

<p>Do you agree with this aim to make best use of social housing stock by supporting those most in need? -</p>
<p>Social housing should be for low income families. Removing the £50,000 a year cap wages . Your not helping the low paid .</p>
<p>thousand illegal immigrants arrived by dinghy boats last year and 20 odd thousand this year all put up in hotels. It was mentioned on GB news that migrants are causing the housing crisis around the UK and are given social housing ahead of those on a long waiting list for years and years and rough sleepers left to rot on the streets. Ealing council came under fire by putting British citizens and legal migrants in shipping containers while they favoured illegal immigrants for new social housing that's why housing developments are popping</p>
<p>- I support these changes. However, I would be interested in seeing the figures on how many people on the waiting list got given social housing in the past 5 years and how long was the average wait.</p>
<p>- How do these changes compare with what other greater London councils have done?</p>
<p>- Is the removal of the gross household income aimed at helping people to save for a house deposit while they use social housing that could have gone to people on lower incomes?</p>
<p>was turned down. The only way I could get a property that I could afford, I need to move. Moving to Ipswich to get a Housing Associating Flat with a safety alarm.</p>
<p>As far as I am concerned you are not helping People of need who have lived in the borough. You are helping not understand the injustice felt by people seeing the huge increase in population with the needs for water, electricity and infrastructure generally.</p>
<p>Also is Sadique Khan gentrifying inner London and thus bringing Havering down?</p>
<p>Putting long term residents of Havering first.</p>
<p>otherwise people from other boroughs will be given precedence above Havering residents.</p>
<p>Havering residents of 6 years or longer residency should always be given priority.</p>
<p>Even if they don't have disabled children, this does not give someone precedence because their children are "healthy" why are they being discriminated.</p>
<p>If residents have lived here 3 years only and moved here because of your new policy which will happen, this will put Havering Residents of 6 years or longer at the bottom of the list.</p>
<p>But not at the detriment to people who have lived in this country all their life and have paid taxes</p>
<p>concerned that an individual may drift in and out of the borough during the 6 year period which could suggest a lack of commitment to our community.</p>
<p>In the proposal can the 3 years be made up of a few months then a break followed by another few months</p>
<p>I'm a wheelchair user and this property isn't able to be further adapted to suit my needs.</p>
<p></p>
<p>Depends on who qualifies as most in need and who doesn't.</p>
<p>There are people that are moved from home to home for many years children uprooted numerous times</p>
<p>Yes, but I do have concerns that it will then be huge increase in demand for already very low stock of housing.</p>
<p>I think residency should stay at 6 years and at least one person in employment.</p>
<p>It should be for peoples needs, overcrowding needing to be nearer family.</p>
<p>I am disabled and in the near future may need help in getting social housin. My sister has cancer and lives with me. This could cause hardship very soon and the steps that the council is taking may provide relief in</p>
<p>The policy of 6 years continuous residency should remain in place.</p>
<p>I agree with the income threshold should be removed.</p>
<p>I feel that the current banding system should remain.</p>

<p>I believe social housing should be available for those most in need, with disabled, key workers & low income families given priority. If you have £30,000 in savings, you're not poor!</p>
<p>I also believe applicants should have lived in Havering for at least 10 years.</p>
<p>As a married couple stuck in private renting it would be good if council properties lifted the income threshold as even a joint income of £50000 is not enough to privately rent and save for a home</p>
<p>I am most concerned that over the past 10-15 years it is obvious that the White working class has been virtually ignored when it comes to supplying them with social housing regardless of their needs, and this private landlords, unless the fault should be with the tenant, should be a Priority. Points should be allocated every year the person has lived in Havering. People with children should get additional points for each year on the list. Havering residents should take priority over others such as illegal immigrants. Council tenants should be expected to relocate to a smaller home when their need changes, with the disabled supplied with the same equipment and housed at ground level. Those earning over £40,000 pa should be taken off the waiting list. The priority should be Havering residents first. Most important the Council should compulsorily purchase accommodation left empty for over one year, unless the owner is not at fault. More council homes should be</p>
<p>If the Council is experiencing such a high demand for Council Housing why on earth reduce from 6 years to 3 years the requirement of being a Havering resident. It makes NO logical sense.</p>
<p>This is a poorly worded question. It should read: 'Do you agree that our plans will make best use of social housing stock?' The answer to that question would be 'No' - decreasing the length one has to be a resident</p>
<p>Havering residents and families want to stay in Havering and not be pushed out by others coming into the borough so they can get a house quicker. Established residences have already created a support network and contribute to the borough. New people to the area do not have support networks and depend on other paid services too much. This borough is financially poor already</p> <p>Leave it at 6 years, this is easy to achieve.</p> <p>Income threshold: Keep at gross income threshold for applicants £36,000 with a savings cap of £30,000, This allows residences to get a step on the ladder, and releasing housing stock in the future. By having an income threshold, housing stock will be well maintained by tenants reducing costs to council. Put in low income tenants and they will not have funds to complete minor repairs or maintain property to high standard.</p>
<p>I myself am applying for social housing, a single parent with 2 children and a sick person, but I do not meet the conditions due to the fact that I have lived here for 5 and a half years and not 6 years.</p>
<p>Why do the people who grew up in Romford who went to school in Romford who represented Romford in</p>
<p>You should put rent regulations in place and cap rents to reflect wages</p>
<p>This must be inclusive and not restricted to homeless, immigrants, non working etc. there are emergency worker lone parents struggling to pay private rent and afford childcare - these must be eligible too for council</p>
<p>There are many people Like myself already council home tenants that are in desperate need to move .</p>
<p>If I was to be allocated the property I need my council property would be available . There should be consideration for though who already a tenant needing a larger or smaller property</p>
<p>should have done as their parents should have done and worked hard to purchase their own private property. I don't agree to give priority to children of Havering - there are those on the housing list with more urgent need - these council tenant children can stay at home if they can't afford to purchase.</p>

I have been on the list I'm living I'm a mouldy Danny caravan with 3 children 1 being disabled and can't get anywhere with the council I have lived in Havering for the past 15 years and can't get passed band 3 within the borough. I have been on the housing register since 2009 and am still in temporary accommodation. The councils priority should be those who have been in the borough longest compared to people moving into the borough with a housing need.

But it is difficult to see how anyone with income of £50000 can be considered in need of social housing. There should be an income above which residents are forced to leave social housing even if they have been in it for

Stop charging sheltered housing tenants for service charges paid for twice.and get rid of sheltered housing

Many people who manage their lives and family within their means will likely be disadvantaged and have to wait longer to upsize or secure their first home as people who have not managed their lives or their family

Yes but you need to look at all residents needs not just not most in need

However priority should be given to those in employment/given higher score.

was necessary to move to Havering for job or relationship.

What does need mean as well.

You haven't really made it clear in your wording its all words that mean nothing.

Social housing should be for those most in need as the likelihood of them being able to afford anything in the private sector is infinitesimal . Providing a stable home will help to increase life chances for families and

It needs to made clear who is considered to be 'most in need'.

to people who decide to have children and cannot afford it as they have no ambition to earn more. If you stop giving these people who refuse to work hard to pay for their own 3 bedroom house, you will have houses available for homeless people and disabled. That's the problem you are creating. Letting perfectly able people

Single people should also have a chance to get a property as private rent/purchase is not an option for most due to the costs. Some private rentals want 6 months rent in advance. Local young people deserve to live

I do not agree at all that qualification rules should be changed

I think that people whom work should have priority. Its well documented that once people who don't work and in receipt of benefits get the council flat they are less likely to ever work of course if they are unable to

lack of transparency in the bidding process. However, care needs to be taken to ensure that people who are currently on the waiting list are not disproportionately affected by the change to the banding system. I am saying this because, I have been on the housing register since 2016 and have seen two changes. Each time the policy change, I was been moved far and far behind for no reason. Still living in temporary accommodation.

but please make sure tenants are abiding by tenancy rules some are not

the first place that came available and if I declined that offer,I would be suspended for a year before I could apply again,this was never advised to me, and I have looked at my emails from the council and no mention of one bid and your out.

thousands of homes destroying wildlife habitat. We will lose every bit of green belt woodland countryside farmland local parks and campsites and wildlife animals will be pushed to extinction. We haven't got the infrastructure to keep letting in thousands and thousands of migrants it is already putting a strain on the NHS and doctors surgeries plus illegal immigrants are given priority for social housing ahead of rough sleepers

As long as they are not in need due to choosing not to work or laziness. If your out at work trying to provide

By changing the ruling of Area connection/contributions your allowing more and more people who don't know the area to be accepted, when your own Havering people are sleeping rough on your streets.

And households already struggling with over crowding struggle to get close to a bigger property.

Care about your own.

Yes absolutely the worse off and most in need should be prioritised.

Living in the borough should stay at 6 years.

Income should stay at £36,000. Social housing is and should stay for people on low incomes.

If properties given to higher earners they would buy that property not save to buy a private property.

whereby people born in the borough, with strong family ties should also have a strong preference over those who are new to Havering.

Just because people are working, they should NOT be excluded from getting a council property. They cannot afford to buy a home in Havering and are forced to move far away from their families, friends and

I do believe that those families in most need should be priority, but unfortunately I don't think this is happening as I know for a fact, some social housing that becomes vacant does not go through the normal
Providing the tenants look after the properties and don't let the property look like 'hovels' .
I totally agree that people under a certain wage should be housed by the council when available
Although I agree it should be those of greatest need, I think time living in the Borough should be taken into
I believe that the policy should be geared towards those that were born in the borough and have lived here,
old and is not energy efficient. I have waited so long to to have our forever home the uncertainty of being told to move out has been constant as landlord wanted house back and landlord won't replace the windows or help but increases the rent. I believe it's only fair that I should be able to finally have a secure home now and I house I can call my home and let the council use this house for emergency which you have lots of
Yes
reduce the six year residency to three years together doing away with the income level except encourage people to move into Havering who may have no intention of making Havering a better place and put more strain on local schools and other amenities
I agree that a transparent and clear points system could potentially work but I don't get why you are changing the residency to 3 years instead of 6. Its already hard enough for local residents to get a home.

<p>Do you have any further comments or suggestions? - Please use this space to add any comments:</p>
<p>Help the low income families get a place to rent . Not sell off council stock at a discount</p>
<p>Don't keep asking the same question</p>
<p>I think by reading my responses you realise I don't agree with the Allocations Scheme.</p> <p>The Council is being "too soft".</p> <p>We need someone like Margaret Thatcher who will stand and be counted and not hide behind a curtain and being soft.</p> <p>Why, who said / proposed to reduce to 3 years?</p> <p>Was it officers or Cabinet Members? or the Leader?</p>
<p>What does it take for a single parent with 2 small children to get a council property with 2 bedrooms, that can't even get on the list and lives in the worst house with the worst landlord, things need to change</p>
<p>I would like to see prospective candidates for council homes in our borough to add points to their score by engaging in community actions such a helping improve council housing stock or clearing community areas like parks. This could be done for free or if they have no employment at minimal wage. They more they do the more points they accrue. This would show a true commitment to our community.</p>
<p>Please bear in mind the few severely disabled people&their families many of whom aren't able to earn much due to caring for the person with a disability.They don't have the luxury of time or energy to keep chasing&keep checking out new systems put in place by the housing teams&therefore they don't even realise that changes have been implemented &they miss out on information this way. They are a small minority I know but often it's easier to think oh well we can adapt it's been agreed or built.</p>
<p>I'm not sure I know enough about housing to comment other than to say it seems a good idea but will need evaluation over time.</p> <p>Does it work? Does the system need improvement once ip and running? Is the principle/system adaptable and flexible to people's needs? Are people being housed well? What's the cost? Does it save money? I'm sure this will happen as part of reviewing the process.</p>
<p>Buying council properties should not be allowed until more council properties are built. Derelict properties within the Borough should be restored to ease the council list. When the council rents from private landlords there should be a minimum fixed term for tenants.</p>
<p>I think assessments need to be done face to face with applicants, seeing is believing I feel. Instead of people fitting a box and getting a certain amount of points for different needs doing house visits would be better.</p>
<p>Any schemes should always take into account long term Havering residents first.</p>

<p>Havering council used my property for 15 years I am a private landlord and they handed back the property in an absolutely disgraceful state, the property was not maintained and therefore could not be used by the council to house anyone, at a cost of £5,000 in repairs I have transformed it and it is now leased through an intermediary of Havering Council to help with social housing. I want compensation for the works I have had to rectify due to the councils neglect Patrick Oddelling-Smee has never answered my letter which was signed for.</p>
<p>Properties should be inspected yearly to ensure the tenant is taking care of it (including gardens). It is a privilege to have a council property and not a God given right. Tenants that are struggling to care for their homes could be offered help, ie: a cleaner or gardener that they pay for.</p>
<p>Not really. Just need help in future and hope this system will only improve</p>
<p>The policy of 6 years continuous residency should remain in place. I agree with the income threshold should be removed. I feel that the current banding system should remain. The format of this consultation is not fit for purpose resulting in me having to copy & paste the same responses for virtually every section!</p>
<p>I believe it is wrong to house girls under 21 just because they are pregnant. They are immature & need guidance & support, not be given a free flat & benefits, only to be left to their own devices.</p>
<p>Stop selling off all your council stock for cheap</p>
<p>Why alter a system that is working. Havering is in a dire financial state trying to balance it's book. Stop wasting money</p>
<p>I disagree with most of the amendments, as noted, and think they will add further strain to the system with an increase of eligible people on the waiting list.</p>
<p>Existing council tenants who are eligible for another bedroom. What's the process on applying to transfer to another Havering council property? Surely tenants don't have to reapply to join the housing register for this? It's such a long process and the council is always delayed in replying. Can the process for existing council tenants be added to the policy as unclear.</p>
<p>It seems all it fixes is getting onto register more easily, but it doesn't solve your housing problem</p>
<p>Please see previous comments. Thank you</p>
<p>Yes I would like confirmation that those on the housing list are given priority.</p>
<p>Just that there are people out there that really need it but some workers don't even listen to you just say no</p>
<p>Except in the case of disabled people who will clearly never be in a position to earn enough to support themselves with housing, council tenants should be made aware that social housing is not for life but to help them over a bad patch. They should be encouraged to work and save so as to be able move out of social housing at the earliest opportunity. I have heard people in social housing boasting about their foreign holidays and new cars and laughing at people who deny themselves such things in order to support themselves and save for retirement because if they spend all their money they know the state will have to look after them in the end.</p>
<p>Make sure that there is still a incentive for working households on low incomes</p>
<p>I agree They seem more realistic to peoples current needs</p>
<p>Medical needs have been abysmally ignored through NOW Medical Advisors who have their own agenda and therefore deliberately ignore a sociological perspective or social model, instead using a narrow medical model not appropriate in local authority housing system</p>
<p>Havering council is going broke why what have you done with our money.?</p>
<p>To make the down size more easy and bit more locative deals and better understanding of residents needs around this</p>
<p>Priority banding to those in employment and living in the Borough long term or from Brith</p>
<p>I feel that a single adult with a 1 child over 4 years old should be eligible for a 2 bedroom property.</p>

Estate officials will be essential to monitor the scheme and how it is being used or misused
Yes, social housing bring anti social behaviour. I am not talking about strong anti social behaviour but the kind where people who get a house for very little simply have no manner with their neighbours. Loud music for example or parties. There should be a easier manner to report them and get the matter sorted. Housing association and Council don't help much and the process is too long. It should be as straight forward as reporting it and get the tenant checked immediately. Then on the second strike, they are out. You will get many houses back for those who really need them. It seems this is for the poor neighbour to try to prove over and over again that the social housing tenant is not a nice neighbour.
Dread to think how much collective time has been spent on this, at a very difficult time for Residents AND Council, which to a great extent will benefit people who have only just arrived in the Borough
Oh yes I do, I think you should withdraw from the sharing of council allocations with all the other boroughs it was designed to funnel people from the inner boroughs to the outer boroughs and was wholly discriminatory against the people of Havering I mean isn't that why we have one of the fastest growing child populations that you are moaning about
stop mixing generations in housing
Yes to transparency. Yes to prioritising those with the most need. No to getting rid of financial limits (why on earth would anyone earning more than 50k need a council house for anything more than profit and greed) No to getting rid of the 6year borough requirement. Why should anyone outside of this borough be given any of the limited housing stock? Regulate landlords. Ban section 21's. Increase LHA Stop selling council housing stock.
The Council should prioritise the residents that have lived here for over 10 years. There are homeless people here that have been placed by other boroughs and then become Havering's problem after 5 years. This needs to stop to allow ALL OUR ADULT CHILDREN the choice to stay here or buy a property elsewhere. Havering should have a SONS AND DAUGHTERS WAITING LIST to encourage our families to live local and for communities to survive
Just that in this period where everyone is struggling we should be made to realise we only use council properties for a short time only to help ourselves and then get out for the next family to help them.
The aims seem good, although you haven't specified exactly how the points system will work. Presumably, x points for each child, x points for time on the waiting list, x points for a health need etc.
I also think that some consideration should be given to people who are trying to help themselves, ie by working. I also think that everybody should be able to apply. They should not be told their parents have got to make them homeless before they will be able to put their name on a list
Additional housing should not be developed without the infrastructure to support the additional people. There is already enough pressure on local services, particularly the NHS. If this cannot be done then these hundreds or thousands of new homes should not be built.

Do not sell off any council housing stock at discounted price. To ensure housing for the future and to ensure council tax payers do not help fund others allowing them to benefit from a cheap buying price and then to sell at market value.

The proposed changes need to be clear and easily understandable by Havering residents. The application process should be straight forward and help made available throughout the application process. We see many clients that struggle with the system and this means a lot of time people in need give up due to complexity of the application system.

The council could work in partnership with advice agencies to make sure independent advice and help is available to those trying to access the register.

Is there anything else you would like to add relating to the proposed Allocations scheme? - Please use this
Stop selling off council houses below cost
Stop selling off council houses full stop
Only allocate housing to those who haven't been evicted from another place
Can these housing proposals be discussed with students in local schools?
This would help them better understand how the housing conditions are in their local area.
Cater for residents that are British not from overseas who have paid nothing in to the UK system.
Maybe the high street banks should be encouraged to offer 100% mortgages which will help and motivate people to buy their own houses which will ultimately reduce the pressure on the council itself.
only 3 years to join the list. This will make the list ridiculously busy and the demands for housing will be too high. Look after the long term residents of Havering, look after the residents who work in Havering I. Prioritise the right people!
Why are the hundreds of flats so awful. I guess they will be ghettos within 10 years.
Existing long term residents of Havering should be given priority over applicants from inner London boroughs.
Yes will the results of this survey be published.
No names as no GDPR has been requested nor signed.
It would be good to get the opinion of REAL Havering Residents and not those who are moving into the borough as an easy route to get a cheap Council property.
Priority should be given to Havering Residents above those who just move into easy Havering - nANNY STATE
I totally disagree that you should be resident for 3 out of 6 years . It should be 6 out of 6 minimum.
To check on your new tenants, to make sure they are not causing anti social behaviour
I wish you luck.
I sincerely hope that the most vulnerable are protected by safety nets because otherwise people who are most in need will be most affected by the changes made.
My fear is that many families will be moved further down the list after many years of bidding.
I think it's better than the previous one
This seems to me to be a return to to the old way of property allocation and is far better than the current needs. Not like me where my autistic ADHD child is stuck in a first floor maisonette with no access to a garden for outlet and thus they are jumping and banging on the poor old lady downstairs all day everyday!! I fell down the stairs twice and got seriously injured as a result of turning to take her bike downstairs for her to play with in the park because I have no access to storage downstairs or a shed or garden. We live in a
There should be no more Right to Buy. Council homes should be kept for those in need & not sold at discount to residents. It is unfair to those on the waiting list & unfair to those who aren't vulnerable but struggle to pay
This year I viewed a property. Because I declined as too expensive for me. I'm an OAP but my pensions exclude me from benefits. I was told because I had refused I cannot bid for a year. I feel this is discrimination
Fairness should be the object of this consultation. If residents and applicants can see fairness at the heart of the changes, these changes will be accepted by those on the waiting list and other residents of Havering
Yes, Leave it as it is
To be more flexible
I have given comments above. I know Havering are fighting a losing battle due to their finances and the huge demand for council accommodation- I do feel this new strategy may help residents but I am concerned how
You mentioned making it easier for the children of social tenants to get social housing. Why? People should be incentivised to stand on their own two feet and not expect ratepayers to subsidise them in perpetuity.
not been done and yet I'm still waiting on a council property which is not far this house could go to a family for an emergency plus the house is not energy efficient and landlord refusing to fix things and council can not do anything about this
Points should be allocated to working households still, it keeps people in work and is a good incentive

<p>Families in low income should be a priority.</p> <p>Send families should be a priority and any medical issue.</p> <p>People want a house that they dont need to keep being threatned to leave.</p> <p>Rents need to match local housing rates or how can families even eat.</p> <p>3 years is better than 6 years. Where would a family relocate after 3 years.</p> <p>More lanlords that rent according to lhr .</p> <p>People need realistic options so they can have the bare minumum conditions of living in a decent way.</p>
<p>Do the right thing and start being accountable to your tenants.explain the corrupt behaviour that has been</p>
<p>To make officers very experience in all aspects of housing and new build and to the right back ground checks</p>
<p>people currently living in social housing could well afford to move into their own property allowing those who need the social housing an opportunity to rent a property.</p>
<p>Also single people living in a multi bedroom property should be moved out to allow families to opportunity to</p>
<p>As with all things reviewing the system is essential. Also ensuring that properties are used by the tenants they are allocated to. Good standards of repairs offered in a timely manner</p>
<p>afford even semi decent accommodation even if they are employed and working hard to provide for a family. The situation now seems impossible and only a massive increase in affordable social housing and a rethink of what accommodation should consist of can solve this. Also clarity of who can apply for social housing and how priority banding is decided should be clearer and much more transparency is needed.</p>
<p>apply for housing using their children as a weapon. They can sort themselves out, be bold or they will never learn and you are not sending others like them the right message. Homeless, disabled and veterans cannot help themselves and they are unfortunately quiet. Be bold for them. Be proud to become a council that help the ones who really need help. The middle class won't mind paying more taxes for them.</p>
<p>Domestic abuse victims, children leaving care system, armed forces veterans, people with disabilities should be prioritised as they are the most vulnerable in our society.</p>
<p>To make changes like your proposing you should wait until the next elections and put them in a manifesto rather than inviting people to comment. if you get feedback from 1% of the havering electorate I'd be</p>
<p>2) Working families with evidence of 3 years in the borough and also with at least 3 years working should be allowed to join the permanent register.</p> <p>3) Non- working household should allowed to join the temporary register</p> <p>4) People who are in serious need (due to domestic abuse, house disrepair etc.) should be be moved to temporary accommodation and if they are working, should be allowed to join the permanent register and if they are not working, should enrol in temp. register.</p> <p>5) People should be able to move from temp. to permanent if situation if they meet the criteria in future.</p> <p>6) In both registers, there should be high level of openness and transparency</p> <p>7) We need to level up as a Borough. While we need to support and ensure equitable community, we also</p>
<p>I don't agree with it. Deport illegal immigrants and housing should be available to British citizens and British Born or the whole of the UK will turn into a third world concrete jungle. Inner London areas and barking and</p>
<p>Prioritise people born and raised here</p>
<p>have the sole purpose/idea of buying the house and selling it for a profit. They are clearly not in need. I don't understand why the housing market is in crisis/collapse and so many of us are homeless and yet the council are still giving a 3 bed house to a working couple who are gutting it ready for sale as soon as they can - I'm homeless and can't even bid on a 3 bed house. The council tenants who moved out of that property were given a detached 3bed with a 100ft garden — a huge property that I was not allowed to bid on. Homeless and</p>
<p>More help should be given to those trying to downsize other than using bidding site. Rules are too rigid and</p>
<p>There are homeless people here that have been placed by other boroughs and then become Havering's problem after 5 years.</p>
<p>This needs to stop to allow ALL OUR ADULT CHILDREN the choice to stay here or buy a property elsewhere.</p>
<p>Havering should have a SONS AND DAUGHTERS WAITING LIST to encourage our families to live local and for</p>

I feel that the allocation scheme should be looked into as there are certain properties that are not included in the stock for allocation before you start to make a new allocation scheme
Established penalties need to be set, so those that don't respect and keep rented property in good order are fined and evicted, ensuring the undeserving are penalised.
but could have either bought the property or gone into private dwelling. I would love to be in Council place with no worries about repairs or updating rooms. But like a responsible person I've saved and got a mortgage.
Some properties could be made available by evicting problem tenants more quickly. It was a clause in my original tenancy agreement that I could be evicted if I was convicted of a criminal offence, but I have never
I feel that when it is advertised as for local people that, local should mean local.
No
own mine was due to domestic violence and even though I'm still having threats from my ex they want me to go through that hell again and go into another emergency housing and then my landlord wanted his property back to issued me a a notice to quit and now I'm just in limbo it's not fair i just want a home where I know I'm safe and secure for the rest of my adult life
<p>1. Residency criteria</p> <p>Majority of the CAH members who responded to the proposal agree with the residency changes, as often 6 continuous years is onerous for our clients.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised for people who are re-housed in a temporary accommodation by the council in a different Local Authority - it needs to be made clearer how these residents will be able to access the Housing register as they will not be living in Havering at the point of application. YMCA residents for example.</p> <p>Other members of staff expressed concerns that if the criteria is reduced, residents cannot just move to the area and expect to be given social housing accommodation. The main concern here is that LA won't be able to manage applicant's expectations as so many people will go on the register but in reality, there is not much LA can offer.</p> <p>2. Income threshold</p> <p>Divided opinion here, however, the majority of our staff disagree with complete removal of income threshold. Residents on a high income potentially have more housing options available to them - rental or right to buy.</p> <p>Removing the income criteria would enable people who are not as in need financially to be eligible for social housing, removing the whole purpose of social housing itself. We do not have enough social housing stock already and this could make it much more difficult for those on the lowest incomes to be placed in appropriate properties.</p> <p>Instead you could consider increasing the cap on income's to reflect the increase in price for private rented accommodation and increased cost of living may work better.</p>
I don't know how you can possibly house all of the people that need housing. So my fear is that with a points based system based on need so many points or needs are required to be housed hardly anyone with normal

Do you think the council should be developing low cost home ownership options, such as shared ownership, as well as rent homes? Are there other housing options we need to consider? - Please use this space to add any comments:
Absolutely not . More effort should be put in to help the low paid . To rent affordable homes . Let the government sort out house buying schemes & building societies.
Yes don't give social housing to those who have been evicted from somewhere else for causing anti social behaviour. I had problems with a neighbour 8 years ago he made my life a misery every time someone moves out I always worry who is going to move in
Rent homes, not shared ownership
A waste of time, People need proper low cost housing for low income and Disability.
Please do so as I'm a high end earner but have no savings to buy my own house. This initiative will help people like me to start saving during this tough times and avoid paying high rents and commissions which then leaves us with no savings
Yes, if social housing is to be a springboard as set out in the policy, there should be routes out such as shared ownership
The Council should build an area just for council tenants - people who have been paying Havering rent money and not in the PLS but council tenants. They should be given priority AND having resided in Havering for more than 6 years!! I even think it should be ten years and that would stop residents from other boroughs moving in to the EASY HAVERING. Havering is getting like the Government a NANNY STATE - holding peoples hands instead of making people realise how lucky they are to obtain a council property. I disagree with removing the 6 year residency.
Allow people who are working to rent a property from the council for a set number of years so they can save for their own property which could include shared ownership
When this has happened in other areas & the very people who need housing the most miss out because there's such limited housing stock available to allocate. Councils use the schemes to generate income & they build less social housing to be allocated to those in need.
Shared ownership outside a proper legal framework can be difficult and the principle open to misuse. It can work for some people though. Would the council consider increasing housing stock by building and renting more properties to people who need a home? (As they already do in some places? It is a safety net for some.)
Building council homes should be the priority. so those properties can go back to the community.
Co-housing - apartments with shared facilities and resources, more sustainable and cuts costs. With adequate storage too Do it yourself shared ownership - work with developers for people to train in the various trades involved in housebuilding whilst they contribute to building them, in exchange for an equity share in a home.
I think people that are in social housing are there because they cannot afford private rents or to buy, at least while property prices and private rentals remain so high.
Low cost housing for disabled people to buy may also be a very welcomed incentive. If already offered I am sorry but is very difficult to find any information about it
Owning a house now is more difficult than anytime before with all the mortgage prices etc. people with low income can't afford that at all especially those who can't work. Why not make a scheme where people with low income can pay directly to the council as a lease or rent that ends with owning the house after several years without the need for the bank or for high interest. If the person passes away their partner or children can finish payments or just opt to return the property. This will create a return income for the council as well which will come in handy.

<p>A mixture of housing is needed. Council homes should be given to the most vulnerable who can't afford high private rent/qualify for a mortgage. Disabled people & the elderly need properly accessible homes on the ground floor.</p>
<p>Social housing should be rent only.</p>
<p>This question has not been thought out as you can answer it both ways. It should be two distinct questions. It is impossible to take one answer when your answer can only allow a test or a no when we need to answer yes for first part and no for second part</p>
<p>The current system of homes for rent is sufficient for the council. There are plenty of private sector schemes covering those that require ownership, (shared or not shared) of their property</p>
<p>As long as it's done properly and doesn't replace Right to Buy, but is instead an additional option.</p>
<p>create a small estate with mixed units. 4 bed, 3 bed, 2 bed houses, 2 and 1 bed flats, senior ground floor units, with green space. Resident can only have 5 year tenancy and must move out of unit - ideally into another unit on same estate. Keeping community and people support together . Families with children learn respect and tolerance for the elderly and the elderly and single people do not feel isolated.</p>
<p>the council does not help vulnerable people.</p>
<p>Share ownership is still very expensive. Something like rent to buy is more realistic</p>
<p>My 26 year old daughter (not the paramedic daughter with children) and her partner recently gave up their awful Council one room bedsit and with family help now reside in New Green on shared ownership. They would not have managed this without an inheritance in the family. This is not right and though they are happy now, there should have been more social housing available to them particularly as they both work but could not afford private renting. Basically the council should own more properties like New green rather than private investors.</p>
<p>Yes but the council don't have money due to legal requirements on adult and social care! If we did not take on this responsibility but instead Government took this on, then Havering would have the money to carry out shared ownership etc.</p>
<p>More landlords that rent according to LHR council rates. The discrepancy is too big.</p>
<p>Shared ownership needs more realistic rent and service charge costs to be affordable Make housing developers ACCOUNTABLE for greed and in building QUALITY not profit for shareholders and dividends creating huge further wealth divides</p>
<p>Intermediate rents stock are far too few</p>
<p>Yes low rents and service charges for sheltered housing tenants.</p>
<p>We need to do this urgently and must be low cost housing</p>
<p>We need to be encouraging young people to make their homes here to develop communities. The rents in the private sector is stopping people getting their own homes.</p>
<p>there is a definite need to look at options. Shared ownership could be an answer but still seems to be out of most peoples pockets. Alternatives such as tiny homes should be considered, more building projects to create different accommodation options</p>
<p>Is at no here as this idea of low cost and share ownership is only good for disabled, veterans and homeless people. If this apply to scroungers then I disagree.</p>
<p>Shared ownership is a worse option than leasehold and that is bad enough. Build one and two bedroom properties. If people want larger properties take responsibility for yourself and your family. I am an owner occupier and not all of my children had their own room. People have to realise there is not a bottomless pit of money to pay for everything, it comes from the tax people pay from working. Just as a child goes into a toyshop and learns they cannot have everything, some adults need to be reminded of that lesson in life, as hard as that may be.</p>
<p>Council has bigger issues to get on with</p>
<p>Shared ownership has not lived up to expectations from what I've heard its a rip off!</p>
<p>Yes, excellent idea.</p>
<p>by using prefabricated homes which could be built faster</p>

<p>The local councils should not build anymore housing. The shortages are caused by illegal immigrants entering the UK. They shouldn't be given anything they are not fleeing from a war torn country these migrants have been coming from France. A safe country and should be sent back there the UK has already lost 2 million acres of land all down to uncontrolled migration</p>
<p>No because you already lack homes, if you sell them off there won't be anymore.</p>
<p>Yes I could afford to part buy if I was given the option. I also looked at adapted and supported living but none of these options allowed for the main applicant to be disabled and to have children (5). I also think it should be my choice to live in or bid on a smaller house than the council deem acceptable. I am waiting for a 4 bed and that's after they have a flat to my eldest child to bring down my need. I was so happy in a 3bed with my 6 children, now 5 children waiting for a unicorn. I would be allowed to buy a 2 or 3 bed property but not allowed to rent one?! This is unacceptable, hypocritical and nonsense to me and is largely why I am now homeless with my children.</p>
<p>Shared Ownership is another con that's forced on our adult children who just want their own home and to raise a family. The residents need to be able to rent. The Affordable rent is definitely NOT AFFORDABLE at 80% of market value. Another con</p>
<p>build more houses</p>
<p>I do believe that people need to have the advantage of being able to buy a property</p>
<p>Definitely, owners/part owners tend to look after their properties over renters.</p>
<p>Push the government for rent control</p>
<p>Have you thought of caravans or mobile homes as an option for short term living accommodation. I find our caravan parks have a great sense of community help with each other.</p>
<p>Shared ownership would be a good option.</p>
<p>Although I don't agree with shared ownership per say, I feel the council could help younger people by maybe having flats that they can rent but part of the rent is held as a kind of deposit for them to purchase a private home later, because at the moment young people can't afford to private rent and save for a deposit. This is why too many young people in their 30s still have to live with their parents</p>
<p>Yes, shared ownership is a good idea for those that would like to own there home one day but are unable to afford it at the moment.</p>
<p>Not everyone is able to do the low cost like single parents even when working full time it's near impossible with todays inflations</p>
<p>Give all people securing a council home the option to buy the property from day 1 by offering tenants an option to pay towards a mortgage rather than rent. This way the council could charge a little more for the property than the current rent and help people get on the housing ladder.</p>
<p>Shared ownership</p>
<p>Properties where the rent might be slightly higher compare to the social housing , but percentage of the rent money go towards deposit with the view to buy.</p>
<p>More investment in a private sector leasing in more affordable rents.</p>
<p>I don't know. Good that you are considering options.</p>

Has this aim been achieved through the proposed Allocations scheme? - Please use this space to add any comments:
Preference should be given to UK residents living in the borough. Not refugees
As long as housing is only given to local people not those arriving by dinghy boats
Some detailed stats on this would be useful
Community contribution is a great idea and should remain a high band
The points scheme is fair and transparent to everyone.
Salary band should stay.
6 years should stay
If that were true, how, other than daily publishing names, which is against GDPR = how can you be transparent about where you are on list and how many points you have.
Have you asked all those on the housing allocations list to sign a GDPR and that these are kept in a safe place?
You cannot publish names in a transparent way without GDPR
Transparency is very important. To be fair on both sides of the coin is also important so I would expect the council to ensure the system is operated correctly and not let individual's abuse a transparent and fair system.
Possibly but it will have to take into account people who aren't able to understand complex structures & systems put into place by the council. (I've previously worked in a Disability Resource Centre in the past in another borough.) Many people lose independence of choice by the fact that they aren't able to understand the ideas themselves either through disabilities or fear of asking & then they have carers or authorities explaining their understanding of the rules & it gets lost in translation or it's assumed that the person involved needs another person to do it for them!
Perhaps. I don't think anything is ever fair and transparent
It will never be fair when there have been residents on the waiting list for a long time and someone else from wherever has more needs.
I welcome the new scheme. As a 67 year old living in a 1st floor flat, the stairs are starting to trouble my knees, so it's nice to know I may have the chance to transfer to a ground floor property should the need arise.
The policy of 6 years continuous residency should remain in place. I agree with the income threshold should be removed. I feel that the current banding system should remain.
Please see previous answer.
The same page keeps appearing I have commented twice already
How is it fair that a new family that has only recently arrived in Havering can take priority over a family that has been on the Council waiting list for years just because they have a few extra points.
Knowing one's position in waiting list is a good thing.
The points matrix isn't clear. It doesn't tell you how many points you need to go up the housing priority list.
Transparency is the key and no anomalies relating to housing allocation. So much hearsay as to some getting properties and others not
Those already on the housing list are pushed further and further to the back as non-Havering residents are given priority.

Costs continue to increase yearly when services not provided
Only a schedule of the number of points that will be allocated for each specific need characteristic would do that.
Working households should still have a priority or extra points added even people who work are in over crowded households and can't afford private rent
But what is affordable rent we need to explain this
You keep asking the same question
This is not a yes/no answer until it is proven when in practice
i think we need examples of how this would work. it must be so dispiriting to see your chance for a particular property going further down a list with no explanation.
You should though charge your current tenants more money for their rent. Except disabled, veterans and homeless, if they can even get access to social housing with the way the system is at the moment. The discount should be no more than 10% of current market rates. That should encourage the scroungers to want to vacate their current social housing and give room to those who are really in need.
This is key and strongly encouraged!. If this has been the case, my family and I would have moved to a new home but still remain in temporary accommodation after 8 years.
One thing the council has never been is clear and transparent. I don't believe this move increases that objective.
It is a discriminatory policy to exclude people born in Havering. Forcing them to buy a property, or privately rent so the council don't help to keep families and communities together. This is all a con. People moving into the borough should live here for 10 YEARS before being eligible to apply. Our adult children are forced away
You do not give any details of how the point system will work and therefore I can not express any views
As we previously mentioned, stating explicitly how many points will be awarded to different categories residents will be a good way forward in achieving this aim.
Possibly but as I said it is hard to know whether I agree without seeing how the points are allocated.

Has this aim been achieved through the proposed Allocations scheme? - Please use this space to add any comments:
But are you housing those most in need?
It seems anyone who has lived here for 3 years will get priority over a 6 years or longer resident!
Not at the detriment to families who have lived here and paid their taxes
We must all work together, work and community should go hand in hand. I am aware that for some people work may be difficult but have little time for people who could work but choose to not work because they can get what they need for shelter and sustenance from the state and local councils.
Definitely not enough wheelchair accessible & partially adapted properties within the borough at present. Not surprising as their aren't enough social housing properties either!
Rents need to be more affordable thought. Some rent costs are the same as privately renting which is unrealistic for struggling families.
Sustainable communities are about everything linked together. Housing policy shouldn't just be about those most in need. There should be affordable options available for everyone in the community.
Those most in need are the ones who don't receive any benefits but work, those on the breadline are the most vulnerable people at this time.
Please see previous comments.
The policy of 6 years continuous residency should remain in place. I agree with the income threshold should be removed. I feel that the current banding system should remain.
Please focus on building a housing complex that accommodates the elderly who are independent so that they can move to smaller accommodation and free up space for bigger families. It would have all the facilities to make their stay easy and comfortable and not feel isolated and away from any facilities and support. No need for a nursing home at that point.
Please refer to previous answer.
I agree with everything except the requirement to work change. The only reason for being out of work is disablement or no work needing their skills. Those working for the minimum wage should, as a rule, be considered over those earning over £30, 000opa
The scheme will break up historical communities and neighbourhoods by acting as a magnet to encourage more pressure on housing
There is nothing sustainable or community building in allowing all and sundry to jump ahead of the queue faster than hard worker but low wage lifelong residents in the borough.
reducing 6 years to 3 will not sustainable communities and neighbourhoods as new people from other locations will move in. Existing residences will not know their neighbours or have time to establish support networks or friendship relationships as everyone keeps moving in and out of borough
We need to bring back the community hub and enable affordable housing for local residents who care about the area and some of whom are children of people who have lived here for many years. We need to build the community spirit even with residents from other areas - ownership and inclusion in a community benefits all
You are still not prioritising those on the housing list already - instead if a non having family arrive with a disabled child they are given priority - it's wrong.
Those prioritised through housing are those out of the borough who are deemed to have housing needs. But the priority should be people like us who have been in the borough 15 plus years who have been on the housing register overcrowded with a child with a disability.
Sustainable neighbourhoods are those with little movement of residents. If you kep putting people with short term urgent needs into a neighbourhood it will never become desirable.
Families cannot afford 2000 pounds rent when they only receive 1350. More affordable homes are due
It's a welcome change to the original harsh approach

Hopefully it will and we will not charge in 2 years time
Must be careful not to ghettoise areas
I am not sure what this means exactly. What is a sustainable community, how do you create that. Needs to be clear
The 3 years should be for veterans, disabled people and homeless people. 6 years for anyone else. But they really should not be anyone else in my view.
Why have you knocked down the estate off London Road behind the rising sun p.h. that was the very type of community your talking off. It's over a year now and it is still empty and you spent a lot of money refurbishing some of the blocks quite recently, it doesn't make sense you never made full use of that housing stock still plenty of years of use were left
That's ok, support those in need but with less economic and financial burden!
Stop building over open spaces and country side it's having a negative impact on wildlife animals
I don't understand what sustainable means to the council. Not selling off housing stock would make housing sustainable. Raising the LHA would make housing sustainable. Legislation against section 21 evictions and regulating private rent increases would make housing sustainable. New build estates are too expensive for those of us waiting to be housed, constantly building 1 and 2 bed flats is not sustainability. We need large family homes at reduced rents. We just want a home and we aren't in a position to care for sustainability.
Building far too many 1 and 2 bedroom properties and nowhere near enough 3/4 bed homes that are really needed to get tenants off the the list to upsize.
This will NEVER be achieved as our adult children are FORCED to move out of the borough. The Council DO NOT BUILD and don't want to build any properties because they do not want to maintain them. They sell off land cheap and let Housing Associations build as there's no maintenance costs and the Council rake in the Council Tax.
how will you build sustainable communities if those who have always lived in the borough, with family, extended family and friends living in the borough, not qualify if they don't have as many or more points than someone who has only lived here for 3 years with no other family or friends in the area
No, I don't think it's been fair or transparent
It's hard to keep up when you change it all the time it should be based on the longest waiting time and in which situation like people in emergency housing still after 9 years when was meant to be 2
Same as previous answer
Aims 8 and 9 contradict each other. By removing the community contribution element, this actively discourages the building of communities and neighborhoods.
I don't see how this helps build sustainable communities if it is less likely that hivering residents are housed by you.

Has this aim been achieved through the proposed Allocations Points Scheme? - Please use this space to add any comments:
This is a waste of time and money.
The current allocation scheme is fairer than the proposed ones especially for community contribution bands
I do not support the proposal to reduce the eligibility criteria from living in Havering for 6 years to 3 out of the last 6 years. I believe this change is to the detriment of long time Havering residents who should be given
I have no idea.
Should remain at 6 years residency
Wage limit too high. People on £50k are not 'those in most need'
Why remove 6 years?
Residents from neighbouring boroughs will learn and rent and get on list and get a council place in priority over a Havering resident that has lived here for 6 years or longer
Savings should be proven to be used for a deposit (government savings accounts)
I disagree with the need for community contribution, however the points based transparency is a good thing. I think a commitment to the community is an important aspect that helps bond a community.
There aren't enough 2 bedroom bungalows or houses adapted for wheelchair use with direct access to a garden (essential for mental health as I can't drive & also we have a dog.
Not sure
being overcrowded and struggling with our living situation. Hopefully it will work better than the bands and date allocation and not then push people further down the list when they have already been bidding for many years
It's hard to say.
This question makes no sense. How can it be achieved if this is only a proposal?
Not sure
Too many people with disabilities and / or mental health issues are being left in 1st floor and higher floor flats. These people, including the elderly cannot in many cases negotiate stairs where no lifts are provided. Too many ground floor flats / bungalows are being given to people that do not have a ground floor need.
People can't get mortgages as they are self employed, hopefully this scheme will help.
The policy of 6 years continuous residency should remain in place. I agree with the income threshold should be removed. I feel that the current banding system should remain.
Yes it's important that it's a fair scheme and doesn't make people who are struggling but don't fully meet the criteria suffer. But rather a scheme flexible to accommodate everyone within reason.
Maybe stop selling off council properties for reduced prices it's not fair on those waiting for a home
Can't believe that it has done with regard to my previous answer.
Should an applicant or their partner be able to physically work and are shown not to be actively trying to obtain work, points would be reduced every year that this situation exists. Those able to work and work is available should not take preference over others. It is their choice.
The proposed Allocations Points Scheme will favour those who have little or no historical connection to
If anything, the length of time someone needs to reside in the borough should increase, not decrease.
Policy isn't clear on the rules of different genders sharing a bedroom. I.e. boy and girl over 10 years old.
Cllr McGeary has failed to listen as Cabinet Member for Housing - he gives priority to those who are disabled or those who come to this borough, as we are known as a soft touch, and gives priority to those, not the many hundreds living in fear of their lives on a daily basis due to harassment and bullying!
I have been on the housing register since 2009. I have been working for 3 years. I have an autistic son receiving high DLA with housing needs. Yet despite all the points I should have none of my needs have been met. I have seen those with less needs prioritised over me.
3 years is more reasonable than 6. And should be according to the families needs for example send kids.

But hopefully as the last one was going to do this and it only last 2 years
Those working should be given a higher banding
Applicants income needs to be assessed for joint income. As before there should be a threshold i.e. anyone having a joint income of over £50,000 should not be eligible as they can afford to buy or rent privately. Council stock should be used only for those who don't earn much or are unable to work, have health and disability issues etc. It would be irresponsible to set no threshold for income. My household income is less than £50,000 and we have a private mortgage.
No idea, unless you advise how many points for what need.
Each case needs to be looked at individually to ensure all aspects are taken into account
This claims that so few houses are available and yet you are lowering the amount of time needed to be resident in the borough, and the other changes will surely only add to the waiting list not lessen it.
purposes, you have allowed for people on a low salary to apply. They should not be able to apply at all. You can live on minimum wage, I know many people who are doing it. They just realised that having 3 kids whilst on minimum wage is not possible and aiming for a house is out of their reach. They settled for less and are happy with a low paid job as not that stressful. This is a lifestyle choice. Consider this 'lifestyle choice'. You should put this in your selection criteria....is it your 'lifestyle choice' to not show more ambition in the workplace and stay on low salary? You have opened the door to more benefits scroungers with a threshold in the first place and it will be worst with a higher threshold. There should not be a threshold at all. Are you homeless? Are you disabled? If yes, they have priority. Are you in immediate danger from an abusive partner? They come next. Anyone else can get a better job if they want a three bedroom house for themselves and their 3 children or they can get a temporary housing for a couple of years only and for the purpose of getting back on their feet. Then they are out. I am glad there is a shortage of housing. Perhaps it will shake the applicants to seek a solution within their 4 walls; perhaps the use of contraception and a pinch of ambition. Help the homeless and the disabled. Also help our soldiers coming back from war zone who find it hard to go back to mainstream jobs. Help women with children who are being abused. Not the people who can work. The mess you created...
At a time of Cost of Living Crisis, which includes even the Council's own budget, I don't want to be paying any more for others' housing
Once again I'm afraid points systems only encourage people to increase their points, i.e. by having more children etc
Not sure.
Working people born in Havering should always have priority
adapted house. I would rather have a house that does not meet my needs (currently I am in temporary where I sleep on a sofa and pee in a commode in the kitchen) then no house at all. Most disabled people would rather be housed and then have the house brought up to the living requirement rather than wait years on lists.
NO!!! This is all smoke and mirrors aimed at trying to confuse and lead people on to think they are in with a chance when bidding, when in fact there is very little or no chance at all. I work in Housing for a Local Authority and know for a FACT that Councils prioritise homeless families first as temporary accommodation is expensive. Bidding is pointless for the majority of residents.
As I previously stated, some social housing seems to be handpicked, but not for those in need because it doesn't go through the system to give these families a chance of the certain properties
The system must be fair and the most needy take priority.

newcomers.

Income and saving thresholds should be kept to assure housing stock is for the people in need who truly can't rent/buy on open market.

The ability to self-assess - there is risk this will be done incorrectly by the applicant, such assessment should be carried out by council.

I totally agree that if a council tenant has wages coming in that can afford private dwelling they should be given a set time to buy or rent accomodation say with in the year Council should surely be given to low income people. Also living or being on the council list of x amount of time should also be set up.

The change in residency should not be changed. People who have lived here since birth and require social housing should take precedence over people who have only been here 3 years.

Assessment should be made by the council. Self assessment open to abuse.

Removing the income threshold does not help those more in need

The Allocation Points Scheme should be transparent and different categories and points to be awarded clearly outlined.

Points scheme could work. But its hard to say of so without seeing the points for each need.