be an high earner or win or inherit a large sum of money he/she should be given time to move out. In all cases the needs of children must be consider, for example, finding suitable accommodation close to existing schools. If you become aware of an existing tenant who has won a lot of money or are in the higher tax bracket you should consider all their housing/health needs before requiring them to move.

If you become aware of an existing tenant who has won a lot of money or are in the higher tax bracket you should consider all their housing/health needs before requiring them to move.

Older people who perhaps have savings but need warden control/supported living, shouldn't be excluded.

I agree in part, as i feel £16000 is a very low figer,as when you think it wont even buy a car now days,£30,000 would be a more realistik amount,

I was very happy to have a council property for approx two years. It gave me the chance to save up for a deposit and buy my own home. However, I don;t think people should bepenalised for working. I don;t think adult only families (not pensioners) who have not yet contributed via work to the local community should get priority. In fact i think families who do work but are on low incomes should be placed ahead of those who have been on long term benefits (except for those on long term disability benefits).

Does anybody earning £40000 a year really need social housing?

savings should be taken into account in some cases but again every case needs to be assessed. applicants that are in a higher tax bracket should not be offered social housing.

### **Neither agree or disagree**

I think there should be a restriction but care should be taken in some circumstances such as a break up of a marriage/partnerhisp where one person may have assets over the cap rate but the other person may need housing and not have much in the way of finances or assets.

I don't agree with the saving part of this proposal. £16,000 is not a lot and people may have cut back on other things in order to save for a child to go to uni' funeral costs, family weddings etc while others just spend everything they get and expect the state/council to pay out all the benefits etc. I do agree if someone is earning about the 40% tax bracket they should not be placed on the register

### **Disagree**

Its not just about money it can be situation espacially in this situation of being in need of housing there are other factors to consider like guarantors needed money up front debt

The proposal for higher rate tax payers makes sense. To bar people with assets of £16000 is stupid and just shows how far removed our leaders are from real life. £16000 will go nowhere today. For the average family on no benefits it would maybe last about 8 months. I think the principle is a good one but the figure is too low.

no clarity on what will happen if the person has assets over £16k, but does not have income and their assets fall below £16k.... higher rate tax payer through regular income, not one time event, and for two or more years out of 3 - if would be unfair to move a person out if one good years income pushes them to the higher rate band. But there is no reason why not to charge such a person a higher rent for the period whilst a higher rate

tax payer also take into consideration household size

£16,000 savings isn't much. Higher limit.

not everyone's got the money to live in other types of accommodation. I had to rent off a private landlord because I'm retired I had to put 5000 up front and all these landlords are the same they won't have you unless you're working. I moved to Thanet for a better quality of life, where I lived in Greater London there was nothing but Anti Social Behaviour I agree with this in principle, however there will always be clients who, due to domestic abuse, have money in their name, that they are unable to access because they are in joint names. As per the previous question, access to these funds may take years to access through the judicial process

### **Strongly Disagree**

EITHER YOU WANT TENANTS TO HAVE NO DEBTS SO DOES IT MATTER WHAT THEY HAVE. THEY JUST MOST PROBABLY VERY CAREFUL WITH THEIR MONEY SO WHY SHOULD THEY SUFFER FOR SHIRKERS

Although somebody may be on a good wage, that doesn't necessarily mean they have that wage to budget every month. They may have debts or bills to pay e.g. for a parent in care. Therefore I believe the wage should be higher than that, approximately £25,000 a year.

this is the same old story...if you've been bought up to take control of your own life and saved by working for the full 45 years of your life then you're not entitled to anything...people with savings over £16,000 should have the same rights as people who just don't bother saving and expect everybody else to keep them in housing and benefits Some housing and areas can still be unaffordable and cause debt to occur and eviction to take place. There needs to be a cap on private housing benefit to prevent people falling in to debt.

## **10. Other Comments**

In all cases the needs of children must be put first.

The Council and its partners should return to the requirement that tenants should maintain their decor and gardens. Assistance should only be given to those elderly infirm, with special needs. Those who do not comply will sadly have to be advised that they could be moved on.

The Council and its partners should return to the requirement that tenants should maintain their decor and gardens. Assistance should only be given to those elderly infirm, with special needs. Those who do not comply will sadly have to be advised that they could be moved on.

Reading through your suggested policy changes it sounds like you're aiming the changes at locals on benefits with no chance of anyone else gaining a slight chance of a house



The checking of applicants should not be affected by social workers and charity organisations and prison bodies. Every property not occupied full time by the applicant must be taken back into the system.

Whilst I understand that there is greater demand than Thanet can accommodate, this new policy will further marginalise some of the most vulnerable clients in our community and will increase street homelessness and subsequent social problems in Thanet. If this were being introduced alongside other measures to build and buy more housing stock and to cap rent increases in the private sector it would not be as harmful as this policy clearly will be.

I've been bidding on the council register for nearly 3 years and I still haven't got anywhere. I have 4 children in a small crowded room but people with less children get housed before me. I think the council needs to prioritise whom they house and house the people who need it like me but the council won't listen.

I feel that you need to either have been in Thanet all your life or at least a minimum of 3 years before being entitled to be housed in the area.

I feel that these proposals begin to penalise those who have abused the social housing system in the past and to prevent an inflow from outside the District. Why not reward good existing tenants with better housing in terms of location and type of property? The biggest scandal in social housing is the allocation of housing to unmarried/unsupported young mothers. All single mothers under 23 years of age should be housed in Group homes. If they are a cause of overcrowding in the parental home they should be expected to move to such accommodation or into the private sector and the parents should not be allocated a larger home because they are sheltering adult children of either sex.

I feel that this is a good idea and should be done.

It should be a 5-year minimum in the area or very strong links with priority to low-income families but where they are working or only been on benefits for a short while. I do not think people who have recently arrived in the area should take priority over those with strong links to Thanet. I would like to see a system similar to the one I had for the short time I lived in Bromley. They gave you 10,000 back in 1990 if you gave up your council home to buy your first house. It meant we could return to Thanet (where I had lived since the age of 4) and had money towards a deposit and fees. It was only if you actually bought the home and it was paid to your solicitor. I would also like to see a scheme where money is paid for people to downsize their home perhaps 1,000 plus removal costs when they have extra bedrooms. Also something for the pensioners. I would suggest give up your flat and move to more supportive/sheltered accommodation again 1,000 plus removals. These schemes would help release more housing. I would also like to see more social housing for the single under 25s which is very hard to find without a guarantor. Even decent flatlets would be ideal perhaps from old buildings that are currently stood empty and could be purchased by the council.

Having been a council tenant for 16 years and on the transfer list for 10 years now, I do not feel that the new allocation policy does anything to help people such as myself desperate to move from an unpleasant area stuck in category D. The Localism Act addresses support for mobility of existing tenants and I do not feel that this allocation policy reflects that at all. Surely if transfers are included in the numbers of the housing register, actioning more of these will reduce the list quicker as there is still a property to let at the end of a transfer. There is no consideration for good tenants, who look after their property, pay their rent on time, every time with a proven track record of good behaviour. Decent existing customers will be forgotten at the bottom of the list as they have been for so long already.

I feel it is going to be harder to be housed in Thanet, it will also be harder for tenants to apply for a transfer. the bedroom tax only affect tenants under the age of 60. If tenants are not using all the bedrooms in their tenancy they should be offered smaller properties that will release more homes for applicants on the waiting list.

No good telling the public to move. A lot of people like myself are retired at 60 and dont have the money. I cant get a job at my age Im to old the firms wont emply you and theres no work about in Thanet either. I live in private accommodation by the time I pay out I got 60 to live off for the month. Who going to pay all my moving fees and put 5000 up front for a private landlord again. The housing benefit peopel really need to do alot more research and stop telling the public to move home its not an option in this current economic climate.

I think it will lead to areas in the community where nobody will want to go if the council housing is only available to low income families

Working at a women's refuge I am very aware how the new allocations policy may affect women looking to be housed in the local area. I believe you cannot have a black and white blanket policy and in the long run this will only increase homelessness and social problems.

has been being stated that those making a homeless application, will be considered under a different section of the act. However under present policy, those found homeless are placed on the housing register and able to bid on properties, how does this differ under the new allocations policy? It would seem that those homeless due to domestic abuse will now also be in band C, where they may have previously been in band A, making the time in temporary accomodation longer The policy states that an offer of suitable accommodation in the private sector would discharge the duty to those that are homeless. Would this offer be the offer of the bond scheme? The availability of a crisis loan to support the 4 weeks rent in advance is becoming rare and is likely to be even rarer with the changes to the benefit system. Therefore the bond scheme is becoming less of an option. References and guarantors are also requested and again pose huge problems for many fleeing DV. What therefor an option for those suffering violence, living in social housing, as previously stated, historically this has rarely been an option for TDC clients. This is clearly not though an option for those not renting social housing.

Please use this space to provide any further comments or ...

There is no recognisiton within the draft policy that considers how Young People who were formerly looked after by the Local Authority will not be additionally disadvantaged by the proposed changes

Our main concern is how the local connection requirements will impact on residents of supported housing who may well have originated from outside of thanet, and not been resident in the district for 3 years or more, particularly in the case of domestic abuse and offenders who may not be able to return to their originating area. Additionally, it is not detailed which level of priority people moving on from supported housing will be granted, which could lead to lack of throughput and poor use of supported housing resources in thanet.

I think after waiting for 3 years & bidding every fortnight & being 1st bidder in every property you need to give a little more Feedback instead of keep writing not in the first 20,I am always in the 1st 20 & you never prioritise me & Never give me ant decent feedback,I've seen the kind of provoke that are taking the homes that I'm bidding on & very rarely are they decent or English,think you need to give decent feedback to loyal people,you seem to just give houses to foreigners that don't work,why is that ?

More emphasis should be placed on compulsory buying from absent landlords of empty/derelict properties. Any developments agreed with Housing Association etc should be for local people first. Consideration should also be given to the impact on the local area and thought given to adequate roads/transport/shops/schooling doctors and NHS dentists etc. Also provision for community centres and young people to keep them from getting into trouble. Little thought seems given to infrastructure or the impact of extra population on existing services and little or no thought for increasing GP's, dentists, patients or local hospital admissions. Please try and keep the open land farmland and the few trees we have left in Thanet. Also keep any crooks, drug addicts and troublemakers out of Thanet we do not have enough resources to cope.

More needs to be done to ensure the tenants once housed are keeping up with their contract agreement, very much like spot checks on the home or even on any benefits that are being claimed for, this would stop or even detract some families of committing fraud. Also there needs to be put in place a system where non-smoking families are not put into residential housing blocks next to those who smoke, it is still a health issue as smoke and its harmful substances are lingering about the air, even when the doors are closed.

my only argument is that you believe if one, say of a married couple is working, then they can afford private renting, possibly so, claiming council tax and housing benefit ok. we are on the council list, and we would like a place where we can settle down and not have to move every 6 months or so, due to the owner selling up, i am 62 this year, my husband is 51 this year, we both are on medication, which is obviously keeping us alive, otherwise we wouldn't be taking it. so we don't need the stress of having to up sticks and move about. also we are not snobs, but there is a lot of anti social behaviour on many of the council estates, which i agree should be looked into, and should be changed, they should be moved out, let them suffer like they have made the estates suffer. it would be nice to hear people say that is a nice council estate instead of the normal, no you don't want a move there, or buy a property there, and that's what we hear all the time

I think it is about time and as a local resident who has lived here my whole life i strongly agree to this policy.

I am against the prospect of applications made by those outside of Thanet being declined. I think all applications should be looked into and considered on the basis of circumstances.

Nice to be asked an opinion. Hope it gets read and discussed and not just binned.

Some good ideas and it is a start. We tax payers are fed up with being taken for a ride by those who refuse to take responsibility for their 'lifestyle' choices.

Would like to see more updated information so customer can see progression and expectation of the bidding. Personal contact at least once a year whilst on the list and hopes for allocation. I have been on list since 2007 with no contact or update of expectation.

I'm so pleased that the council has started to tackle the current grossly unfair system for allocating the scarce resources. It will make it much more difficult to abuse the provision of social housing and more people should be able to benefit.

feel that the changes will be very welcome in my eyes, because there are far too many people that know how to work the system ie; youngsters having babies and staying with mum and then they plead over crowding so they get re-housed and immigrants come into the area and plead they dont understand and then they have the support from representatives who also work the system to fight there corner so they are also housed quicker? so i feel that if a youngster is mature enough to have a baby then they can stand on their own two feet for a while and i feel that they should also wait 3years before they are housed becuse it is only then a baby really needs more space and immigrants should also wait there turn just as anyone else. Because i was a single mum at 29 and i was made homeless twice and i didnt have the help from family TO house me and i didnt get re-housed and was forced to find private housing?? and have been struggling ever since i have been on the waiting list for 7 years hoping i will be given a break in life and have an opportunity to life in affordable housing.

PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON FOR ASSAULT/VIOLENT CRIMES SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN COUNCIL HOMES.

Ive heard that when a property has been bid on and the bidding being closed thst the first 5 people with priority have the chance to have the property and if no one wants it then it goes back on for bidding why is this? Is this true?

The policy needs to provide more shorter term tenancies for people so that they don't get a council home for life. You end up with older people living in family homes for years and years with no homes for people who need them. Please please look at offering more shorter term tenancies that help people for a shorter period of time such as 2-5 years. This means people can have their tenancy renewed if needed but people move on/out if they can. This could be a step up into buying a home and link in to the right to buy. Also please look at people 'who take advantage of the system' and kick their children out at 16 and they become homeless or have a baby to get higher points.

about changes in circumstances e.g. an applicant is on Benfeit when housed but subsequently enters paid employment? If they are earning a reasonable salary (above a certian threshold), should they continue to be entitled to social housing or should that be freed up for someone in more need. Essentially, should a council house be for life or only a stepping stone into the private housing market? Should tenancies be for fixed terms e.g. three to five years whith the expectation that tenants should be moving on to the private sector once theoir circumstances improve? Whilst it is almost certianly outside of your powers, I am opposed to the Right to Buy. I see no sense in selling off social housing stock when we have so little. Tenants benefit from subsidised rent below what they would pay in the private sector. Why should they then be able to buy the property at a discount? We already have insufficient housing stock, and accordingly it makes no sense to sell it off. O therwise, I am almost wholly supportive of your proposals which I congratulate you for putting forward. Well done!

The current system is totally unfair to local families. Thanet will continue to spiral into poverty all the time the rest of the UK use it as a dumping ground. Without the option of automatic housing I believe that this will slow the growth of our problems. I know so many people like born here, raised our children here and get no support from our council when our need is genuinely high! I have watched brand affordable houses being wrecked by people walk into refuges, drug rehabs and into homes... And they haven't lived or contributed in any way to the local economy.where Thanet district council is concerned charity really should begin at home.... And there area will once again be great...

Brilliant Plan

Believe that people should only be in social housing whilst they are in need of it. Once they are able to afford private housing they should be moved on to allow the social housing to be available to more people. Rents should also be in line with private housing to discourage people from wanting to be in social housing purely for the lower rent.

a lot more help and advice should be given when applying for housing. and the housing team should be trained to treat everybody like theyre all non working people on benefits.

There should be five year tenancys, as people's situations do change,(family size and income) and certainly no life tenancys which I understand is the case at present.

is now empowered to give some preference to applicants who are of working age and working or even volunteering in the community. That would ensure that we get a mix of tenants truly reflecting the population mix. This might improve estate environment and help reduce ASB. Circumstances change throughout life and TDC should take this into consideration to ensure recycling of housing - a precious commodity. Will there be various sorts of tenancy agreement? Are tenancies a mixture of short and long-term with specified review periods enabling TDC to reduce expectations of a "subsidised house for life"? If not, can TDC justify why tenants may have this preferred status at public expense for life? Family homes should have fixed-term agreements and regular review dates to ensure that new families can be placed in them, avoiding under-occupation in the future. High rise units should be carefully allocated to improve mix of tenants - but ensuring those with physical dis abilities are not unsuitably housed there. Short-term tenancies for younger working people may be the answer here. Does the policy allow for this?

Tackle antisocial behaviour better, it's a nightmare currently living with this kind of behaviour from the flat above. You also need to make better regulations for private sector landlords, such as repairs etc. I was forced into private housing and for the last year have battled with the landlords agents to make repairs but nothing has beed done at all.

i think that O.A.P.S who are living in bedsits paying topup need more help in securing a home to live in

Its a shame the document does not reward those people who are working in this community. People who receive benefits, have their rent paid for them, and the government states how much they can live on. Those people who work hard and usually with 2 jobs as most of the jobs in this area are only part time, have difficulty in keeping up with their rent and bills, but manage, we have all spent money on our properties to make them our homes, only to receive our NTQ, then having to move out and find somewhere new to live again, plus keep the family together, and holding down a job

I think it is about time that restrictions were put on people who want and have social housing. They/we are lucky to have these properties which are maintained and affordable.

There needs to be a change as My Family have been on housing list Band D for 4 years and bid every time and never get a chance

Well done Thanet Council, you finally managed to pull your thumbs out of your collective arses and introduce decent policy for a change.

I found it helpful to complete this questionnaire as when i was telephoned to inform me my change in circumstances would make no difference to finding a home and almost certainly my band would not change and to rent in the private sector.i understand there is a large waiting list but i don't feel there was a need to be so cold and blunt i was upset for several days afterwards.

I think it is fair and takes action on people that behave badly or don't pay their way. There aren't many council houses left so they should go to people that really need them, not people that want them because they are cheap and get maintained better than private rented places. Difficult times, right way to deal with them.

We are currently in a 3 bed property with stairs. Neither of us can now use stairs so the space upstairs is unused. We are worried that even though we are looking for a smaller place we would still be penalized by the bedroom tax. We know properties are well sought after but we are trying to do the right thing by leaving this place so a family can have it.

Personally I think if you have rent arrears then you shouldn't get allocated another place till you have paid up, the changes to the banding don't matter as it doesn't mean a thing the truth be told i.e. if you live elsewhere in the country or further afield all you have to do is show up at the council office and you get a place before people that have lived here all their lives one thing the council does need to do is put their residents first and all the houses that are boarded up sort them out as there are too many in Thanet that could be used that aren't

It is with some thankfulness that the council has taken the opportunity to make these changes. I'm concerned though, that immigrants from Eastern Europe who arrive here and cost the council a great deal in Housing benefit and maternity services, as well as taking up places in schools, will continue to do so.

I am pleased that TDC is at last addressing the ridiculous situation we have nationwide of over reliance on social housing, the ridiculous expectation that the council provides housing to all, and those who choose to produce child after child need to consider the consequences of their own actions and not expect the Council to give them larger accommodation. Perhaps they might think, do I earn enough to have another child, rather than what more can I get out of the system if I have another child. Well done!

A sensible, fair and realistic approach to the environment we are now in. It is a shame this approach wasn't taken a few years ago.

Consult with OT's to ensure adapted properties are sensibly allocated and avoid the wasteful practice of taking out expensive adaptations. Maintain a register of adapted properties.

A good move.

Yes I believe people under 30 should be looked at more as these type of people can be the worse for loud music and late night parties and also drug and alcohol use too much of and I think Thanet Council needs to do more checks before willing to house people do checks like Orbit does. If not check other council in the UK where they have set up a sister business where they own the stock but trade as a housing association it can be done I have done some research and Aylesbury Vale Council as done that and they have hardly any trouble,

I also think that people who have more bedrooms than they actually need i.e. a couple whose family have now left home should be required to move within a specific timescale. There should be no 'rights' to stay in a three/four bedroomed property when there are only two of you or a single person.

An excellent set of new policy measures!

A very sensible piece of proposed legislation if it is enforced properly and maintained.

I think the whole 'shake up' is just what we need for you to be able to manage OUR Thanet Council better

The needs of children of school age should be the first consideration

parents both moved to Thanet in the 50's and 60's as it was the English Riviera and the place to be. It horrifies them that it has become what it has and that their children have been left to deal with a rotting area. Thanet District Council need to lay down the law to people who take this area for a ride, and by this I don't mean just the Thanet residents who take everything for granted - I also mean Kent County Council, various London borough councils who are trying to dump their unemployed residents down here and to an extent the UK Government and courts who are also trying to turn us into an urban grotto. This area deserves more and it's about time Thanet District Council stood up to be counted and a reform such as this one is a good start. If this goes the way it is hoped then maybe next you can start dealing with the increasing number of London visitors to Margate beach who are parking illegally all over the pavements and being abusive to the locals, and who not only are bringing their own food to the area and therefore not actually spending any money in the local shops - but are happily leaving a ton of rubbish on the beaches everyday!

I look forward to seeing these proposals being implemented, I think that Thanet Council has finally woken up. I wish you the very best of luck with your proposals, it will be for the good of the Thanet community and Thanet Council that these proposals are implemented.

does not appear as though TDC has made any changes to increase mobility to Transfer Applications, I have been patiently waiting for this allocation policy to see if TDC will take advantage of the recommendations in the Housing Allocation Guidance for local authorities to help Transfer Applicants it appears you have chosen to completely ignore the ones below: "1.6 Transfers at the tenants request, where the authority is satisfied the tenant does not have reasonable preference, do not fall within Part 6 and housing authorities may set their own transfer policies in relation to these tenants. Authorities should consider how to make the best use of this flexibility. Providing tenants with greater opportunities to move within the social sector can help promote social and economic mobility and make the best use of social housing stock." "1.8 Housing authorities may decide to operate a separate allocation system for transferring tenants who are not in the reasonable preference bottom of the list because they do not need an additional bedroom or have an empty one to give up. I don't feel it is an unreasonable request after ten years of waiting to know why this is not enough for a transfer from an awful place!

I am very pleased to see this new mood of realism from our council. It has taken a long time, but this is a step in the right direction. I hope this spirit will spread to all other areas of council work. And I'm very glad that you have consulted the people of Thanet about these proposals - that is the true spirit of democracy, of which we have too little in this country! Well done and keep it up.

were do I stand with this new policy as I have 3 children living in a small damp flat with no heating and have been on the housing list for 14 yrs stuck on band c

The council should be offering homes to people across the bands, not just those in bands A and B every week. I have been on this list for almost a year and a half, and haven't even come close to obtaining a home. I think it is despicable the way the council offer homes to foreign people, and others whom move into the area suddenly. I have lived in Thanet my entire life, I pay my taxes and bills, and get absolutely nothing in return, especially from the council. Just because they have easy lives driving their Mercedes cars, others, such as myself, struggle with the collapse of our economy, and seek help from those who have life easy. Changes need to be made promptly, before serious repercussions take place.

Private housing - Private landlords need to be stopped from charging high rents - if the council can charge £100 per week so should private landlords instead of charging double. Also help should be provided for the private sector to gain properties easier as guarantors are not always easy to come by or in a position to be a guarantor, this then makes private housing very difficult to obtain also charges fees - deposits and rent in advance also makes finding properties difficult and very hard to obtain.

The Thanet area is a wonderful place to live and work but we should not keep accepting that other councils from more affluent areas can just dispose of their social housing tenants because they can't afford to pay them housing benefit. We are all losers as we have to suffer the cutbacks the council has to impose because of this. Why are we taking these people from outside the area when there is very limited skilled jobs available, a lack of good school places and other amenities which are important to the social well being of the local residents. We should be promoting Thanet as a place to visit, by providing things such good hotels, tourist attractions such as a Sea Life Centre or a Ice rink where people will come but go home again. This would encourage spending ion the area, provide jobs and give Thanet back it's place as a place to visit and enjoy.