

Landlord Licensing Scheme Consultation, 2019 Melcombe Regis-

Appendix

- **All comments (redacted)**

Produced by Mark Simons
for Dorset Council

June 2019

Q7 Other issues in the proposed scheme area

Alcohol abuse, drinking on seafront, drugs

A lot of the above attract drug dealing, alcoholics which in turn can fuel the issues

black bags left out any time of the day & night

Crime indicator suggests that crime is centred on the commercial area of the town and the station area

Do you feel unsafe when in the area

Dog fouling, beggars, alcoholics & drug users, dossers outside the train station

don't know above questions have to do with the licencing scheme

Drug dealing

Drug dealing

Drug dealing/drug use

drug use and begging

Drug, alcohol use and violence

Drugs

drugs and alcohol, plus violence associated with these issues, especially around the railway station a

drugs are a big problem in this area

drugs are a big problem in this area and lead to most of the above issues

Fed up with the lack of on street parking controls. Need some more yellow lining and CPZ

Groups of homeless/alcoholics hanging out outside my flat

High levels of homeless/professional beggars within the town centre

Homeless people

Homelessness which is only going to become worse by such a scheme!

How would licencing landlords ensure tenants act responsibly? Education is required!

I am told prisoners on Portland are taken to Weymouth when released and left there with no rail fare

I don't agree that these questions should be "funnelled" in this way and hope I can explain later

I wouldn't say there is any more general crime than anywhere else, its the drug issues that are bad

Impact of the Shopping decline as the whole town has an air of decay. Even the hotels are shabby.

Inconsiderate parking with no regards to the law or anyone but themselves.

Lack of community spirit, lack of care for local environment

Late licencing hours has led to the "going out clubbing" time to be near midnight, after home drinks

Living in this area the rents are very high resulting in our council having to top up rents

Multiple occupancy housing. Parking

Need more community activities other than pubs to further curb crime and anti-social behaviour

Noise from pub live "music" well outside its licensed hours (on a regular basis.)

Noisy at weekends particularly in summer

| |
|--|
| Not enough larger houses to rent to big families or are they affordable |
| Parking |
| Parking management |
| Poor heating and thermal insulation in many homes |
| poor policing of antisocial behaviour by a hardened few boozers / drug addicts |
| Private rented accommodation is the best controlled and maintained compared to other tenures. |
| Recently moved into the area - just feels quite run-down and needs a bit of TLC. |
| Resident parking |
| Small flats have no space to store all the different containers for recycling etc. |
| Some properties require visual enhancement by being properly maintained externally. |
| Stigma applies to living here. That discourages good tenants and dissuades landlords from improving |
| Street drunks / drug users / homeless / beggars etc - esp by station, sea front and town centre. |
| Tackle the homeless in Weymouth town centre |
| Tenants will be too scared to complete this survey sadly |
| The amount of alcohol licensed premises in the area |
| The amount of Dog Mess and Homeless is appalling |
| This question is unbalanced. Why not ask respondents to rank their responses? |
| too many HMOs - don't agree with them AT ALL |
| Vagrants in the shelters on the esplanade intimidating visitors and residents on a daily and nightly |
| with multi tenancy housing I am concerned about regulations regarding fire safety maintenance |

Q11 Please give details of the street/s and your reasons for removing them

All that do not have a problem that is not able to be managed using the current legislation protecting tenants.

This scheme will only deter people from buying house to rent out. As we are very short of property to rent out it is a very short sighted move. The council already has the legal powers it needs to take any problems there are, Without putting a stealth tax on landlords.

The Carriages blocks in Chelmsford Street. Already fully managed and maintained.

Lennox Street. A well to do area

You should not be targeting by area, you should be targeting by property/landlord for genuine cases of neglect. You can have a really good street with one landlord who either does not care or who, for whatever reason, cannot afford to upkeep a property. The other landlords should not be targeted who are upkeeping their properties well in the same street. There are already laws available to tenants who are living in uninhabitable properties. I do not at all agree that you should have a blanket scheme by area which points the finger at landlords who have spent good money on upkeep, and who genuinely care about their properties and their tenants. One of the major problems of Weymouth is that there are too many pubs and too few community activities for residents to be involved with. Landlords should not have to deal with their tenants fly-tipping or their behaviour; landlords already have to deal with such issues themselves. Tenants, who may seem completely respectable when they first mov

Custom House Quay, no lower end rental property there surely?

St Alban Street. Mainly shops and very few private landlords. All properties seem to be kept in good condition and for myself my landlord ensures any problems I have are dealt with immediately and I have the correct fire safety requirements including the stairway lighting should the electric go

the area of park street near the town centre adjacent to the car park is a quite residential area

As a whole I would suggest that property stretching from Gloucester Street to Custom House Quay is less saturated with HMO accommodation and bedsits, which are generally the sector that needs addressing

The harbour end of St Thomas Street and the other areas around the harbour, but generally I don't feel this scheme is warranted. It has been applied in another area of the country where I have a property that I let out and it really appears to be a money making exercise for the councils. Nothing is given back for the licence fee - nothing has changed in this area and besides what is being proposed here is an even higher fee than this £550-£625 is excessive and the council would need to prove what they plan to do with the money specifically to justify such money. One of the main issues with the town centre and proposed scheme area is homelessness and the subsequent drug and alcohol issues that are connected to this. Charging landlords such a fee on top of the exiting increase in stamp duty for purchasing a buy-to-let and tax changes is already having an impact on landlords and the degree of available properties which is serving to increase rents as fewer rental properties become available.

Most not in Park District

All of them, because I think this is unnecessary, prejudiced and misguided.

Chelmsford Street and Upwey Street, Upway Street because the area is of a good standard and the scheme would only force up our tenants rents making it worse for everyone in the area as a whole.

The area I live in is nice, people are fine and accommodation is good. May I suggest the council would serve the people of Weymouth more by having a good scheme to regenerate the town centre rather than penalising landlords. Those that should register won't and those that don't need to will just have to pay more when they already comply.

Chelmsford Street, and Upwey street as they are of a good standard and are definately not part of the most deprived areas of Weymouth and the scheme would only force up rents in the area making it worse for all tenants.

Chelmsford Street and Upwey Street, Upway Street because the area is of a good standard and the scheme would only force up our tenants rents making it worse for everyone in the area as a whole.

| |
|--|
| <p>Chelmsford Street and Upwey street, Upway Street because the area is of a good standard and the scheme would only force up our tenants rents making it worse for everyone in the area as a whole.</p> |
| <p>I think the council needs to justify their inclusion. Might be some streets where there are no rented properties or if there are perhaps these are very well managed- so why select them?</p> |
| <p>I do not agree with the scheme. Blaming landlords for Town Centre problems is not valid. Legislation exists for individual problems.</p> |
| <p>MELCOMBE REGIS. Ive lived here for some years and haven't noticed any problems different from any town near a prison area, near a railway station, but that not a landlords problem.</p> |
| <p>Blocks of purpose built flats that are actively managed by a Management Company or Managing Agent. Owners already pay to have the management in place that you are going to replicate.</p> |
| <p>All streets should be removed. Landlords should be allowed to run their properties. There is existing regulations available for tenants for issues raised.</p> |
| <p>All this seems to be putting forward something that would not be required IF the local authority specifically targeted the addresses where there are problems. This seems a way of raising money by the local authority from one town wherein the majority of housing including rented is well maintained.</p> |
| <p>Surely not all of Weymouth town centre suffers from the same problems. I have no knowledge that this map is accurately drawn according to the problems presented.</p> |
| <p>Chelmsford Street because there is the park church centre, which serves as a community facility. Also I let out xxxxxx & we now have our own Right to Manage company. We have regular meetings & contact with all residents, owners & tenants alike. This has engendered a real, proactive approach to address any issues such as bins, rubbish dumping, installation of gate to prevent using car park as shortcut from Victoria St (so stopping loitering behind flats) etc. The flats span a considerable part of Chelmsford St & there is a real community spirit. Although I have moved to Winchester due to husband's job relocation I lived in Weymouth for 23 years before this & was a member of St. John's Church, many of my friends still live in the Park district. I think yes, there are some streets - for example, Ranelagh Rd, where some properties are in disrepair which does not encourage pride in the environment around. But I do not believe Chelmsford St falls into that category</p> |
| <p>This is not needed in the whole area</p> |
| <p>We should be encouraging accomodation over shops and it is important that no action is taken that will act as a disincentive to this aim. I would therefore exclude St Thomas and St Mary's Streets</p> |
| <p>The Esplanade. Most buildings are commercial or hotels. The properties are listed so owners have to look after them properly.</p> |
| <p>The lower end of St Mary's Street (ie below st Edmund Street) is part of the harbourside community and has no affinity with the main part of the town centre</p> |
| <p>If there are problem dwellings then deal with them individually. No complete streets should be burdened with licensing costs. However attention of some other sort should be applied to the "landlords" shown to be failing their tenants within the designated area including in respect of their rental properties outside the area.</p> |
| <p>The Esplanade contains mainly hotels and guest houses.</p> |
| <p>Streets around the harbourside are not the same as streets in the town centre</p> |
| <p>I think the harbourside doesn't need to be included</p> |

All the residential areas should be removed as there are adequate routes to pressure Landlord to comply with the Law especially with the Homes (Fitness for Human Habitation) Act 2018 coming into force. All tenants receiving housing allowance should declare the identity of Landlord and thus the few properties that remain in poor condition can be targeted without making the entire area one big HMO which have the effect of devaluing all the private owner occupier properties in the area and further increasing the blight. Housing Associations have sold off properties which are not viable to raise their EPC to a fit level these properties are generally not mortgageable and where they sit empty increase blight. Private Landlords will have to do their own viability tests and I would expect many more properties to be up for auction in the near future. Incentives to completely renovate are needed and well controlled Building Improvement Grants are successful and help build communities if

All. Don't agree with it

All of them. Licensing landlords is not the answer. More social housing should be provided to rehouse tenants into better standards accommodation. The landlords providing run down, substandard accommodation would be forced to renovate to meet the standards expected by tenants.

The area around the train station is where there is Anti social behaviour is, dossers hanging about and being unpleasant. The council not only allow but openly encourage begging in the town by doing nothing to stop it. A walk along the sea front shows homeless, drunks and druggies sleeping in the shelters and the council do nothing about it. But rather than lead by example and deal with these unpleasant people the council ignore anything tricky and look to pick someone to kick and pay for it, ah yes the landlords.

All.

The Esplanade I think should not be a part of this, a high percentage of this area are hotels and B&B's the small amount of other properties are rental and of a high standard.

All of them as the introduction of the scheme would unjustifiably brand Melcombe Regis as a slum district

No sign of deprecation. Dorchester rd.

All the streets should be removed with the exception of HMOs as the extensive existing laws, EPCs, new deposit laws, gas & electrical safety laws, PAT testing, environmental health laws, the new laws of the right to have housing fit for human habitation & the new housing dispute resolution service all coming in nationwide in June 2019 all cover the normal private single dwellings, this is just overkill and swamp landlords unnecessarily, rents will go up for sure. I've read about this in Manchester and tenants have said for sure their rent has gone up & is a total waste of money as existing laws cover all this anyway. HMOs are the issue, I see it in my job everyday. There you have a completely different type of tenant to the the single dwelling tenant. There was so many empty & derelict properties before buy to let, but now the area has largely been rejuvenated, local environmental health officers have played a key role in this over the last 20years. Much has been achieved.

Esplanade ,Park street and Greenhill are very good ,only the HMOs and drug rehabs / hostels are problem in other areas .

I am concerned that the cost of the scheme will be directly passed on to the tenants. Having a total cover of all properties irrespective of whether they are problem ones or not pushes means that effectively all tenants will have to pay more if their rented property is part of the scheme. There is already a proportion of properties in the area that cost more than the Universal Credit (UC) allowances for housing benefit (HB). There is a high proportion of people on benefits having to visit foodbanks and going into debt. This is likely to make things worse for them.

the survey is showing a bias . It is not producing any evidence or documentation to back up any of the statements to give the person completing the survey an informed opinion . it is not showing any evidence or proof that by introducing a registration scheme that anything will improve by doing so. it is my understanding that there are already bodies within the council who can deal with any issues. On the face what i have seen so far it looks like a money making scheme for the council

St Thomas St. I don't see an issue with St Thomas St, it is generally clean and the bins are regularly emptied. The properties are generally clean and tidy

I don't agree with this proposal.

All the streets need to be removed, there's legislation in place already, I rent privately and my landlord is great, this scheme will clearly drive up costs for the tenant, with all the other costs ie sound and fire tests etc.

Wesley Street and Commercial Road as there don't seem to be any issues with either area

THE ESPLANADE Rental properties overlooking the sea are likely to be rented by professional people who already demand and receive proper standards of property management. At a time when tax changes are making property rental less profitable, the costs of licensing may well prompt landlords on the Esplanade to let their properties as Holiday lets instead, further reducing Weymouth's supply of quality rental properties. There is a problem in the Park District to be solved, but not with rental properties on The Esplanade

This proposal would adversely affect the whole Park St district and is not a solution to the problems in Melcome Regis. The main problem is crime e.g. stolen bicycles and criminal damage in the town centre. CCTV coverage and Police liaison needs to be improved.

All of them

commercial road and custom quay road The properties here are typically holiday let for short terms (viz 1 or 2 weeks) The visitors usually have selected the property from a web site which gives accurate details. The properties are rated on sites such as as trip advisor. A rogue landlord is soon exposed and he suffers from lack of repeat business if there are complaints.

All of them! I feel that this is just a way for the Council to try to raise more funds and it will put the rent up or make properties more difficult to come by. My son and daughter and their respective families have been born and raised in this area both live in this area and cannot afford to buy their own homes so if their landlords sell up they will both be homeless and looking for council housing which you don't have and so could not provide. this is a very BAD IDEA!

I live on Market Street and have rarely had any issues. I also do not agree with this proposed scheme because - even as a tenant and not a landlord myself - I believe it should NOT be a landlords responsibility to deal with anything other than their own property. The street itself and any anti-social behaviour by foot-traffic should remain the responsibility of the council and the Police. It is unrealistic to expect a landlord of a single property to be responsible for every thing that happens on the street outside.

| |
|---|
| Cake |
| If there are no issues on the relevant streets they should be excluded. Your questions are somewhat poised and seeking the answers you require. eg it sounds as if the proposal is all ready decided ! Perhaps you should deal with the antisocial landlords and the antisocial tenants. As a landlord, sometimes we a re saddled with a problem without any help from you. |
| The map appears to cover the whole of Melcombe Regis! A more detailed survey would have to be carried out in order to ascertain which streets could be removed and which ones definitely need help! I still cannot see how licensing private landlords is going to help this. There are rogue landlords (greedy and uncaring of their tenant or their property) and there are those who go out on a limb to help their tenants and are still misused and abused by them. Detailed discussions need to be carried out between Housing Dept and local landlords before this scheme is introduced, I feel. |
| Gloucester Lodge, 85 The Esplanade, as this was the Kings summer palace, I think the queen would be very upset to know that this has fallen into such decline |
| I used to work in the criminal justice system and some properties in some streets were renowned for housing offenders or ex-offenders, which contribute to anti-social behaviour and crime. Currently, there is the added problem of drug abuse. It is reckless and wrong to label all private landlords as irresponsible and blame them for the actions of their tenants. Some tenants are notoriously difficult to manage, and will commit anti-social behaviour in order to be evicted and then claim they are homeless, so they can obtain social housing. Also, surely it is the responsibility of the agencies who place their clients in private rented accommodation to supervise them and ensure that they retain that accommodation. Previously streets used to house such clients were Avenue Rd, Bath St, Belle Vue, Derby St, Dorchester Rd, East St, Market St, Turton St, Upway St, Walpole St, and Wesley St. You could also include Westwey Rd as that is where the Weston Probation Hostel is now situated. |
| St Thomas Street and most of Weymouth town centre. |
| Brunswick Terrace should not be on the list because is mostly hotels and all the properties are well maintained . It is not an area of low deprivation. |
| The scheme is unreasonable and will penalise good landlords, it needs tenants and landlords to both adhere to common decent standards, not a licensing scheme that is on the one hand revenue generating and on the other has costs associated with running it,resources can be better used on enforcement |
| Council need to stop housing people who do not respect property. A list of poor landlords and poor tennants would be invaluable. Poor landlords are the only ones who are going to give accomodation to bad tennants, and thd council know who they are but take no action. |
| If a property is in good condition and always has been , nothing has changed, why should you need a license, ??its only for your coffers |
| IF the scheme is adopted then many of the streets have good housing and also good retirement homes. William Street and those adjoining the Greenhill area should be excluded |
| The streets that appear to have a high level of houses that are in good condition should not be in the scheme |
| The esplanade .commercial road And great George street. These are major roads with large commercial interests and as such not influenced by the needs of tenants in rented property to the extent that other streets in the areas are heavily tenanted. |
| Custom house quay Lower st alban, bond & st Edmund streets. Problems don't seem to exist here as mainly shops, & I think private owner occupation accommodation. |
| scheme should only include HMOs where most of the problems are |

| |
|---|
| <p>all of them the council should provide housing not private landlords but as usual they just interfere with others who are doing what the council should themselves be doing. I think the council are interfering busy bodies and all they do is have meetings about nothing instead of actually doing what they should be doing</p> |
| <p>Either all streets in Weymouth and Portland should be included or none.</p> |
| <p>Some properties are and include business premisses as part of the building. Has the Council the staff and funds to set up and police all these locations for compliance should this scheme be approved. The other aspect is the cost of the licence will be passed on to the tenant, as in existing schemes in other Council Areas in the form of rent increases?</p> |
| <p>All ! If a BAD TENANTS register is not kept. Landlords need good referances for possible tenants / lodgers. An accesable file of "problem people" eg non payment of rent, ASB, public nuisance etc should be kept to help landlords avoid letting property / rooms to problamitic people. If you are to go ahead with this, you need to improve the Quality of tenants more so than the quailty of landlords or property!</p> |
| <p>The whole area should be removed from the scheme because many of the problems listed earlier should have been dealt with by the police or the council if they were doing their jobs correctly. This proposal is being used as an expensive excuse for the council and their staff not doing their jobs properly. This survey is also an appalling piece of opinion gathering by biased collection - it is a travesty.</p> |
| <p>I can only speak from my own experience as a landlord, and hear what the tenants say, which is:- the street is always quiet and not littered with rubbish, we also encourage our tenants to contact us or the agency should any problems occur with the property and we promptly rectify . Also I would not expect any tenant to live in any accommodation that I would not be happy to live in myself. Should this scheme go ahead I consider it to be a disaster, solely because the good landlords and tenants would have an extra cost but would not gain anything. This scheme seems to be a system to attack all for the sake of a few bad landlords. Surely it should be totally aimed at the bad landlords and tenants to pay.</p> |
| <p>The esplanade I have lived in Weymouth for 25 years now and never had a problem with my landlord or property You are just targeting everyone. Not just the bad landlords and lousy tenents private stealth tax yet again which will just mean the landlords will have to put up rents to cover the cost. Well done council.</p> |
| <p>Esplanade and Great George street and my reasons being are as follows: I have lived on Great George street for many years and i am now living on the esplanade and have been for appox ten years and have never experienced any issues that would validate this scheme in any way.</p> |
| <p>the Esplanade, it is on the sea front and is supposedly kept under maintenance through the council services. i.e litter picking, waste collection, anti social behaviour.</p> |
| <p>SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN INCLUDED</p> |
| <p>The Esplanade ... i have never experienced any problems living here that would justify this scheme and the rent increase...</p> |
| <p>I can see no reason why these streets are included and not all streets in Weymouth and Portland. There are a lot of privately owned houses and flats in the area and if you walk around it does not look any more deprived than other areas in Weymouth and Portland.</p> |
| <p>All of them.</p> |
| <p>I cannot see why only the odd numbers 1-33 Dorchester Road are included if no other part of Dorchester Road is included. I also think that if you go with this scheme then all of Weymouth and Portland landlords should be included. It is ridiculous just to licence Landlords in one particular area.</p> |

I do not have any impression that there are problems in any of the areas. With a group of others I manage a large block of flats and we deal with all the problems as they come along, including fly tipping and passers-by dropping things. This is not a fault of the landlord. The problems are more likely associated with alcohol, drugs and dependency and antisocial behaviour connected with these more than the housing. The run-down appearance of Weymouth is connected with empty shops, high parking fees (preventing people from nipping into town) and high business rates, preventing a healthy mix of larger and smaller shops. Changes to those might improve the town's image and provide more jobs rather than scapegoating landlords.

The only problem in this street of great George street is we need cctv and proper road markings for dropped curbs and parking

William st - decent road well looked after & bordering greenhill

Frederick Place is part of St Thomas Street and the properties are listed and look well maintained

All - we do not agree with this scheme at all, social housing is the problem area and their tenants. Housing Authorities do not care for the properties nor the tenants in the way private landlords do.

Atlantic Court situated in Gloucester Mews is a managed complex, self contained with security gates. applying the scheme purely by street is inappropriate

Q13 Please explain which streets you think should be excluded and why

Carlton road south has a high number of flats, in fact everything west of the Dorchester Road should be in the scheme

Areas in Westham close to the Swannery Bridge. Living conditions are very similar here.

Everywhere in Weymouth should be part of this scheme

I think the largest area possible should be included as this scheme is needed to bring up the standard of private rented housing in the area. But I DO NOT think landlords should need to help towards antisocial behaviour. It more the standard of properties and the energy efficiency that needs to be improved especially for tenants on low incomes.

The whole of Weymouth and Portland, several other areas are just as bad e.g. Littlemoor, Weston, Fortuneswell etc

Carton Road South, Glendenning Ave, Kirtleton Ave, all the reasons stated earlier - anti social behaviour, high % of flats rented out, lower income households etc.

Carlton Road and Dorchester Road both have a number of rented properties.

all street should be included - landlord should have a professional agent of some discription working for them

Abbotsbury road should be included as it also has a high number of properties that have private landlords - some are HMO's but most are bedsits/flats.

Carlton Road North and Carlton Road South. There are significant numbers of private rental properties in this area which could benefit from inclusion

Yes if your going to license one area surely all of Weymouth, Portland and surrounding areas need to be licensed.

I don't think it should be limited to additional streets. I think the scheme should also be applied to all areas surrounding melcome regis, such as chapelhay, littlemore etc.

| |
|--|
| <p>Carlton roads North and South and the roads linking them. There are a high proportion of rented houses in these roads and problems relating to drug abuse there which spills into areas close by.</p> |
| <p>I feel that if you are doing it for one area then it should be implemented across the board. Licences in a particular area only could cause landlords to stop buying in this area because of the cost and requirements that go with the licence which then has knock on effects. ie empty properties, squatting etc. There is then the chance that this makes the area even less attractive to buy in then it already is.</p> |
| <p>We feel that all of Weymouth rented property should be licensed to protect those who rent property</p> |
| <p>Carlton Road South/Glendingning Avenue appears to have a large number of privately rented properties. The area also has a large number of guest houses, bringing much needed tourism to the locality. The privately rented houses are in a poor state, houses are not maintained and litter and numerous general waste bins and recycling bins litter the pavements. This area does not show Weymouth at its best!</p> |
| <p>Abbotsbury Road</p> |
| <p>There has been recent problems of serious anti social behaviour associated with a property of multi occupation in Hanover Road.</p> |
| <p>Weymouth is a big area and as you said in the letter there are a lot of private tenants and I find when work needs doing private land lords have very deep pockets they take you rent money yet don't want to pay out when things go wrong</p> |
| <p>Hanover & Lyndhurst Road. Rationale; a number of the properties here are multiple occupancy and whilst most appear well managed there have been numerous problems with drug abuse and anti social behaviour in recent times with the foot bridge over the railway acting as an easy access/ escape route from problem properties. Drug dealers/users oft times use the park bridge and these roads as meeting points. In t he last two to three years a couple of properties have caused problems both in relation to drug abuse and ASB which took far too long to resolve.</p> |
| <p>the whole of weymouth and Portland, there are private and social housing landlords all over the area, why should it affect just the town centre</p> |
| <p>sorry to be honest but not studied area all I do know is houses concentrated around the train station and Bath street and town centre need urgent need of repair. All of the causes you are linking with depravation are very evident and need reformation of laws and regulations to stop what is affecting the whole of Weymouth in general. . I have experienced first hand disruption and crime increase in my area brought about by drugs usage and all that comes with that . This whole of Weymouth is blighted by this social imbalance . This is not helped when seemingly landlords rent out their property to all in sundry with no thought of what effect it has on the wider community. That is one symptom of indiscriminate renting but another is the increasing number of houses purchased and used as holiday rentals, the outcome is cars are parked up in a street for the length</p> |
| <p>The immediate area north and east of the Park District.</p> |
| <p>All Streets/Roads West of Dorchester Road - up to and including Carlton Road North. There is a very high percentage of rental properties in this area.</p> |
| <p>all properties should be included</p> |
| <p>a lot if areas in Weymouth central are in disrepair and in need of a facelift</p> |
| <p>shouldn't just be limited to the scheme area. should have other areas in Weymouth included</p> |

| |
|--|
| Entire area of Weymouth. If this scheme is beneficial to tenants why single out the Town Centre and Park District. |
| Carlton Road North/South |
| Carlton road north and south, kirtleton ave, |
| The council must be aware of this property and the catalogue of problems there |
| I think the scheme, if introduced, should be for a wider area, not just in the highest density private rented areas |
| All streets in the Borough should come under the same scheme otherwise the problems will just move from the Park District etc to areas outside the scheme area. |
| Abbotsbury Rd area |
| Consideration should be given to extending the area towards Lodmoor, on the Dorchester Rd, to include the Carlton Roads. There are appear to be a lot of privately rented properties in this area too resulting in similar issues. |
| cassiobury road and carlton road south |
| Area between Carlton Road South, railway and Lodmoor Hill. |
| The area bordered by Carlton Road North and Carlton Road South. This area also has evidence of drugs, antisocial behaviour, fly tipping, etc. As it borders the proposed area it may also become worse by attracting miscreants avoiding the demands of the new scheme in the adjacent neighbourhoods. |
| ALL the streets in the Ward should be included. There are numerous HMOs and rented properties in the Northern part of the Ward. |
| If licensing is introduced, it should be uniform across the borough. Whilst there clearly are identifiable problems within the proposed licensing area, such a targeted approach is discriminatory and bound to exacerbate issues rather than addressing them. |
| Rest of Dorchester Road |
| As the scheme is a forgone conclusion, it should cover all of Weymouth & Portland. |
| Carlton road |
| The whole of Weymouth & Portland would surely benefit from and should be included in this, otherwise you could have a situation whereby a landlord with several properties may have some in the area covered and some that aren't. This could lead to neglect of the properties outside of the scheme as they are forced to focus on the ones within the scheme for fear of reprisals, this will just move the problems to a new area. |
| Whole of Weymouth & Portland should be included as it's the only real way to improve conditions across the borough |
| All of weymouth town centre. If there needs to be a licence then it needs to be everywhere in the town council area for the same reasons as the current area. Same benefits for everyone or the problems just move to unlicensed areas. |
| Over the other side of the harbour |
| All landlords expecting housing benefit should be licenced. We have outsourced security of tenure as a county and landlords should be held accountable in exchange for taxpayers money. |
| The rest of Weymouth and Portland |
| Some streets further to the north should be included as there are many rented properties there |
| I believe all rental properties should be licensed to make sure they are not over crowded & meet fire regulations. |

| |
|--|
| Should be the whole borough and I would encourage Dorset Council to look at the same across the county. |
| Carlton road, north and south plus surrounding streets. High proportion of privately rented properties. |
| It should be a national requirement. There are too many rogue landlords and sometimes rogue estate agents in with them. They need regulating everywhere. |
| Scheme should be extended to include all roads up to the lower half of Dorchester Road (eg Kirtleton Avenue and Dorchester Road itself at least as far as Dorchester Road surgery. |
| Why limit the scheme to town centre and the Park District? The entirety of Weymouth and Portland should be covered by the scheme. |
| Most of Weymouth as there is problems everywhere |
| Why not impose the same licensing regulations for all landlords in the Weymouth and Portland area.? The problems are not exclusive to Melcombe Regis!! |
| Dorchester Road Lodmoor Hill as far as the doctors surgery |
| The whole of Weymouth needs to be included |
| ticked this as no option for don't know. |
| Dorchester Road - has more private rentals further up from 1 - 33 that could do with some repairs etc |
| The scheme should be extended over time to the whole Borough. Need to consider if the changes in local government will impact on proposals. |
| The whole of Weymouth and chickerell, as many private landlords are unaware of the impact their high priced poor quality property is having on the towns economy. Eg lack of disposable income for tenants and available housing for local people to buy to actually live in. Just fed up with homes being treated as investment instruments by wealthy city professionals, when everybody needs one. What's next service charges for air? |
| Wider area included....possibly including littlemoor, some portland and other known 'deprived' areas |
| If such a discriminatory scheme is to be brought into place all streets should be included and further still the scheme should include all of Weymouth otherwise those with private properties will sell up and this will only accentuate the issues |
| The area should be extended to include Westham. |
| North towards Carlton Road North where similar problems obviously exist. |
| Carlton Rd South, Carlton Rd North and area in the middle - similar properties in some areas |
| The whole of Weymouth & Portland |
| dorchester road - all of it - it is one of the main routes into town for visitors, high proportion of flats so i assume high proportion of rented. everything north of cassiobury road upto and including alexandra road. - high proportion of flats so i assume high proportion of rented. plus i live there and it can be a bit messy with some very tired looking houses |
| As many streets as possible will help tenants with rogue landlords. |
| Why is only 1 area of Weymouth being stigmatized with this perceived problem? There are so many areas not covered in this inclusion area which i believe are of a similar standard |
| Westham |
| If you plan to have licenses for the area proposed, you should apply to the whole area. There is no conscionable reason to apply just to this area. I would however say that licensing landlords I believe is counterproductive, it's just a way to tax "more" than already is. It may cause a landlord to "skimp" more than he does. |

| |
|--|
| <p>All the streets running between the railway line and Dorchester Road should be included as far as Milton Terrace as well as the houses on both sides of Dorchester Road up to that point. There are a considerable number of substandard private rented homes in that area, which is contiguous with the area proposed for including, and it would be ridiculous to exclude them.</p> |
| <p>The scheme should cover all areas of Weymouth & Portland and all homes rented out by private landlords whether they administer the property themselves or get a letting agency to do it for them.</p> |
| <p>North towards Alexandria Bridge across to Dorchester Rd.</p> |
| <p>Streets which have to dispose of household waste in sacks.</p> |
| <p>Carlton Road Melcombe Regis This area is one of the 12 areas in Dorset (9 of which are in W&P) falling within the 20% most deprived in England for multiple deprivation. (The Indices of Deprivation 2015 a summary report for Dorset County Council)</p> |
| <p>It should be same rules for everyone</p> |
| <p>Rogue landlords offering substandard accommodation are not confined to the selected area</p> |
| <p>The landlord and builder of this property, should never ever be allowed to be landlords again. The building in question was damp, as there were no condensation barriers in the ceilings, there was water ingress firstly from the terraces above and then from cracked stonework outside, the extraction fans went nowhere and no gas flu inspection hatches had been fitted when they should have been. Over £5 million had to be spent on rectification work paid for by the developers' insurers, thanks to the dogged persistence of a disgruntled flat owners' group. The developers continued to deny that there was anything wrong with the flats, a line they particularly spun re their own tenanted flats. However they were forced to have them done as well, because otherwise the building work guarantee would be invalidated; At no time did my late father or I have any information from the landlord or his agent as to what was going to happen and when.</p> |
| <p>Carlton Road (South & North), Kirtleton Ave, Glendenning Ave, Hanover Road.</p> |
| <p>Probably...</p> |
| <p>Everywhere around the railway station, King Street, the bit round the bus station, behind there - sorry can't remember the names of the streets.</p> |
| <p>The area should encompass most of Weymouth and Portland. Private rental issues don't stop in the town centre</p> |
| <p>Westwey Road, specifically Weston Probation Hostel. Westham and Littlemoor also have problem areas. Do you intend to include social housing landlords in the scheme? Or is it just private landlords, who will have to pay you money, which, I believe, is the real reason behind this.</p> |
| <p>Westham has much the same problems as this area</p> |
| <p>The rest Weymouth. I know people who are renting in other areas of Weymouth, who try to look after their homes ask for help with matters like mice or repairs to their homes and the landlords or managing agents do nothing</p> |
| <p>Carlton road south has a high proportion of flats why is it not included?</p> |
| <p>Carlton Road South Glendinning Avenue I have seen a number of adults who appear drunk walking around. One man was urinating in someone else's front garden in daylight hours when I was walking with my 3year old niece. Also, coughing and spitting flem. Also found broken beer bottles here.</p> |
| <p>Littlemoor should be included as there is a high proportion of private rental properties there. Some of these Tenants cause anti-social behaviour and high crime rates.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>Carlton Rd South and Cassiobury Rd also contain some privately rented dwellings (some multi-let mainly in Carlton Rd South) and may also be the source of some of the highlighted issues, and the targeted assistance that might be deployed in the area could be a real help to some of these residents too.</p> |
| <p>This should be a nationwide proposal.</p> |
| <p>Pottery lane for the high level of crime and drugs.</p> |
| <p>The licencing scheme should also include estates like Littlemoor and Southill</p> |
| <p>A scheme should include all private rented properties there are such poorly looked after areas such as chapelhay, westham to name a few the idea of painting over only the side of town that visitors to the area see is a cop out private landlords should be held accountable more severely than the current legislations allow. Also there should be tighter control on what is believed to be 'fair rent' private landlords should not be allowed to exponentially increase rent year on year it should be proportionate to the mortgage on the property say 10 15%more bot double!</p> |
| <p>The Weymouth area in general, all streets so the scheme benefits all residents. However as a trial basis the current map is sufficient</p> |
| <p>I don't agree with in being just melcombe regis.It should either be the whole of weymouth and Portland as a borough, or none at all.</p> |
| <p>Ferndale road</p> |
| <p>Carlton road north & south Glendinning Avenue Similar problems, unkempt, rubbish, etc.</p> |
| <p>Carlton Road South and Kirkleton Road areas (lower west Lodmoor area) because there are many houses for multi occupancy and for various service users.</p> |
| <p>The entire borough</p> |
| <p>We live next door to flats where the property isn't maintained properly and i'm unsure if it is even listed as two flats or of there is fire regs in the property. It seems landlords make a lot of money without any disregard to their tenants safety and well-being.</p> |
| <p>If there is to be such a thing as a landlord licencing scheme then it should include all landlords in Weymouth and Portland and all streets.</p> |
| <p>All of the Council area. eg W&P B Council, Weymouth Town Council or even Dorset Council! That would be fair and inclusive to cover EVERYONE / EVERYWHERE in ANY probrerty, with out discrimination of area or income or situation</p> |
| <p>I thought all Landlords would have to be Licensed. all streets to be licensed.</p> |
| <p>I believe the whole of the area should be included to enable a true reflection / comparison and also it would not then make certain streets feel they are being selected by status. The area, in my opinion, attracts a types of people e.g. poor, those affected by background or prison records, unemployed and those with mental issues because the rents can be cheaper. These vulnerable people can then be prayed upon by the worse types of society. A register of landlords would help but getting those residents be made responsible for cleanliness and may improveand make them become more proud of the area too.</p> |
| <p>Properties in Carlton road north and south could be included as they have a lot of rental accommodation.</p> |
| <p>There are always some landlords that need encouragement to manage their propertied well</p> |
| <p>I don't agree with the scheme but it if you license one area you should licence all.</p> |
| <p>Throughout Weymouth there are other areas with the same problems, esp Littlemoor and Westham. The same rules should apply all over.</p> |
| <p>St Mary's Street St Thomas Street</p> |
| <p>is Bath street included?it needs to be,plus a few streets on the outskirts of the park district,carlton road south and north and the convent.they have social problems as well.</p> |

I don't agree with the scheme but if it comes into being It should be everywhere or nowhere! I have been a landlord for 30 years in this area. I make sure my properties are in a good state of repair, Over thirty years I have rarely had any problems. I make sure my properties are in a good state of repair, Over thirty years I have rarely had any problems with tenants. I would obviously attend to waste and littering but with our waste management system in Weymouth there is not a problem. I cannot see how a Landlord can be responsible for anti-social behaviour, surely that is a matter for the police? It can actually happen in all areas of Weymouth and Portland.I think that it is an outrageous statement to say high levels of crime are associated with the private rented properties. I do not think the appearance of the proposed are is poor. Private owners and many tenants take pride in where they live.with tenants. I would obviously attend to waste and littering but with our waste manageme

Abbotsbury Road and all streets leading off - Ilchester Road, Holly Road etc...

streets within the Westham area

If you have a scheme everywhere should be included

I do not agree with the scheme but if it comes in to practise then either everwhere should be included or just houses in multiple occupation, The Bus and accommodation for people released from prison!

Carlton Road North and South as many HMOs

Charlton Road south and north, Glendining avenue, Kirkleton Avenue due to many HMOs

Q15 Please provide details below of any conditions that you feel

1. The first item should already be in place and 2. I would think the security of the property is paramount to any landlord. 3. I feel sure most landlords have better things to do with their time than monitor his tenants' anti-social behaviour or that of his visitors! That is not the job of the landlord although I suspect most would like to know the calibre of their tenant before offering them his property! As we are all aware, drugs are the cause of much of the problems associated with 'a bad tenant' - how can a landlord, whether licensed or not - address that? 4. A good landlord would want to maintain external areas although should not have to be responsible for clearing tenants' waste from front gardens for example if it has been dumped by them. Tenants have to face up to their responsibilities too. 5. A good idea but more expense to landlord if not already in place and unless enough time is given for these improvements.

1. The government's "conditions" outlined above are a pre-requisite, irrespective of any licensing regime. 2. Notwithstanding the general agreement to the "other conditions" (above), such conditions should not be necessary on the basis that any licensing scheme should only entitle good, responsible landlords to operate.

A good landlord does all on this list and does not need a license, and our tenants are carefully selected by the agency.

Adequate facilities are provided for the disposal of waste, and landlords should ensure that tenants are aware of the facilities. If waste is not disposed of properly, the the landlords are responsible and should be fined

Affordable heating and energy efficiency sound like major expenses for a landlord, so may well result in rent increases

Agree with all the above.

All above are OK but again, they would be difficult for a holiday rental landlord to control due to the short term and not even meeting the tenants. As a holiday rental all the legal requirements are met as a minimum requirement for the contract with Dream Cottages.....even further. I recently had to upgrade the electrical system to qualify for the new electrical compliance certificate.....I would not have had to do this for a straight rental property.

All of the conditions above are normal policy. Gas safety certificates, electrical appliance safety, smoke alarms, carbon monoxide alarms, tenant references and tenancy agreement are all normal procedures for Landlords and most must be done to make a tenancy legal and enforceable.

All should be removed as are covered in existing letting agreement. It should not need a license process to mandate a letting agreement.

All the above should be Conditions, the Tenant goes into a home that is safe, clean and well maintain just like you would hopefully get with council housing.

All the conditions in Q14 are not necessary. As a responsible landlord we manage our properties well.

All the standard conditions already must apply by law to all rented properties with the exception to tenancy references. However private landlords and their agents are red hot on taking references. The extra conditions the scheme say could be required are conditions that should be applied to the tenants not the landlords.

anti social behaviour by tenants / visitors - If a register of BAD TENANTS is kept this will help avoid a lot of these issues. If you are to go ahead with this, you need to improve the Quality of tenants more so than the quality of landlords or property!

Anti social behaviour would be less of an issue if the police bothered to do anything when it was reported. So I think some of the responsibility for that should lie with the police.

Anti-social behaviour isnt really an issue that the landlord should have to deal with after the tenant has moved in. Perhaps the contract should have an anti-social clause in it - contracts to come from the council and if anyone is convicted of anti-social behaviour it would be out of the landlords hands ...the tenant would be evicted automatically with local authority support to the landlord.

Any decent letting agent already covers these things - perhaps you should consider some register for approved letting agents and offer some dispensation for Landlords who let via these?

Any requirements need to be reasonably compilable by a landlord otherwise will be next to useless and only lead to increased "red tape" and an increase in rents or indeed landlords selling their properties so less private low cost rentals will be available in future. Other areas of Weymouth may not be so convenient and suitable for the type of people currently renting in the area. Unfortunately we have very few formal social landlords and low cost private rentals are essential. There is a real need to ensure licencing does not drive private landlords away. I leave the Council to balance the pros and cons of licencing as there are many.

| |
|---|
| <p>As a landlord in the area I do not know which of the other properties are let or otherwise. I have seen and paid for the removal of fly tipping and our house suffers graffiti and casual damage from drunk passers by. We have reported drug dealing suspicions before, but no response was ever provided. I have talked with councillors but no real solution has been found so far. We have lost good tenants from fear of walking back from the station to Walpole Street after dark. The back alleys seem to be the problem as they provide areas for meeting up / drinking / buying and selling drugs which are mostly out of sight of the public. I am told that HMP brings prisoners when released from Portland to Weymouth and then leaves them there with no onward rail tickets. I do not know if this is true or not but the district does seem to have more people of the street doing nothing than one would see elsewhere.</p> |
| <p>AS LANDLORD IN LONDON, THERE ARE MANY THINGS IN THIS SURVEY, BUT, THEY MUST BE ADHERED TO AND CHECKED, NOT JUST LEFT BECAUSE YOU HAVE NO STAFF TO CARRY OUT CHECKS. MUCH MUCH MORE ONUS MUST BE PLACED ON THE TENANTS TO LIVE DECENTLY AND DON'T LET THEM ASSUME IT IS SOMEONE ELSE'S PROBLEM. I HAVE A NUMBER OF FLATS IN LONDON REMAINING EMPTY BECAUSE I WILL NOT SUBSIDIZE THE GOVERNMENT ON UNIVERSAL CREDIT. IT IS GROSSLY UNFAIR TO CHARGE FOR A LICENCE AND THEN DO NOTHING FOR THAT MONEY, IT IS PRIMARILY A MONEY MAKING SCHEME FOR THE COUNCIL, COUNCIL TAX PAYERS DON'T GET VALUE FOR MONEY.</p> |
| <p>Checking over crowding by subletting</p> |
| <p>Chelmsford street and upwey street, upway street because the area is of a good standard and the scheme would only force up our tenants rents making it worse for everyone in the area as a whole.</p> |
| <p>Consideration should be given to ensuring provision that where vulnerable people are being housed, landlords will engage with other support services as required to assist with the ongoing maintenance and management of tenancies.</p> |
| <p>Council liable for the tenant behaviour and treatment of property if they paying housing benefit and have standards expected of landlord if being paid via housing benefit.</p> |
| <p>Damp and mould problems, where building related.</p> |
| <p>Don't think this scheme should be introduced</p> |
| <p>Easier removal of antisocial tenants. It is not normally the landlord who is antisocial. Landlords would generally like good law abiding respectable tenants who pay their way and respect the property.</p> |
| <p>Energy efficient homes in largely older housing stock within the licencing area is cost prohibitive unless centralized grants are made available. You cant expect old homes to have much in the way of energy efficiency unless they have undergo significant works/structural makeover. Getting landlords to carry this out will be difficult and has the potential to either remove property from PRS or drive rented homes underground. Achieving band E on older property many with solid walls is already difficult.</p> |
| <p>Ensuring adequate provision for waste removal</p> |
| <p>External areas I take it you mean gardens. Anti social behavior by visitors is down to tenants. What about anti social behavior by visitors to owner occupied houses surely the same applies.</p> |
| <p>Fines for shoddy landlords</p> |
| <p>Fire safety</p> |
| <p>For tenancy agreements to be valid most of the above proposals have to be adhered to. I can not see how a landlord can deal with anti social behaviour, surely that is a matter for the police?</p> |

Give careful consideration to attempts to control peoples way of life and also to trying to turn landlords into policemen.

Good landlords do all these things anyway, isnt this just going to increase rents?

Honesty this is far too much meddling as already stated it is only going to cause more issues !! I am a reputable landlord having rented out properties for 18 years and always go through an agent with a proper tenancy agreement - which most sensible landlords will do! This is only going to cause more cost and issues forcing landlords to sell or increase rents to cover what is already a difficult market for landlords !!

Housing Benefit - how many tenements are supported from outside Weymouth and Portland

How is a landlord supposed to control a tenant fly tipping or littering? The majority of those other terms are already legal requirements so they are adding nothing.

I think all is covered but overall my conclusions are on the whole thing is that definitely it is time for landlords to recognise what goes on in the community pick up the responsibilities of that not just pocket the rental and the end of the month I am pleased here are serious moves on this but surprised this hasnt been addressed with private landlords before to be honest loads of people are having to turn to private rental but equally a high percentage need housing benefit so am wondering why this hasnt been initiated before . It is such a difficult time for Councils police schools hospitals to cope I do realise that of course , There is no easy answer but i think the scheme is a positive one for Weymouth , Weymouth has a lot to offer and the houses are spacious well designed and could make beautiful homes

I already let my property through an accredited letting agent. It is required by law that my property conforms to government requirements. If my property does not conform, the letting agent will not let my property because if they did so, they would be in breach of their operating licence. Using the agent ensures that I am not breaking the law and that my tenant is living in a safe and well maintained property. If the law changes and I need to adapt the property to meet the law, then the agent notifies me and arranges the work on my behalf and bills me accordingly. The proposed introduction of this licencing scheme IGNORES and does not acknowledge the essential service responsible landlords pay for by doing everything properly and above board through a letting agent.

I believe that this scheme is being considered as an alternative to sorting out any problems using the powers the authorities already have. I believe that landlords are being made scapegoats for anything their tenants do wrong, and that this scheme is easier and more lucrative than actually tackling the issues.

I certainly do not think landlords should help address anti-social behaviour. They do not have the resources to do this and could be subject to potential harm, this is a job for the police not the landlord.

I disagree with this because I disagree that ALL landlords should be licensed, irrespective of whether they are managing their current property well or not.

I do not agree with this licensing scheme full stop by road or region. Why not impose a penal licence upon landlords who are not upkeeping their properties properly instead? I cannot see that it is justifiable to waste money unnecessarily targeting landlords who upkeep their properties well as a matter of course. This would be a waste of local government resources. There are already laws to combat landlords who are not upkeeping their properties to the required standard, it sounds as though the penal system requires modification to make it more effective... rather than including targetting perfectly good landlords.

| |
|--|
| <p>I do not feel that I wish to respond to the above as the landlords that my children have keep the property in good order; maintain the properties exteriors and ensure that the properties are secure. As for Antisocial behavior - do you want their landlords to do a job that the Police and you should be doing? question your reasons for this - I feel that you are just trying to raise extra money and get out of doing your jobs.</p> |
| <p>I do not think landlords can be held personally responsible to tenant's anti social behaviour however this does not mean they should not be involved in the process of addressing such behaviour</p> |
| <p>I do not think that it should be down to a landlord to control behavior or tenants this could potentially put them selves at risk and there is nothing that they can do as a person to control another person. The maintenance of external areas should be down to the tenant and again not the landlord. All other area I only agree to as we already have these in place.</p> |
| <p>I don't agree with licensing as laws already exist to protect tenants and good landlords should not have to pay for bad landlords to be chased up.</p> |
| <p>I don't agree there should be license and therefore I disagree with any conditions imposed on something I think is a completely pointless and bureaucratic nonsense.</p> |
| <p>I don't agree with the scheme</p> |
| <p>I feel the tenants need to be involved, take responsibility with anti-social behaviour by themselves and their visitors. Maybe if their landlords were more hands on with all the other conditions above, then the anti-social problem may then be addressed by the tenants being treated in a humane manner.</p> |
| <p>I have been very aware of the deterioration of the fabric of the buildings, many of which are grade 2 listed. Landlords should be made aware of their duty to maintain the quality of both the actual building and aesthetics. Councils should play their part in encouraging the occupants to take a pride in their area for instance the council (at last) power washed Wesley Street and the improvement is enormous. Up until then, it was weed strewn and dirty. I personally noticed a lessening of the rubbish being left out after the cleaning. It should be done regularly.</p> |
| <p>I haven't really had any issues since I moved in nearly a year ago. I knew when I moved into town there was a chance of noise from the shops and clubs/bars in the area, so that was my choice. I havent really needed anything from my landlord, as the estate agents has dealt with a couple of small issues I had, and they carried out a 6 month check after I had moved in to check everything was ok and that I was looking after the place, so I can't really pass judgement or have an opinion on other properties, tenants or land lords.</p> |
| <p>I live next door to a privately owned rented out property...it is like a house in Beirut with plaster falling off the external walls and windowsills. I contacted the owner about the state of repairs....he wasn't interested in repairing. It used to be a lovely house owned by a lovely lady. If I look to sell my property it is an absolute eyesore for potential buyers (not to mention any problems that I may incur from his house`s disrepair i.e travelling damp, etc).</p> |
| <p>I thin the landlord has enough regulation to deal with, so I would not be happy with anymore responsibility</p> |
| <p>I think it should be the tenants who ought to be licenced , anybody who rents a propery should have the responsibility fore their own waste disposal & keeping the property clean . Anybody being antisocial should be controlled by the due process of the law . A lot of tenants think they can treat a propery without any care because they don't own it . This is all about getting a society that is responsible for their own actions . When I rented a flat it was in better condition when I left than when I took it on .</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>i think no conditions should be added the landlords are being ripped off enough the council should be taking responsibility in helping landlords getting their rent on time and encouraging tenants to look after the property. the landlords are doing a good thing by providing homes</p> |
| <p>I think that conditions such as gas safety, fire safety are already legal requirements. I do not understand how a landlord is supposed to deal with anti social behaviour of tenants or their visitors. They have no enforce powers. Many of the properties in this area are listed and so by nature not energy efficient.</p> |
| <p>I think that if all these points were covered that Weymouth would recover it's former reputation for a good and safe town.</p> |
| <p>I think there are plenty of schemes available to help landlords in the area provide suitable homes for tenants such as the recent scheme to improve affordable heating provision.</p> |
| <p>I think this proposal should maybe only apply to houses in multiple occupation</p> |
| <p>If a landlord repeatedly fails to observe the various conditions, the council should be able (as a last resort) to permanently close the HMO and move the tenants elsewhere.</p> |
| <p>If a property is rented out to tenants then surely responsibility falls to the tenant to not be anti social and if they are perhaps this is a matter for the Police? not a private landlord. Good landlords can manage their own properties they don't need the council to be involved. There are already Energy Performance Certificates and legislation relating to Energy Efficiency so again we don't need this to be licensed.</p> |
| <p>If you are looking to reduce tenants cost , will licensing not cause rents to increase?</p> |
| <p>It is the responsibility of the police to tackle anti-social behaviour unless it is in your property and if the tenant is not ensuring this doesn't happen then that is already the landlords responsibility, the tenant is responsible for all areas of the property internally and externally in as much as keeping it clean and tidy, if they do not then the landlord should intervene, it is already the landlords responsibility to ensure the property is secure and energy efficient, this is just a clever way of preparing landlords for an extra tax and I resent this due to the fact I under charge my tenant to stay at the property to ensure a long tenancy, I maintain the property as it is in my interests and I already comply with the law, by all means go after bad landlords but if good landlords are forced to sell up due to government/council greed then you will have an even bigger housing crisis than you already do! quite frankly I find it insulting that you should add costs to my already measly</p> |
| <p>It should be down to the tenant to ensure that heating is adequate. In the old days, a coal fire hearth would do; now; of course, we all need central heating. As a private tenant (although not renting the property) I am responsible for this. I don't see why the landlord should be; especially when a large proportion of those renting in these areas are paid for by Government funding ()my money) any way</p> |
| <p>It's all covered by existing & new legislation in June 2019. HMOs and hostels may need explanation of simple rules but single dwelling tenants are fully capable to get on with life. Ridiculous nannyng leading in these questions.</p> |
| <p>Landlord already have to provide gas safety checks and other before tenants sign contracts. why is additional red tape added and landlords have to pay for this.</p> |
| <p>landlords are not social workers and can not control their tenants behaviour . all of the above points are covered by existing legislation</p> |
| <p>Landlords do not have the means to be able to address anti social behaviour by visitors. That is a police matter</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Landlords may well be intimidated by bad tenants and also may not be aware of the problems they cause. Neighbours who wish to complain will quite often not know the landlords name and address / telephone number. Within the proposed scheme should be a requirement for landlords to give their contact details to neighbouring properties so that problems can be reported. Landlords should also be assured they will have the support of the Police when they have a problem with a tenant. Zero tolerance of drugs would be a good start as this is the root of the problem.</p> |
| <p>Landlords should be responsible for their tenants behaviour</p> |
| <p>Landlords should be responsible for ensuring that tenants adhere to the proper arrangements for refuse/recycling disposal. The "wrong bins" are frequently left out for days which encourages gulls and leads to refuse littering the streets.</p> |
| <p>Landlords should look after the outside of the building of course, but the street outside should remain the responsibility of the council. The other things on the list I believe are already a legal requirement of a landlord: addressing anti-social behaviour by tenants, security of property and good property management (inc: repairs, annual gas checks, etc). Finding suitable heating suppliers should be up to the tenant and who they want to use.</p> |
| <p>Landlords shouldn't be made to be responsible for things they have little control over such as antisocial behaviour which they often don't witness personally. It should be the responsibility of the council and police to gather evidence from complaints and then present this to the landlord if eviction is considered necessary.</p> |
| <p>Maintaining external areas wouldn't include gardening but certainly fences, windows, pathways etc. Security being a minimum level or door and window security etc.</p> |
| <p>Make it easier and meaningful for neighbours to contact regulators, owners and agents about nuisances.</p> |
| <p>Management of rubbish collection/storage. Repair and appearance of exteriors of rented out properties, a "good look" at the prices charged for rents given the size/condition of the properties.</p> |
| <p>Mandate high efficiency light bulbs.</p> |
| <p>Many buildings are listed which means they cannot be as energy efficient as they could be. My building has sash windows which are not efficient at all but they can't be changed. So unless restrictions are lifted you can't ask everyone to be fully efficient as it's not a level playing field. I'd love more insulation but can't replace my windows for better insulated ones!</p> |
| <p>Many of the above are statutory requirements for privately renting property and are included on the tenancy agreement, EPC, CP12 etc. Please don't assume that all private landlords in the proposed scheme area neglect their responsibilities. There are obviously many properties in the proposed scheme area that fall far short of the statutory requirements and that these landlords do not fulfil their legal obligations. In an ideal world these should be prosecuted for not complying, but obviously this does not happen. If Dorset Council can bring about positive change it will be an improvement but I worry that responsible landlords will pay the licencing fee and others will avoid this and continue renting substandard properties as they have done for many years.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>Most landlords do provide all the above, without the need for a licence and thereby having to pay a fee to yourself. As stated earlier, the onus should be on the tenant to behave in an appropriate manner. Should the landlord not comply with basic regulations, there is always redress via the Courts. When a tenant does behave in an anti-social manner, and the landlord tries to remove the tenant from the property via County Court procedures, these can be lengthy, costly, and are now weighed in the tenant's favour. I pity current private landlords as the council appears to be carrying out a witch hunt instead of targeting offenders, merely to extract more money into the council's coffers to waste on ill thought out schemes.</p> |
| <p>Most landlords rent through agents who insist on all the above How can a landlord correct antisocial behaviour? They are NOT the police</p> |
| <p>My only concern is that overregulation will remove properties from the rental market, this driving up rents, debt, homelessness and the cost to the taxpayer.</p> |
| <p>New tenants should be told about recycling etc.</p> |
| <p>no licence required. the contract defines the conditions. tenants and landlords are responsible for their part of the contract. the gov escrow system safeguards the deposit for both parties.</p> |
| <p>No tenant should be Allowed to sub let property</p> |
| <p>None should be applying.</p> |
| <p>Our block of flats is currently prevented from installing gas central heating due to the FREEHOLDER not responding to enquiries. This is again not the fault of landlords.</p> |
| <p>parking</p> |
| <p>Parking permits should only be allocated to the tenants NOT absent landlords</p> |
| <p>Policing the living choices of tenants is not a role for landlords . Unsocial behaviour when it occurs is already containable by current legislation. The government acknowledge the importance of giving individuals choice in managing their life choices. To expect landlords to encroach on that freedom is a breach of their human rights</p> |
| <p>Potential Amendment: tenant reference to be obtained. There will be a number of potential private tenants who will be unable to obtain a reference, for good reason. It would be helpful in reducing homelessness locally, perhaps, if the council would underwrite such tenants vis a vis rent and damage. Landlords must feel confident that their tenants will not cost them money and inconvenience - but everybody has to live somewhere. There is very little social housing. Where are the vulnerable members of society to live if not in private rental property? potential addition: 'maintaining external areas' is mentioned. That is stuff like bushes, grass and concrete frontage, yes? Windows and doors and in some cases the whole outside of the house shows signs of neglect. Properties should be made at least weatherproof. If the outside looks like that, what is the inside like? That too should be pleasant to live in, redecorated regularly, or the tenant could be permitted to redecorate for a rent r</p> |
| <p>Price of rents capped so they are affordable</p> |
| <p>Private Landlord rent for profit. I would think all these provisions are already in all standard Tenancy Agreements the issue is one of consequences of management of poor tenants. Poor tenants cancel profit. Badly maintained buildings cancel profit. Since the rents are lowest in Weymouth in this area this is where the tenants who are challenged by skill, circumstances and health can potentially find somewhere to live. Private Landlord under pressure will stop providing homes and when they are no longer wanted as tenants where will they go? Mental Health support available is not enough. There are enough people sleeping rough in Weymouth. Good purpose built supportive accommodation is needed and there is no profit in this type of accommodation.</p> |

Private landlords already do a good job of looking after their property - after all it's in their interest to have well maintained places with good tenants. Landlords cannot be held responsible for the actions of others - anti-social behaviour and littering etc.

Private lettings via licensed agents already conform these conditions

PRIVATE RENTED PROPERTIES NOT TO INCLUDE BENEFIT CLAIMERS, NEXT DOOR TO ME THEY DRINK ALL DAY AND ARE EXTREMELY NOISEY, IM ALMOST A PENSIONER LIVING ON MY OWN AND FEEL VULNERABLE VERY OFTEN. PARKING IN CAROLINE PLACE SHOULD BE RESIDENTIAL ONLY NOT FREE FOR 1 HOUR

Private tenants should not feel like second class citizens. If they pay their rent and do not cause trouble they should be entitled to live in peace and quiet. Landlords should ensure that their tenants lives are not made a misery by other tenants. Anti social behaviour should not be tolerated.

Property owners should be held to account for poor or non-existent management of their property.

provide proper housing yourselves and leave the private landlords alone. stop holding back tenants housing benefits without proper cause why should landlords have to wait for weeks on end with no rent while you lot try to find idiotic ways of not paying up stop wasting our taxpayers money with your useless schemes and put the money to where it should go if you actually ensured the landlords actually got their rent and on time they might actually be able to afford to spend money on maintenance and repairs.

Providing adequate bags and boxes for rubbish and somewhere to store them. Too many blue bin bags left outside for seagulls to pick at

Refuge problems these are very poor in our street myself and other residents feel the use of wheelie bins would improve the problem and also make the street look more appealing and tidy as at the present moment the street is just a huge waste bin with rubbish bags and recycling bins left sprawled in the street dirty nappies sanitary items aswell as food waste all over the street ...many of us residents try our hardest to make the street look nice I.e flower baskets planters etc but the refuge problem spoils our hard efforts and is unhealthy an environmental hazard and totally unpleasent for us residents

rental increase restrictions capped to CPIH

Responsibility for managment of waste and fly tipping:- why on earth should the landlord be solely responsible for (and pay for costs associated with) the accumulation of waste outside the property? Surely this is a joint responsibility? Making the landdord responsible gives tenants the statutory right to just chuck all their waste outside the property! Don't want to get rid of your old sofa? No worries - just chuck it into the garden and the landlord has to devote time and money to removing it for you. Please THINK about the longer term implications of making poor tenants not responsible for their waste - by all means make the landlord responsible for removing HIS OWN waste. Anti social behaviour: I've said no to this because the landlord does not have much legal power over this matter. It is everyone's responsibility to report anti social behaviour to the council/police etc. The landlord in reality has very limited personal power over who the tenant invites to visit the property

Rubbish and recycling to be addressed to new tenants when taking over

Should be a two-way street - need responsible tenants as well, who pay their rent on time, look after the property, aren't a nuisance, allow access to the property for repairs/maintenance, don't lie, cheat and steal from the landlord, damage things and claim not to know anything about it so the landlord ends up paying for their damage (my experience).

Sound insulation, mould and damp cause big issues. Roof insulation where easy to do so

Sub letting

TENANT REFERENCES: Tenant references should be discretionary for the Landlord to obtain. References "can" be unfair to individuals with history of substance misuse, mental health issues or debt problems. Potential Tenants may have 'recovered' and been in recovery for a long time, but may be stigmatised and rejected by Landlords if there is a history of certain issues on their record. ENERGY EFFICIENCY: The proposed area has many Grade II listed and older properties in it. Providing decent energy efficiency in such buildings maybe difficult due to single glazing, lack of cavity walls, etc. Grade II and older properties should not be penalised if they are not as efficient compared to newer properties. SECURITY OF PROPERTY: I presume this simply means decent door locks and possibly window locks. I do not believe it should include burglar alarms particularly in HMO properties.

tenants need to care about the home they live in and enviroment

Terms and conditions relating to rubbish and behaviour of tenants and their visitors especially, sound more like turning landlords into a policing force. Already landlords have to prove prospective tenants have the right to rent in UK . There are already statutory requirements for landlords to carry out many of the proposed licence holder requirements.

The above conditions are already implemented at our properties. Also free central heating, as most tenants will not heat their property to avoid condensation problems. and free wi-fi.

The Carriages blocks of flats in Chelmsford Street are already subject to these requirements and are fully managed. They do not have gas. Electric heating is the only option

The condition re: anti-social behaviour by tenants and visitors is unworkable when many Landlords do not live in/on the property. Therefore this should be amended although the tenancy agreement should have a clause to the effect that such behaviour WILL NOT be tolerated and WILL lead to eviction.

The cost of doing this will be passed on in the monthly cost to tenant who will not be able to afford the increase and so will then move to another area of Weymouth and so it will continue. I would suggest you stop hailing such a paternal approach and allow people to choose where they live.

The council do not look after their own portfolio correctly. Parks are not cut, the harbours walls are falling down, the seafront chalets were cordoned off due to being unstable. How can a new army of clipboard carriers be anything other than jobsworths attacking the better landlords.

The Council is trying to shirk its responsibilities for public order, public health, cleanliness of residential streets and I suspect much more. I'm a local resident that lived in the area for over 25 year. I have 2 married children with families that live in Weymouth town centre. Your proposal will immediately add £50pm to their rent (£600/12). And how are Landlords supposed to address public order, personal health and street cleaning - that's your job. This licencing is a stupid idea. When costs are high, Private landlord sell property. You'll have less property available for rent thereby creating a housing shortage.

The council knows that most problem rentals are HMO which are already licenced. So the council is already in a position to rectify many of the problems in the previous questions. Landlords are not mental health workers or the police. Landlords can not enforce any action against anti social behaviour. Family homes should be excluded where they are the only members in the household. The problems are with flats and HMO and these are already covered by the council powers. The council it just trying to pass on the responsibility to the landlord as they are unable to deal with it themselves.

The landlord should rent the property in I a safe and good condition but the Tennant should be responsible for clear any mess and repairing damage they make.

| |
|--|
| <p>The landlords need a quicker and cheaper way to remove problem tenants from their properties, especially when drugs and antisocial behaviour are in play. The current system takes too long and involves great expense for the landlord.</p> |
| <p>The mandatory items are legal requirements or items which benefit the landlord so I do not see that they add value. Energy efficiency is obviously a good idea but there are already constraints on letting properties (an 'acceptable' EPC certificate is required) so I do not see what value this would add. It may just take more homes out of circulation if stricter requirements are applied locally.</p> |
| <p>The moment a license involves landlords having to improve anything is the moment a tenant or society will be covering the cost. This will only increase rents. It should be policy for landlords without a license needed.</p> |
| <p>The most continuous problem concerns leaks .The properties are so old the network of pipes . I had a section of ceiling fall on the corner of the bed due to a boiler leaking through the floor . The guys who came to fix it were called out to deal with another around the corner . The first floor flat had a cascade of water pouring into the front sitting room .i have a feeling it wasn't located wher the water was pouring in from along the gutter . Plus there should be an emergency helpline through Christmas and New Year .Goadsby shut for a week up until Christmas. I know someone who moved here years ago and lived on the same street .It was having the same problems with leaks then</p> |
| <p>The need for tenants to be referenced and on demand for this information to be provided to the Council would appear to be against current legislation and a violation of human rights.</p> |
| <p>The scheme should not proceed</p> |
| <p>The security of the property is within the tenants' control, the landlord cannot be held responsible for the tenant leaving the front door on the latch or using his boot to open the door when he forgets his key which appear to be the causes of the main security problems. The landlord cannot address anti-social behaviour in his property until the lease has run its term. Only then can the landlord remove the tenant after a two month delay. The landlord cannot maintain external areas without interfering with the tenant's private enjoyment of the property. The provision of affordable heating is outside the landlord's power and appears to outside any government's power.</p> |
| <p>The top points are already covered by laws for all landlords this is a bogus scheme ,it's drug rehabs ,hostels and HMOs that's the problem.</p> |
| <p>The whole scheme is ridiculous</p> |
| <p>There appears to be an attempt to make landlords responsible for the anti-social behaviour of their tenants.This should be limited to them informing the proper authorities that there is a problem when they are made aware of it. To expect them to investigate and attempt to resolve the issue could place them in danger of assault. Anti-social behaviour is surely a police and council matter. How do you make a landlord responsible to the extent proposed if he or she lives 50 miles from the property. What if the landlord is a woman, is it right to expect her to become involved in what could turn out to be an altercation. With regard to the return of refuse bins to the property once emptied, how do you make a landlord responsible for this if they live some distance away and are unaware. They should certainly be made responsible for instructing tenants to do this, but it would be unfair to punish the landlord for a failure of a tenant to comply. These conditions are very extensive and are lik</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>There is a risk that over regulation might lead to a severe reduction of the number of properties available for rent, which would lead to an increase in housing debt and homelessness. Energy efficiency is a difficult area. Many of the older homes will never go lower than a Band E for energy efficiency - insisting on, for example, a Band D might be enough to take the property off the rental market.</p> |
| <p>there is no space provided for if you disagree that a licence is even needed! a good landlord already has these covered and there are laws that ensure that they are covered . for example energy efficiency is measured by the epc and if it is below the recommended standard the landlord will be heavily fined how would that change under the new scheme</p> |
| <p>There should be a list of bad tenants example who don't pay rent and disrespect property bring costs to landlod</p> |
| <p>There should be cheaper rents for good quality homes the private sector is far too expensive for people on minimum wage,</p> |
| <p>These conditions are already met by responsible landlords.</p> |
| <p>This is a 2 way street,tenants need help also.there are young adults that live there who are at Weymouth college.The college needs to be involved as well. landlords need protection from poor tenants as well,perhaps some type of mediation scheme as well.</p> |
| <p>This is already being done. Do not over complicate</p> |
| <p>This proposal is going to have the exact opposite effect of its intentions I as a upstanding Landlord I will never invest again in such a short sighted council that suggests a policy that is going to see massive disinvestment from the area</p> |
| <p>This scheme needs to be removed, this will drive the rental market up and we will lose good landlords</p> |
| <p>This should be all landlords rather than a particular area. Housing benefit should not be paid if these conditions are not evidenced!</p> |
| <p>Using the latest Tenancy Agreements already use these Terms and Conditions that apply to both Tenants and Landlords? Getting tenants to do their bit in my opinion is an on going problem in some cases.</p> |
| <p>Victims of 'cuckooing' should be treated as such rather thab being evicted</p> |
| <p>Well managed premises already cover these points</p> |
| <p>You should add something about ventilation and damp. My niece's flat is very damp and privately let.</p> |
| <p>YOUR EMPHASIS IS ON THE STANDARD OF THE PROPERTIES AND NOT ON TENANTS, THEIR VISITORS AND PEOPLE GOING HOME IN THE EVENING AFTER A NIGHT OUT DRINKING TENANTS REFERENCES ARE OF LIMITED USE AS THEY AVOID BAD NEWS AND THE CREDIT REFERENCES ARE OF LITTLE VALUE UNLESS THE PERSON HAS A CCJ IF YOU WANT TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE PROPERTIES THEN REGULAR INSPECTIONS BY THE COUNCIL AND REQUIREMENT TO PRODUCE CERTIFICATES WOULD WORK WONDERS. HOWEVER NONE OF THIS WILL CONVERT AN IRRESPONSIBLE TENANT INTO A GOOD ONE THE TERMS OF THE TENANCY AGREEMENT ADD LITTLE TO THE MIX, A BAD TENANT WILL IGNORE THEM AND SAY GET A COURT ORDER AND YOU HAVE MONTHS OF AGGRAVATION AND TROUBLE</p> |

Q17 Please explain why they feel a DBS check should/shouldn't be included

A Letting agency would have already completed all checks so a further DBS check would be unnecessary.

as some landlords take in ex con's and some landlords may discriminate against them not letting them have the property I understand people have to do a disclosure but it should go against them

Difficult as some convictions should not be included under the rehabilitation of offenders, also people do change and to have a blanket DBS bar for certain convictions could be seen as discriminatory against the landlord.

Have no knowledge of DBS check requirements

I do not see why I have to pay to prove that I, or my agents, have a clean bill of health.

I have no problems with my landlord I love my flat more than happy with my rent and if anything needs to be done my landlord deals with it promptly, I don't think all landlords should be tarred with the same brush

I just wonder if it's over the top.....maybe not.

If it starts to increase the costs for landlords those costs are going to be passed on to tenants in an already increasing cost.

Is it illegal to let a property if you have a conviction? Presumably in the proposed scheme area there are reasons why you feel this would be beneficial and if a landlord or agent has a conviction you would refuse their licence application, in which case perhaps it would be worthwhile. If you suspect illegal practice is this the only way to address this? Please bear in mind that imposing extra expenses on landlords may result in increased rents.

It would be good to have knowledge about the landlord if he was a difficult person or had previous convictions regarding letting properties. However I thought DBS checks were for working in childcare and show different information.?? I do feel that landlords should get a similar type of references or checks relating to their potential new tenants. - so everyone knows what they might be dealing with. It's always the way though, that there's a small minority of bad landlords or bad tenants that let it down for everyone else. To protect both sides, they should both have some kind of checks or register.

Not enough information providing details on what would bar a landlord from managing tenancies. While I would strongly object to sexual predators, and those convicted of fraud / burglary from managing a tenancy. I don't see why people convicted of other crimes should be excluded. Basically, I'd want a clearer definition of what disqualifies somebody before I say everyone should have one.

Not sure how this would negatively impact on the tenant.

Our landlord takes care of most things in a reasonable time.

Possibly. Not sure if DBS appropriate in this case. How about taking up two references?

surely by doing a dbs and then refusing a tenancy on that would be prejudice against an individual

They are only valid the day you get them and only for things you have been caught and prosecuted for!

What is a DBS check?

What is a dbs check?

| |
|--|
| <p>A DBS check is excessive - IF this is to be included then tenants also should produce a valid DBS check. No landlord would wish to let a property to someone who had not passed a test in an area where vulnerable and young people live</p> |
| <p>A self-declaration would be ineffective. Even a DBS check would not solve the problem either. If this came into effect, a person who had a bad track record would be likely to set the lease up through a limited company to get around this.</p> |
| <p>Again its HMO which have all these problems and bedsits etc. I have had a DBS already for my employment.</p> |
| <p>again this is just a way of making more private landlords drop out of the rental business!</p> |
| <p>Again this is unfair, how can you justify saying that and landlord has to have this done by going on their background! People have pasts but this should not affect their future. Charging landlords more will push the prices of rental up and it will be both parties that loose out in the end</p> |
| <p>Again, penalties for landlords - and managing agents who already have strict control and guidelines to adhere to. Do you feel tenants should have a similar check before they are offered accommodation?</p> |
| <p>any extra rules need to be paid for ultimately by the tenant as it would be a logical move to charge for the extra work and fees.</p> |
| <p>As a landlord you have to maintain your property to ensure that your property is rented out again . That is how you keep a good tenant. A responsible landlord would do this.</p> |
| <p>Because only jobs with vulnerable people require this type of checking, I dont think it is appropriate to check the landlord and probably goes against their human rights.</p> |
| <p>Because unless people work with children & vulnerable adults the general population is not required to be DBS checked. Those landlords having a managing agency such as myself are unlikely to have contact with tenants any more than visiting tradespeople. I believe it is a valid suggestion but where to draw the line should be considered in this case. (I am DBS checked myself in my capacity working in a local school so I have not got any vested interest in this).</p> |
| <p>Because we already have checks in place</p> |
| <p>Bureaucracy gone mad</p> |
| <p>Don't see the relevance.</p> |
| <p>Don't understand the reasoning for this?- Sounds like "Big Brother".</p> |
| <p>I am not sure I know what type of conviction would make someone unsuitable (other than one directly related to rental properties, or people trafficking). Who would make the decision if there is not a nationally agreed definition? I agree with the concept of fit and proper (and I have needed to be fit and proper as a trustee of a local charity) but we cannot allow council officials to determine what is fit and proper based on their own ideas. Self declaration is a waste of type because criminals do not worry about being honest.</p> |
| <p>I am providing a service, a service that saves the council thousands of pounds by doing their job for them, I have purchased the property in good faith, and not by dishonest means, what gives you the right to treat me like a criminal or someone of dishonest means?, I have no criminal record and I am not asking you for a service, why must I provide a DBS check? I would like all councillors and members of parliament to provide this service but I doubt that will happen ever! I find your questions insulting, and although I appreciate it is only a survey, I am not stupid, this is preparing the way for you to take more money off of me, well I do not make what the property is worth by a country mile so if this is to go ahead, I would have to reconsider the buy to let business, incidently are you planning on charging for every property individually or altogether, and if altogether would that be altogether only in that county or across the board?</p> |

| |
|--|
| I AM SURE THAT YOU KNOW THE BAD LANDLORDS, WHY PUT ANOTHER HURDLE ON THE LANDLORD. |
| I cannot see how old and minor offences should hold a person back from improving their lives and attempting to help others. |
| I do not agree with the whole registration process. I see it as a combination of "an income stream" for the local authority, and another layer of wasted local authority employment. Whoever is responsible for this suggested process has no idea of the relationship between landlord and tenant. |
| I do not feel the need for this has been explained by the survey / scheme details. |
| I do not think this will stop rogue landlords |
| I don't agree that a License is necessary. All Landlords have the option to require a DBS check. If Landlords decide to accept a tenant then they have to manage the consequences. There are bad tenants out there and it is difficult to resolve some issues. I have had a very nice tenant in the past who became/was/is bipolar, unstable with suicidal tendencies; calling emergency services many times as she could not cope and a huge liability as she was not rational and would not pay the rent. No DBS check would have picked this on out. As a Landlord how do you deal humanly with this problem - would the Court agree to eviction of such a vulnerable person? Being a Landlord has many risks and a problem tenant in a good property can be a nightmare of dilapidation. Where does the Council expect the people who have problems to live? |
| I don't agree with the scheme |
| I don't feel it is something that the landlord should have to pay for. If a DBS check is required it should be included in the licence fee. |
| I don't see how this would improve the quality and management of private rental property. |
| I don't think there should be a license and therefore a further DBS check is just bureaucracy on bureaucracy. This will end up consuming an entire Council sub dept. at time when there are more important priorities. |
| I m not convinced the proposed license will improve the situation. Rouge landlords will always operate, they will find ways to get under the radar. So this suggestion of landlord licenses seem just another added burden to good honest law abiding landlords who need to be encouraged, not discouraged. |
| If a landlord has just got out of jail for murder, what would you do legally, you cannot stop them letting their property out so why collect this information. Collection for data with no purpose. |
| If I was letting from a landlord that didn't have this it would put no bearing on if I wanted to let the property or not. There needs to be more emphasis in this process of the standard of housing. |
| If landlords should it is only fair that tenants should also |
| If one landlord requires this check to be done then surely all need to be checked |
| If people are not fit and proper/have outstanding convictions, if they are committing a crime in letting properties they should be prosecuted. Honest landlords should not have additional costs due to (potential)rogue landlords. |
| IF THE TENANTS ARE NOT LIVING IN THE SAME PROPERTY AS THE OWNERS ,IT IS IRRELEVANT .YES , IF THEY ARE LETTING ROOMS IN THEIR OWN HOME . THE MORE OBSTICALS YOU PLACE ON LANDLORDS ,THE LESS WORTHWHILE IT BECOMES. |
| If you are renting out a property what does a conviction have to do with anything. You are not living there with the tenant. If a landlord owns a property and has a shoplifting conviction can he no longer rent out the property and therefore have to sell it? Or is someone deciding what conviction is serious enough... |

| |
|---|
| If you are to go ahead with this, you need to improve the Quality of tenants more so than the quality of landlords or property! |
| Increasingly most properties are run by estate agents, |
| Innocent until proven guilty. We are landlords, not safeguarding officers. |
| Irrelevant. Tenants are adults and any criminal or possibly-criminal activity can be reported to the police. |
| Is anyone presenting any evidence at all that this would even help (and if so with what, exactly) let alone addressing the privacy concerns of it? The requirements you are proposing are even more onerous than those for an HMO licence, and we are talking about ordinary private tenants - single people, couples and families. |
| Is the tenant required? If one is so should the other. |
| It is not relevant to private rented LICENSING conditions should include a declaration and the council then assess. What effect would a DBS check have on licensing, they would have to have enforcement and rejection etc to back it up |
| It will only make landlords push up rents making it worse for every tenant that's renting in the local area. |
| It's a police matter if they have outstanding convictions not the money grabbing local council, I think you are so wrong hitting these people with a big stick ,it'll put rents up and it's the drug rehabs ,hostels and HMOs that's spoiling the town |
| Just another fee to be passed onto the tenant. |
| Just because someone has had a previous problem does not mean that they are unsatisfactory . Similarly, just because someone has a clean record does not mean they are clean and proper. However and person who has had a sexual or assault charge should be registered. Landlords are not cash cows! Most try to provide a reasonable service at a reasonable cost. If a landlord fails to maintain a property to a certain standard or is found to be an unsatisfactory landlord, then they should be requiring registration. Do not use a blanket brush to blame all landlords and punish all of them when the vast majority provide a much needed service to the community. Perhaps the tenants should also be vetted and easier eviction of them should be possible before they damage the property further. |
| Landlords are not criminals. This is just a witch hunt and a means to obtain more money for the council. |
| Landlords are not the problem, tenants are. The landlords aren't fly tipping or behaving anti-socially. |
| Landlords provide homes. Most are excellent. Do not tar the good with the few bad |
| licence to print money!! |
| Load of rubbish |
| More interference in a system that is working reasonably well. |
| Most landlords do a fair job , why penalise the many for the few . There must be existing legislation that governs landlords ? |
| No. This is housing not employment. |
| No. Why not make everybody in the proposed area have a DBS check!! |
| Not relevant to tenants |

Obtaining DBS checks take excessive times and would delay letting a property. Again if an owner had just been sent to prison for say fraud and wanted to rent out their property while they were away on her majesty's pleasure would that landlord be a fit and proper person? It would be great if landlords were able to insist on DBS checks from their tenants but how would the courts view a situation where a tenant was denied being able to rent a home. How would a landlord fare if through a Christian decision to take homeless people of the street he was being penalised by the council for putting unsuitable tenants in their properties.

Once a tenant has a contract surely that is enough

Once again the landlord is being penalised for the behaviour of the minority, furthermore costs will be passed on to tenants

Only if tenants are subjected to the same checks. We have more issues with tenants and anti social behaviour than landlords. If tenants fail the checks then we wouldn't allow them to rent and this would be a huge improvement. Our building had a drug dealer living here and it took 2 years to get rid of him. If we had been allowed checks for owners and tenants then it would have been avoided. And all the costs associated with it.

Only if the tenants are too.

Only if they are renting to unaccompanied u18s. Landlords have to give 24 hours notice if they wish to enter a property anyway and do not have the right to just enter when they like meaning they should not have access to unaccompanied children living in a rented home. A DBS check can give false reassurance anyway - it doesn't mean someone isn't a paedophile, it can also mean they are one but they have not been reported or "caught" yet.

People with criminal records are entitled to live somewhere. ARGOs and eviction for anti-social behaviour is a separate matter

pointless

Previous convictions should not influence their requirement to provide a high standard of accommodation.

Self certification should provide enough security and basis for action if wrong

Self declaration should be sufficient

Self-declaration should be ok

stop pushing work that you should be doing on to others

Surely if anything, the tenants should be DBS checked?

TENANTS SHOULD ALSO BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN

The existing checks by letting agents are sufficient. I interview prospective tenants to judge that the trust required between landlord and tenant can be achieved.

The extra costs of DBS checks will be passed on to tenants. as long as their landlords or their agents are honest re being fit and proper and do not have outstanding convictions

The government are abot to introduce a lettings fees ban - any DBS check would have to be paid by the landlord, our costs are going up by the minute and the time is fast approaching where landlords will exit the market and then you will have a real housing shortage as the volume of available property to rent will fall and rents will increase still further as demand far outstrips supply.

The Government should make all Landlords and Agents approved to hold a licence to let a property and this would stop problem Landlords and put everyone on a level standard. I have property in three Council Locations and have to do this time and time again? A national registration to be a landlord would be a lot more sense in my opinion. I can't vote in more than one location of residence.

| |
|---|
| <p>the landlord does not have right of access to the property unless required under the contract terms, and that's controlled or under supervision.</p> |
| <p>The landlord has no right if access to the property after the tennancy starts. Should any criminal event happen after this it is a police matter and should be handled by the courts not a council official.</p> |
| <p>The vast majority of landlords and agents are fine; however perhaps it might be good to include a provision that says under certain circumstances that a DBS check may be required. Perhaps pair this with an option for more oversight if deemed necessary. These may be because new information may come to light - thinking perhaps either undeclared convictions, or a history of allegations about relevant matters such as accusations of sexual misconduct, financial impropriety, known for poor tenant management/housing conditions etc. Maybe also for those who house particularly vulnerable tenants? Caution should be taken though not to let past mistakes adversely affect suitability - if there is nothing recent or a first time give them a chance. Those negative things might actually make them best able to handle the harder to house.</p> |
| <p>The whole of this "survey" is being put forward with leading questions with no negative questions in relation to the whole premise as to whether it is required.</p> |
| <p>There are already very good laws in place. If a tenant is not happy they will move out at the end of there tenants.</p> |
| <p>There is already a significant burden on private landlords to comply with current legislation. It would seem more reasonable to require private landlords to sign a standard tenancy contract with their tenants. A local byelaw could be passed to define the default conditions. This would allow support organisations to know what the basic rights are without passing on significant additional costs to the tenants.</p> |
| <p>There is no point unless you can legally prohibit someone who 'fails' a DBS check from owning & renting out property. Would you intend to make the DBS result common knowledge so that potential renters could avoid that landlord? The cost of the check would be passed on to the tenants via inflated rent charges.</p> |
| <p>There seems to be a movement to discourage private rented property and this is just another step down the ladder. This will not discourage rogue landlords. It will only discourage law abiding small landlords who provide good rental properties. Although I am not affected by the area proposed I am considering selling all my flats. My wife and I live in a flat in a block where I let seven other flats we are very fussy about tenants for obvious reasons, Dorset Council now only give us four weeks to find a new tenant this is just not long enough. The result will be that we may be forced to take unsuitable tenants thus spoliing a supportive small community. Be careful of unexpected consequences.</p> |
| <p>Think the area is being misrepresented. Don't think any more troubled residents in melcome Regis than any other estate in weymouth area</p> |
| <p>This discriminates against and incurs unnecessary costs for the majority of decent landlords.</p> |
| <p>This is a waste of time and will only add to the burden on the landlord who will have to recover the expenditure by raising rents.</p> |
| <p>This is just a money making scheme</p> |
| <p>This is more paperwork and cost which would be passed to tenants.</p> |
| <p>This would not solve poor landlords. Councils already know who the poor landlords are but continue to pay housing benefit to them. Tennants should have a list of properties owned by landlords known to be poor and told housing benefit is not paid to them</p> |
| <p>Time consuming and little benefit</p> |
| <p>Unecessary cost</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Unnecessary, the courts already have the power to prevent a landlord from managing own properties if convicted of serious breaches of environmental housing laws, this is being strengthened in the new tenant housing act in June 2019.</p> |
| <p>We have been Town Centre Landlords for over 40 years and get to know problem properties. They are invariably run by "associations" - rehabs - churches - hostels. with no "Individual" to take responsibility. They tick all your boxes, will probably be exempt from any scheme, receive public money. and are a pain in the ass.</p> |
| <p>What is a DBS? Acronyms?</p> |
| <p>What level of checks? Basic Disclosure Standard DBS Enhanced DBS</p> |
| <p>What really will this achieve, how many tenants are victims of crime committed by their landlord? Maybe DBS checks should be allowed on tenants to even up the playing field</p> |
| <p>What would it be used for? Should people with criminal convictions be stopped from being landlords? Or just relevant convictions? Seems a bit invasive.</p> |
| <p>Whilst it is clearly important that 'vulnerable' individuals in society are protected, such a requirement should not be included within any licensing regime. This would represent a further cost to a landlord, whom will inevitably pass it on to the tenant.</p> |
| <p>Who decides which convictions prevent persons from being landlords? Would a motoring offence, for example, make a person unsuitable to manage a rented property?</p> |
| <p>why do they need this they are not looking after tenants children</p> |
| <p>Why do we need to know this when they are providing a property for use. Why would we need this?</p> |
| <p>Why should I, I am not a criminal and have no intention of becoming one. Also, the rehabilitation of Offenders Act says that criminals should not be further punished once they have served their punishment; assuming that landlords should prove they are not criminals is presumptive. In any case, DBS clearance is primarily for people in a position of authority or control working with or in contact with young people. It is an inappropriate tool to ensure landlords comply with their legal obligations.</p> |
| <p>Willyou require tenants to declare their convictions. The courts have already declared the checks into the right to rent is discriminatory.</p> |
| <p>Words Fail me - this is quite ridiculous !!</p> |
| <p>Would it matter?</p> |
| <p>you are insulting people</p> |
| <p>Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.</p> |
| <p>Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.</p> |
| <p>Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.</p> |
| <p>A DBS check can give an indication of an applicants fitness to be a Landlord/Agent and prevent mistreatment of clients.</p> |
| <p>A DBS check is of a national standard; self-declaration is not!</p> |
| <p>A potential landlord should have to have a DBS check done regardless of this proposed licence, because they might have a copy of the house key. However I am AGAINST the proposed licence being actioned.</p> |

| |
|--|
| A self-certified system could be open to abuse/fraudulently filling in the declaration. |
| Absolutely! The worst landlords are repeat offenders with tenancy/safety issues but they also have access to the homes that they rent out, while people are living there. They need to be trusted on all levels, including in the country where they originated if they aren't British. |
| Agree. |
| All landlords should be DBS checked by letting agents and councils paying housing benefit. Not just some landlords in a select area! |
| all landlords should be transparent to their licence providers. Any known issues should be questioned and held on file for information, if required, at a later date. |
| All people need somewhere to live and proportionally so do vulnerable people. Vulnerable people should not be at the mercy of private Landlords. Our current government allows this. I work nights in the town Centre and I see people walking the streets who should be being looked after or under some sort of protection and they are not. |
| Although not infallible, it would help to add to the weight of evidence for judging whether a potential landlord is a fit and proper person to manage properties. For example, if they had convictions relating to extortion, intimidation etc. you obviously wouldn't want them as landlords. |
| ANY FORM OF ABUSE FRAUD GENERAL SAFETY AND WELLBEING (Perhaps landlords should also be able to request a DBS from potential tenants) |
| Anyone who has influence over other people should be 'fit and proper' |
| Anyone whose business gives them access to vulnerable adults or families with young children should be DBS checked. |
| As a tenant of private Landlords for some years the vetting system for the tenant is rigorous and also costly. I feel more secure when renting through an Agent as my Tenancy Agreement allows me certain rights. Not so much with Landlords who who let direct to tenants who may not supply a Tenancy Agreement as with some HMO's (which are often very scruffy in the neighbourhood). There are so many issues that have arisen in the last twenty years or so, eg. subletting of property by so-called tenants. It's the Landlords who live outside the area, eg. Poole, who are sometimes unaware or don't care about what goes on at their properties that give me some concern. I think a DBS check would provide some security not only to a tenant who sometimes don't even know who their Landlord is, but also the Landlords themselves. |
| At least this would be one positive from the scheme and not just a money making exercise. |
| Because it's sensible |
| Because of the level of vulnerable clients in the area |
| Because of the risk of fraud and to protect tenants. |
| Because they are providing a service to the public by their business of either landlord or agent. They need to be upstanding members of society who can be relied on. |
| Because they house, have access to and power over vulnerable members of society. |
| Better control of residents |
| better safe than sorry |
| But probably for free if associated with a licence as it needs to be about improving standards not income generation |
| Clearly some landlords are unfit to let property |
| Could be dealing with vulnerable tenants. |

| |
|---|
| <p>Currently landlords can rent out homes without any (or very little) checks on their suitability to have the lives of possibly vulnerable tenants. Weymouth is full of vulnerable people who have had to withstand threats, horrible housing conditions and possible homelessness because of their landlords.</p> |
| <p>DBS check supports the definition of 'fit and proper' person. Not all crimes should exclude a person from obtaining a licence. A driving conviction would not necessarily make a person unfit.</p> |
| <p>DBS will provide clear evidence of the honesty or otherwise of the landlord..</p> |
| <p>Disreputable landlords ignore rules and take advantage of vulnerable people.</p> |
| <p>Doesn't cost much</p> |
| <p>Due to the fact that many vulnerable adults are housed in private rental properties. However it must never be the only evidence re and these references should be followed up and not taken at face value</p> |
| <p>Due to the fact that the area has some extremely vulnerable people in private rented accommodation.</p> |
| <p>Ensure consistency across all private landlords</p> |
| <p>Ensure private landlords are of reasonable character and likely to uphold the purpose / ethos of the process. Any convictions for drug supplying / trafficking related offences should automatically disqualify an applicant.</p> |
| <p>Ensures landlords are fit and proper persons to look after vulnerable tenants.</p> |
| <p>For tax purposes. Every landlord should pay any tax owing. No cash in hand.</p> |
| <p>For the reasons previously given for the inclusion of a particular property in Weston Road in your scheme</p> |
| <p>For the safety of the tenants and family.</p> |
| <p>I am aware that some landlords in the area have been threatening to tenants (some of my neighbours) who have complained about the appalling housing conditions. Perhaps a DBS check would help weed these sorts of landlords out. There are also a number of vulnerable people (mental health or drug addicted) who are tenants, and therefore could be better protected by having fit and proper landlords.</p> |
| <p>I am sure you wouldn't want to be paying rent to a sex offender?</p> |
| <p>I believe some landlords renting houses in multiple occupation (for example) maybe of the criminal kind and therefore threaten tenants if any complaints about the property etc are made.</p> |
| <p>I believe that the area will never improve until both the landlords and tenants don't improve. How can, and this is only supposition on my part, the landlords improve if they are the ones making life awful for the tenants. In my opinion, convicted felons can get rich enough from the vulnerable to then be able to continue this abuse by owning properties within these areas to rent, nothing will improve. E.g., convicted drug suppliers, paedophiles, etc.</p> |
| <p>I see no harm in asking for a DBS check to ensure that a landlord is of good character. £25 is not a large amount of money, but it will depend on how much it is intended to charge for the license. Self declaration is no good, as anyone of poor character will not hesitate to lie about it and hope they will not be found out. However, the next question appears to suggest that you will be requiring landlords to obtain a license for each property they own, so you are in fact proposing to license properties, not landlords. In a landlord licensing scheme you would seek to ensure that the individual was a fit and proper person and that they produce and maintain good quality accommodation. This would not require a landlord to hold more than one license, anymore than a driver is required to hold a separate license for each vehicle they own or drive. A decision needs to be made whether you wish to impose property standards or management standards. There is already a plethora of property standar</p> |

| |
|---|
| I think that there are Landlords that are not fit and proper and nothing is ever done about it. If the Landlord is not fit and proper the tenants do not have respect for the LL and that is when problems start. If LL's have nothing to hide then they should not be afraid of getting a DBS check - it might be surprising how many get rejected!!! |
| If recent it can indicate present character. |
| If they are a registered sex offender etc they may be managing properties that have young children in and no one would possibly be aware. |
| Important that landlords are people who would take their responsibilities seriously |
| it provides the authorities with documentation of good intent , It would also convey to tenants their rights and well being were being taken into account . Be positive for Weymouth itself , and this action would form a more regulated approach to th whole situation of rental for the three parties Council tenant and landlord By doing this there would be more money going into the coffers , |
| It is important that private landlords are fit and proper people to manage and let properties. |
| It is very important that all landlords are properly vetted and clearly responsible people |
| It makes absolute common sense. Letting a property should be considered a responsibility. |
| It provides better security to prospective tenants that may be vulnerable to abuse. |
| It will prove they are fit and decent people - which is what we want landlords to be. |
| It would be a good incentive to keep a high standard . I think the landlords are fairly good here so it would be straightforward.if they have a good reputation |
| it Would be good to know if your landlord was a criminal |
| It would hopefully exclude poor landlords and encourage landlords to be more responsible. |
| It's a cost effective first screening. |
| It's an extra level of confidence in the people running the properties. £25 is peanuts, money-wise. |
| Landlords and agents should be able to illustrate that they do not have a dubious background which could influence their attitude toward how they conduct their business |
| Landlords and agents should be fit and proper if they are letting out property. Its common sense to think they should be. They are responsible for the people in their properties, the property itself and to the community around them. |
| Landlords are expected to be responsible, upstanding members of our community. Therefore proof of such in the way of a DBS check is essential. Who knows some unscrupulous landlords are out there who have criminal conviction for crimes such as Fraud, handling stolen goods, drug abuse, I could easily make this list longer. |
| Landlords could be sex offenders or drug dealers themselves, and therefore allow similar people to occupy their properties. |
| Landlords could lie or bend the truth if asked to self declare. At least if they are DBS checked It will prove they are fit and proper. not only that most jobs that deal with people on a personal level require DBS checks these days anyway. |
| Landlords expect to know everything about their tenants, it's only fair tenants are able to have peace of mind on their landlord, after all they have keys to the tenants home. |
| Landlords should be responsible, able and law abiding people who have a responsibility to their tenants and neighbours. |
| Landlords should prove that they are a fit and proper person to let property. |

| |
|--|
| <p>Many, if not most, landlords will at some time be responsible for providing for vulnerable people. Since one of the aims of the scheme is to raise the standards of private landlords this would add to their reputation as well as put them on a par with standards required of social housing providers, which the scheme seems to be doing in other areas.</p> |
| <p>Need to make sure that landlords have statutory DBS checks, particularly if renting to vulnerable adults or "children" of school age. Need to make sure that out of County landlords, and particularly overseas landlords are checked, both for UK DBS check, as well as OVERSEAS checks for criminal activity (exp. pedophilia, etc).</p> |
| <p>No as a DBS is only valid for the day it's completed... How often would you expect the landlord to complete it?</p> |
| <p>No one wants a suspect landlord. The home is so important to people and any check that is given to someone who provides homes is a positive thing to ensure they are responsible and proper.</p> |
| <p>Not sure what a DBS check is, but self-declaration is a non-starter.</p> |
| <p>Only fit and proper owners would be fit and proper landlords</p> |
| <p>Probably one method of preventing 'rogue' landlords</p> |
| <p>Property's could be used for a number of illegal reasons.</p> |
| <p>Provides formal and standardised evidence of suitability</p> |
| <p>Quit happy with this but not sure what you would really get. If you push landlords underground then you will get illegal letting. Until you have a fool proof method of identifying rental property then it may be best to not alienate landlords.</p> |
| <p>Responsibility when renting is essential and landlords should be of good character themselves.</p> |
| <p>Responsible landlords and agents need to be of good character to ensure their tenants behave in the same way.</p> |
| <p>safety of buildings and tenants</p> |
| <p>Scrupulous landlords will lie on an application form.</p> |
| <p>Security</p> |
| <p>Security for the tenant</p> |
| <p>Self declaration is open to abuse. £25 is a very small amount to pay for a proper check.</p> |
| <p>Self declaration is wide open to abuse.</p> |
| <p>Self- declaration only</p> |
| <p>Self-declaration is open to abuse. A DBS check, especially with a fee, would tend to concentrate the mind and show a willingness to maintain a certain level of responsibility.</p> |
| <p>Shows responsibility and caring attitude to tenants and like to weed out unscrupulous irresponsible landlords.</p> |
| <p>So that landlords living outside the area can be charged extra, as should owners of second homes left empty for more than two weeks.</p> |
| <p>So that we know they are responsible people. HMRC checks should also be made</p> |
| <p>So they will be monitored</p> |
| <p>so vulnerable members of public have some protection - i.e. street workers, teenagers leaving foster care, etc</p> |
| <p>So you get a good landlord</p> |
| <p>SOME KNOWN LANDLORDS HAVE A BAD REPUTATION, this may get them to clean up their acts</p> |
| <p>Some of the Multiple Occupancy houses have vulnerable people living in them and the Landlords should be fit and proper. There are many cases of the bullying of young tenants in order to get them evicted. Allowing drug use on the premises should be outlawed, some landlords turn a blind eye, therefore businesses in the vicinity suffer from drug dealing.</p> |

| |
|---|
| Some of the past tenants and some of the present tenants are continually causing trouble in the street the police are called on a regular basis we definitely feel that tighter checks should be carried out and more in-depth vetting of potential tenants should be carried out |
| Some tenants are vulnerable so checks should be done to protect everyone |
| Some tenants could be vulnerable |
| Stop fraud |
| Tenants may be vulnerable and beholden. |
| The borough should not be encouraging unsuitable people to rent out properties. |
| The cost is minimal to the landlord but invaluable to the licensing authority and also safeguards tenants. Self declaration is pointless as it will undermine the licensing process. |
| The DBS is a very basic check and it ensures that the agent or landlord is fit and proper person to manage a property and be a custodian of a potentially vulnerable person. It may even be worth asking agents and landlords to attend a course to ensure they understand the conditions and responsibilities of the proposals, this would also be an opportunity to highlight any beneficial assistance there is for landlords and tenants alike. |
| The majority of tenants living in the Park District are in private rented accommodation, they are vulnerable to exploitation as they may have either suffered/suffering from Drug abuse, mental health, low wage, single parents, minimum wage so are limited to where they can live - Properties in the area are low rent. Most private Landlords in the area I have dealt with take advantage of these issues and exploit Tenants. |
| there appear to be many "rogue" landlords who charge so much for sub standard properties which further worsens the state and public appearance of properties |
| There are a few rascals about. |
| There are likely to be children in the properties, so sex offender checks are important. Also, any landlord convicted of theft, fraud, or violence, could also could pose a risk to tenants |
| there are no restrictions upon who can be a landlord or how they conduct the business of letting properties and yet tenants are expected to provide references and "jump through" allsorts of other hoops often to their financial detriment with no planned maintenance / renewal schedules for the property and no security of rental costs etc. VERY one sided arrangements that favours the landlords alone |
| there should be transparency for both landlords and tenants |
| These days it appears to be the minimum standard for anyone providing a public service. Having a check doesn't preclude involvement but provides for a further judgement call. |
| they are dealing with the public |
| They have access to vulnerable people who can be taken advantage of. |
| This is a relatively small fee to provide some enhanced reassurances around the suitability of landlords to be operating, particularly where they may be engaging with, and housing, vulnerable people. |
| This is absolutely needed to be more sure that a landlord is 'fit and proper'. They are likely to come into contact with vulnerable people and have lone contact with them. While not entirely foolproof, a DBS check will at least show any previous convictions or concerns. I'd also say it backs the licensing authority up if something did happen - let's hope it would never come to that! |
| This is the only way to ensure that landlords are fit and proper. Those landlords that are not fit and proper are likely not to be truthful in their declaration. |
| This will help ensure all landlords are respectable business people |
| This would encourage landlords to take notice and take part |
| This would ensure that landlords are fit for purpose |

| |
|--|
| This would help ensure fitness to hold licence |
| This would help sift out any unscrupulous landlords or agents |
| Those who are not "fit and proper" are unlikely to declare so with self certification! |
| To avoid slum landlords |
| to check they are ok |
| To demonstrate that they are respectable honest persons |
| To enable better control of people moving into and around the neighbourhood |
| To ensure that responsible people are Landlords and Agents to help prevent problems |
| TO ENSURE THEY ARE ACCOUNTABLE |
| To make sure that the landlord is suitable |
| To make sure they are fit for purpose |
| To make sure they are fit people to do this |
| To make them more responsible |
| To protect the tenants from unscrupulous landlords |
| To protect those who rent from them. We feel this is particularly relevant if they are renting to vulnerable people |
| To protect vulnerable tenants from bullying, aggression or sexual manipulation. |
| to prove they are worthy and honest and for tenants piece of mind |
| To provide a more secure feeling to vulnerable people. |
| To rule out criminals who see providing vulnerable people with low cost/low quality housing as an easy way to make money. |
| To safe guard the young and vunerable from exploitation by greedy landlords |
| To safeguard tenants from unscrupulous landlords |
| To show they are (fit & proper) |
| To stop rogue landlords. |
| To stop sub letting.. The drug dealers then arrive |
| To validate their suitability |
| Try to stop criminals causing there tenants any problems. |
| Vulnerable individuals are open to abuse |
| Vulnerable persons need protection |
| We have some seriously rogue landlords. |
| Well, its self-evidently a good thing - although I think it should apply to tenants as well. |
| While DBS checks can be over-used, I think they would be a proper and proportionate requirement in these circumstances. Equally, it will be important that landlords are not discriminated against for irrelevant convictions. Therefore, the equitable oversight and management of the DBS process will be important and I assume that this will sit with a neutral body such as the council. |
| While not a guarantee of suitability, a DBS check would reduce the potential risks associated with self-certification. |
| Why shouldn't they? Huge numbers of occupations and voluntary roles required these checks in place. If you are housing (and making huge amounts of money from) vulnerable tenants, then you should not be a potential danger to them. |
| Without it, it's too easy to get away with being a poor landlord with no comeback |
| Yes, this is important as some Tenants can be vulnerable. Therefore, Landlords and Agents with certain criminal convictions, particularly sexual offences and violent offences such as ABH or GBH, should be excluded. |

You can not always believe details given but some people

You got a good tenant it don't mind any difference

A DBS should be okay , but also to charge is an insult

I am against this whole licencing scheme because I am a decent law abiding citizen who has worked hard and paid his taxes all his life. I own a flat in the proposed area which I let out through an accredited letting agent. I want the property to be safe, comfortable and well maintained for my tenant. I value my tenant and he values me. The only way I can ensure that the property is legal, safe and well maintained, is to use a professional letting agent who is across the legal requirements and ensures I comply. They advise and guide me to ensure the property is kept up to date and the tenant cared for. They also have access to professional tradesmen who can attend the property fast if the tenant has a repair issue, like no hot water for example that needs a fast call out. It's called duty of care and this scheme fails to acknowledge that this is a service I am already paying a professional accredited letting agent to do. The proposed licencing scheme is adding arbitrary requirements that are already been met by by letting through a proper agent!

Through owning properties that they let out landlords in general are responsible people who should be trusted to behave conscientiously. Therefore self-declaration would be appropriate. If the authority overseeing the Licencing scheme feels the need to to have checks undertaken, this should be done by the scheme itself.

Q20 Do you feel there are any other practical and beneficial ...

1 Licensing landlords is not the issue: if properties are deemed to be unfit for habitation the letting of them should be prohibited until an agreed standard has been met; the council must be notified of properties intended for letting; tenants should be able to complain to the council if properties are below an acceptable, defined standard; Landlords could be ordered to remove rubbish on their properties, if tidying-up the area is your objective (if appropriate legislation were in place).

1)Council should not get involved in creating what will become a bureaucratic monster. 2) If they put landlords of renting out properties the whole area will decline further and landlords will go elsewhere. There are plenty of other areas in the UK where landlords don't have to pay for and support a pointless licensing dept. 3)The net result will be even more empty buildings, less income for the few remaining retailers and overall less income for the Council. 4) If the Council identify illegal activity all they have to do is report it to the police. That is a much better idea than this scheme

a larger police presence in the local area.

A readily available list of names of landlords and their properties so that concerned neighbours could inform them of any worries regarding the tenants or property

Action is required to improve the are but I do not agree this is the way to do it. I cannot see this reducing crime in the town centre, drug dealing or begging on the streets. I do see an increase in empty upper floors of properties in the town centre as landlords decide it's not worth the hassle and costs being passed on to tenants including the low income families it professes to help.

Address the bad landlords anyway as we all know they are the one who will end up dodging the scheme and all you are really doing is punishing, financially, the good landlords. Are you prepared to guarantee that all the money you are going to take will ensure that the scheme is policed and enforced. We all know the council/ police currently do very little about anti social behaviour or littering at which is not going to be stopped by this scheme.

Again, the use of the term "Selective Licensing" appears to be more relevant to property standards than to the responsible attitude of the landlord. If you license approved individuals to provide good quality accommodation conforming to standards already set, you can revoke the license of anyone who who fails to do so and in effect force them out of the market. You also need to provide a fast track sanction that landlords can use against bad tenants to get rid of them.

All landlords to use or abide by ARLA guidelines. Discount if ARLA managing agent used.

Any action that is taken on properties or landlords to be follow through asap and checked, this will require staff to fulfil this action.

Are you now suggesting that landlords police the area because the area is high in crime. That's a matter for the police.

As discussed you the council need more help to provide changes in the area which are not possible due to not enough policing , with all the other cuts for various social requirements the list is endless . There should be facilities like in the old days there were prefab housing or the like many people lived happily in those , caravans or the like maybe look at developing in that way and that might not need as much planning etc to install not sure to be honest but from little acorns etc . difficult times difficult memories I strongly feel that if you are making a living out of rentals there does have

As a letting agent with 32 years experience in the ward I can confirm it's the HMOs, hostels & drug rehabilitation houses of multiple occupation that are the trouble. This is not going to work you're attacking the wrong group. Single dwelling landlords work hard to keep their investment safe from being 'kicked in or damaged' by the miscreants you keep describing. They already adhere to the extensive legislations, EPCs, new deposit laws, & coming in June 2019 the new tenant housing act.

As said before, I believe the important things are already legal requirements of a landlord: addressing anti-social behaviour by tenants, security of property and good property management (inc: repairs, annual gas checks, etc). A DBS check on Dorset (UK) landlords I believe is a good idea. The above should be enforced. Other than this the Council and the Police should remain the responsible for the street itself and any anti-social behaviour by foot-traffic.

Better enforcement of existing regulation, perhaps.

Better policing in the area. More frequent street cleaning. Grants for property maintenance in the area. Tenants to be better vetted in the area. If there was better policing and crime reduced in the area it would entice more people to owner occupy in the area and would help the housing stock.

Build more social housing so we dont need to rely on amateurs and shysters.

By bringing back weekly bin collections would be a start.

| |
|---|
| <p>Checks to be done on private landlords who don't use an estate agency to rent their property. I have been conned out of money in the past by a private landlord in the DT4 postcode who did not hold my money in a tenancy deposit scheme. I am an ideal tenant who has a string of excellent references, I have never damaged any properties or left any amounts unpaid. I lost several hundreds of pounds because of this landlord who had printed his own gas bill out that he had made on Microsoft Word and took it upon himself to take out £300 of my deposit for the final gas bill! To think that this kind of thing could be happening on a larger scale is horrible to think about and is an abuse of power by the landlords.</p> |
| <p>Compulsory purchase of unused properties. Limitation of overseas owners of properties; houses, flats, hotels, commercial properties, particularly when there is no occupancy.</p> |
| <p>Council does it job</p> |
| <p>Council should provide social housing instead of putting on private landlords because they have no other option so putting more costs on private sectors will deter landlords and many will sell up then even less housing</p> |
| <p>deprivation is high due to no money being available landlords paying a licence or not is not going to encourage the tenants to behave is this a scheme to generate an income for the authority? who is going to carry out this job will they have knowledge of how to run properties i would love a list of tenants that should not be aloud to rent in the private sector due to the damage and unsociable behavior but this will probably not happen</p> |
| <p>Do you not already have housing enforcement officers,who can keep a check on landlords and tenants.</p> |
| <p>DONT BUNCH ALL PEOPLE WHO ARE ALLEGEDLY "DEPRIVED" IN ONE ARE , THE AMOUNT OF HMO'S IN THE AREA DRAGS THE WHOLE AREA DOWN .HOW DO THE PEOPLE WHO OWN PROPERTIES IN THE AREA FEEL? I WOULD SUGGEST YOU GET THE PEOPLE WHO ARE ABLE TO HAVE PRIDE IN THEMSELVES AND THE PLACE THEY LIVE AND THE AREA THEY LIVE IN . I STRONGLY DISAGREE THAT YOU HOUSE PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE OF THE AREA ,IT MAY STOP THE ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON THE STREETS BY PEOPLE THAT HAVE REGIONAL ACCENTS.</p> |
| <p>Don't know</p> |
| <p>Earlier closing times for licensed premises. Access to CCTV recordings by residents should incidents occur. Existing powers to deal with problems should be acted on at once.</p> |
| <p>Enforce the legislation that is already in place to ensure properties let comply with the law.</p> |
| <p>Enforcement should be focused on bad landlords. Maybe an anonymous complaint system could be set up for tenants and where justified appropriate action can then be taken using existing powers.</p> |
| <p>Firstly, you really need to know about all the units that are rented and all the houses in multiple occupation. If you only have details of about 50% or so of the landlords then this is not going to be effective. I would suggest the land registry and the identification of names owning more than one property. For this you will have to search outside the area. There would be no need to charge for the service if all appropriate tax were paid. Central government has a role here. Finally, something that will not help in this area particularly, but I am aware that approximately 35% of all our rental income goes to the government in taxation. This is fair until one realises that our rents could be</p> |
| <p>GET COUNCILS TO DO THERE INSPECTIONS NOW AS THEY SHOULD ,NOT PASS ON THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>Get rid of HMOS - hate them - they are a terrible idea and cause nothing but problems. Vulnerable people, drug addicts etc. should be in sheltered or similar housing where they can be kept an eye on/cared for - surely cheaper for the council in the long-run. Much stronger police presence - not just on the seafront but everywhere. Park Area is so pretty really and has such amazing potential to be a vibrant, attractive area for residents, tourists, to provide to the economy of Weymouth - it has amazing architecture and history and is in an amazing position close to the seafront and the train station - much, much, much more needs to be done to capitalise on that potential. Look at Whitstable for goodness sake - why can't we aspire to be like them?</p> |
| <p>get the police to take antisocial issues seriously , stop the local housing advice from hindering landlords from evicting problem tenants.Landlords cant be held responsible for their tenants behavior</p> |
| <p>Grants should be available to help improve rented accommodation in deprived areas</p> |
| <p>Higher police presence in the area.</p> |
| <p>Hold the landlords responsible to upkeep properties</p> |
| <p>https://www.snapsurveys.com/wh/k/154816667924/radio-bdrw-2c-t.gif</p> |
| <p>I believe that legislation exists that, if enforced, could achieve the same result. There should be no need for a new organisation if existing departments were properly staffed. Enforce existing legislation.</p> |
| <p>i believe the current rules cover everything, complaints by tenants should be investigated.</p> |
| <p>I can't think of any other courses of action apart from a landlord and tenant area committee (but maybe a more informal name) where a selection of tenants and landlords could occasionally get together to look at issues and maybe come up with resolutions together. All complaints from either side should be considered by a central official - maybe a council housing official - but certainly someone impartial. I believe there is a serious issue that needs attention. Not all landlords or tenants are good but, personally speaking, my landlord is good and vice-versa.</p> |
| <p>I do not believe the scheme is necessary. There need only be an easily accessible channel for tenants to report landlords who are not fulfilling their responsibilities in line with existing legislation.</p> |
| <p>I don't believe the scheme will impact in the way it is envisaged.or are you just trying to price out people out of the area and move them somewhere else out of your area. The poor council management of the town centre has resulted in less investment which contributes to the people who wish to live in Weymouth.</p> |
| <p>I don't believe that any of the above will be impacted by making a landlord have a license.....it's nonsense.</p> |
| <p>I don't think Licensing will make any difference. Can you please provide evidence and examples to show why Licensing is required. All the problems regarding deprivation and crime will be found in Housing Association, Council and Social Landlord accommodation to probably a higher degree and Councils have more influence here but are generally slow to act on those properties.</p> |

I feel that good landlords are being lumped together with other landlords and that this is a method to extract more money for the Council. Town Centre issues and those of the Park District are not down to landlords, but to general deprivation, lack of jobs, addiction, etc, none of which is caused by good landlords. I have little knowledge of Town Centre issues and as someone who has owned my Victoria Street property since 2000 neither I nor to my knowledge my tenants have ever been affected by any major problem in this area. General deprivation is a matter for politicians to rectify, for the local police to watch over and health and addiction is a matter for the health service to step in. Why is any of this due to good landlords?

I feel that private landlords should be called upon to declare their rental charges for properties and have them assessed by a fair rent tribunal, also I think that the rents that are paid by the department of health and social security should be very closely inspected.

I feel this government should not under fund local councils to the point they are making up ridiculous scheme's to further tax hard working people to pay for a service they already don't receive, I would also like to point out if the council is hard up for money in these austere time's, then they should make cuts to their already over inflated pay packets and bonuses!

I have already listed my opinions earlier in this survey. It is a money making job providing complete waste of time. Spend more time looking at efficient policing, looking after the councils own buildings and tenants e.g. Guest House owners. Make sure waste collections are carried out thoroughly. Getting money from landlords to register on what is a complete waste of time and money, will simply mean that rents will be increased to cover the costs pushed onto Landlords. Anyone who disputes this has no business or financial understanding. If you believe that a register will make "errant" landlords better you are wrong. This is, in my opinion the latest in a local authority mess up. Registration is going to have no beneficial value.

I have no answers however , i believe in general bad landlords are often good ones that have fallen foul of bad tennants. Inserting more regulation on the landlords because they will have to comply could make the situation worse. Bad landlords should be brought into line however so should bad tennants and a mechanism to tackle both in equal measure must be found . Sad but true, bad tennants end up in deprived areas because no one wants them, bad landlords buy and operate in deprived areas because its cheaper. Housing condition enforcement is great as long as it compliments tennant enforcement in equal measure

I have said all I need to say already.

I know its highly improbable because of cost but private landlords property should be regularly spot checked as some landlords neglect the property to a point of it being unfit to live in

I think the council should make it as easy as possible to achieve the licensing requirements as most landlords will want to comply fully

I think the issues relate to the tenants rather than landlords. I agree the safety issues - electrics, gas, fire alarms etc as detailed definitely should be enforced. The issue of property disrepair is a difficult one because by definition, areas with better quality accommodation are more expensive, so putting a home out of reach for people who cannot afford it. I remember the overwhelmingly positive response a few years ago when there were flower troughs put around the park district & the pride it engendered locally. To put it colloquially, the streets need a 'revamp' with ? seats & trees & green areas. Where people can sit & pass the time of day with each other. Economics of this can be balanced/ justified with researching social & crime reduction impact outcomes from other areas in the UK who have done similar.

| |
|--|
| I think the proposed cost of administration is falsely exaggerated and ideally should be completely free. |
| I think this is a solid idea that hopefully will connect with everyone and transform in feel ,and transform its faded grandeur . |
| I think this is an excellent initiative and balances well the costs and benefits. I strongly suggest to give s 100% discount of the fee to those that comply fully and quickly. This will nudge behavior and send s powerful message that this is not ‘the council trying to get more of our money’. |
| I think this scheme is treating the symptoms rather than the cause. In my opinion it is the tenants that are the problem, and the money would be better spend supporting them. |
| I think what we need it affordable, social housing not more private rented. I have disagreed with the third point as I do not think licencing alone will deal with the real issues of low wage/high rents, mental health issues etc that cause real problems. So action may be required but licencing landlords is only part of the picture |
| If the people are on benefits then the benefits should be paid straight to the council or the landlord's so they don't waste it on other stuff and then the landlord's would get their money and keep the buildings in good condition |
| Implement a tourist tax to help fund cleaning uo the area, instaesd of swinging the extra cost onto the residents |
| In a block of managed flats it should be enough if a landlord flat owner provides housing via a management agent. |
| In theory this should be possible via existing legislation. |
| Inspections of housing quality and conditions |
| Introduce a CPZ |
| It comes down to cost! Address crime should happen all the time in all places. Deprivation should be dealt with at all times in all places with no one on the streets begging or without home etc even those who say they want to live on the streets.this is not normal and we know they have problems in their life. Why cannot the council be the positive council that stops the issues of the area? I agree you are trying and you are doing the best you can It should be the aim of the Council to be pro active in all areas. |
| It is a good marketing point! |
| It should be the council, police services and public services that we pay taxes for that should be covering these issues. We already pay a high tax increase for things like antisocial behaviour to be dealt with. It’s a failed system and targeting landlords will only result in it becoming punishment for tenants. |
| It sounds like the the money collected would just be used on getting Landlords to fill in lots of forms.Surely the council itself with local services should be addressing issues in the town centre. |
| It would be of interest to know how many properties have landlords that are known to the council. Of the 46% of properties that are rented, how many of these have had questionnaires sent? In other words, is the council aware of them? The majority of landlords that are known to the council are reputable and have well- run properties, many of these managed by agents who help to ensure that standards are upheld and regulations complied with. This section of the landlord population would therefore resent any intrusion to their operation, particularly if it involved charges at anywhere near the levels being suggested. Why not have an inspection regime of questionable properties with financial p |

Landlords should be made to attend a course designed by the council to assist them with managing rental properties.

Landlords should be made to tell their tenants: 1. put rubbish out on proper days and not in the alleyways 2. All bins should be removed off the pavement as they cause an obstruction. Also they get blown into the road causing an obstruction to traffic (also it looks very untidy when visitors get off the train for a holiday. 3. Fine the landlords for not informing their tenants.

Landlords will only respond to designated schemes

Legislation is already in place for enforcement.

Liaise with Probation and Social Services to identify and manage known offenders. Help landlords by offering to support them if they have problem tenants, rather than blaming the landlord if a property has been allowed to get into disrepair by the tenant in order to obtain social housing. This could be done by running a landlords` group, where the landlord could deposit photos of the property prior to renting, as proof that the former has been carried out by the tenant. Make it clear public knowledge that private tenants who carry out unsociable acts and damage to property will not be considered for social housing. My own property was clean, tidy and well-managed, but tenants refused to hang their washing on the line in the garden, preferring to string a line across the window and hang wet washing there, resulting in the wallpaper peeling and black mould on the upstairs walls. There was also sick on the carpet, fishing bait left in the fridge, resulting in numerous flies in the property, junk and dirt left behind them, and I have the photos to prove it. The council rehoused them, job done, they achieved what they set out to do, and I had weeks of work to get the property back into a habitable condition. You only see one side, and you should talk to landlords and get their side of what they have had to deal with before blaming them. I had another tenant who stopped paying rent, moved her doubly incontinent father into the property, then moved out. She only came back to take his pension money. He had no food, electricity and no support. Social Services did not want to know. The only ones to help were the Ambulance Service, as he kept falling. I had to complete refurnish the whole property, and lay new carpets once again. You have very little knowledge of what landlords have to face. Mostly it is the fault of the tenants and until they are made to accept responsibility for their actions, and the consequences of them, the problem will NEVER be solved. Mo

licensing is not required for the council to enforce it's obligations to prosecute bad landlords

Licensing landlords is NOT the answer! Proving more social housing and withdrawing housing benefit from sub standard accommodation is the answer!

Many of the proposals could be achieved with proper enforcement of existing legislation.

Many other solutions but nobody will bother to look for them as long as the council has an easy source of revenue from caning the poor old landlords who al2ways get the blame for any problems. For instance why not give consideration to getting tenants to behave better?

Many problems in the town are related to homelessness and drugs. This scheme will ultimately result in higher rent or fewer available homes. Neither of which will help the situation.

Maybe an INCENTIVE to landlords to own and maintain a clean, attractive property and to take an interest in the property and ergo the tenants he has in there. There are, I feel sure, lots of wealthy landlords who could pay for the licence and still turn a blind eye to the state of the property and the actions of his tenants whereas there are also 'cash-poorer' landlords who are eager to offer their property in a legal, fairly run contract offering the best he can to worthwhile tenants. Perhaps, over the years, the council should have taken more control of the 'run-down' properties in the designated areas so that they were not cheap buys for people who neither know nor care how to run a good tenancy not just for his and his tenants benefit but for the surrounding neighbourhood. Instead of a landlord licensing scheme, the Housing Dept. should have dedicated officers to monitor all rental properties from time to time (spot-checks once every 12-18 months or more if necessary) and introduce fines to landlords (and maybe tenants too?) if the properties are not kept within the pre-designated rules and regulations set out by the Council. This should keep everyone on their toes!

Maybe if you didn't have pubs and clubs open until 5am in residential areas you would get better tenants who look after the area? Landlords are not to blame for people urinating outside properties the Council is.

More effective monitoring of the area by authorities having the responsibility for the neighbourhood.

More Police in the area ,

More police in the area. More for young people to do to occupy themselves. Better anti-drug education at schools and general area. Remove drug addicts, homeless and drunks from the streets. Have been litter collection and encourage people to care for the area - maybe anti-litter weekends where people are given bags to fill with rubbish. Better LA housing!

More police on the streets! Probably not an option available to the council? Bin men to tidy the streets while on their rounds.

More Police on the streets. Improved rubbish collection regime with return to weekly collections for town center non wheelie bin properties. . Recycling boxes need fixed lids. I have one HMO producing between 4 - 8 boxes per fortnight and it regularly gets scattered down the street in windy conditions. I've seen very similar boxes in other city centers with metal handles that clip over the box lids. Boxes still can be stacked on top of one another. I've outlined these issues many times to Dorset Waste Partnership at the highest levels and to date no action has been taken.

More police presence. Bring back community policing.

Much of the crime in town is caused by drunks moving from the town centre nightclubs to the seafront. This also causes disturbances for people staying in seafront hotels, as well as, quite often, broken glass etc along the promenade. I'd put forward that alcohol licenses for the seafront clubs should be limited to prevent remaining open to the early hours. This would contain most of the drunks to the main highstreet of town. At that point, the few officers we do have would be able to deal with anti-social behaviour much more quickly, before things spiral rather than after it's too late.

My assessments above relate to the proposal not to the desired objectives. The council is particularly poor at achieving inward investment to change the demographic for higher paid employment and as a landlord of 3 HMO's for 15 years (over 200 tenants) in my view the majority of anti-social behaviour is created by factors external to the properties particularly alcohol and drug abuse.

| |
|--|
| My landlord is a responsible, efficient, and extremely caring human being in whom I trust and have every confidence. I cannot understand what benefit, the imposition of the suggested fee would have to improve his effectiveness (especially as he would, of necessity have to charge me some or all of this charge. |
| N/A |
| Naming and shaming bad landlords and supporting tenants to fight for their rights within the existing laws would be more cost effective, and would focus on rogue landlords rather than adding an administrative burden onto all landlords, including those who are acting ethically. |
| No |
| No |
| No |
| No |
| No |
| no |
| No, I think it is a good idea all round. Sometimes when a tenant moves out of a property the rubbish is left outside, sometimes for days. The seagulls get into the bags. It needs to be gone quickly. With anti-social tenants, more cameras at the ends of alleyways would be a good idea, as so much drug dealing, drinking and dog fouling goes on. |
| NO as its about time Landlords were regulated as they have been exploiting Tenants for too long |
| No as previous voluntary accreditation schemes have been poorly taken up, licensing just HMO's does not tackle all property in the area and given the levels of deprivation and other issues this is the only sensible and measured approach to tackle these issues and identify where the right help and assistance can be targeted going forward. |
| No, clearly the aims will involve costs and that has to be covered by a fee |
| No, I think Landlords should be licensed. I do think there are other issues which cause problems in the town centre, due to late night drinking, lack of toilet facilities at night and the fact that we are a tourist attraction and in the summer our population explodes. We need more police, medical centres, ambulances and social care, not less which is happening now. |
| No, I think the property owners need to be accountable. eg I know of one house where the front door doesn't close, and the inside door has a faulty lock, the tenants pay £100 per week to barricade themselves in their room overnight with broom handles, furniture etc, as they are too scared to ask the landlord to fix the doors. It is absolutely atrocious that certain landlords get away with this. |
| No, sounds as though it could work without overdoing it! |
| No. |
| No. |
| no. |
| No. A licensing scheme set by statute would give the council a legal basis for addressing concerns with certain landlords and their properties. It would assist tenants also. The council could provide access to courses to help landlords get things right for their tenants. E learning? make it a part of the licensing scheme perhaps? landlords required to complete courses to show they are fit and proper - Health & Safety, Gas Safety, something on checks required on the property. The council could set something up similar to what taxi drivers are required to undertake. |
| No. I think it's a very good idea. |

| |
|---|
| Not at this point in time |
| Not housing all problem tenants in the same area. See my earlier comments. |
| open up empty buildings for the homeless as shelters and / or adapt for reasonable priced housing for those on the breadline, engage the community with more free or easily accessible community centres and activities. Reduce commercial rental costs to encourage shops back into Weymouth and increase jobs and prospects for all. |
| Other things that might help could be to encourage longer term lets as part of the licencing - these have been shown to improve areas. Perhaps also increase the stock of housing available by using things such as EDMO or other powers available when there is a known issue with the quality of housing available. |
| Over the years the council have made numbers of bad decisions eg investment in harbour which never worked because first sea link then condor would not commit long term. Well paid jobs have been sucked out of Weymouth by the government, civil service, local government, Bournemouth got the University so the teacher training facility moved to Bournemouth. Then various other areas move their homeless jobless to Weymouth. Prison populations decide it better to be down and out in Weymouth rather than going home. This all results in an imbalance that becomes very hard to put right. Why is our council tax so high and yet the area is becoming one of the poorest in Britain. In other towns the Park District would be full of expensive bijou seaside cottages I really don't know how it got to be in the state it is in. |
| Patrol round the area and look for external problems/fly-tipping etc and action as per normal. Tenants can already report unfit properties to the council for inspection so I don't think this needs improvement. |
| Perhaps these measures would help to control the problem with drugs etc. |
| Plenty of staff to do the work and follow through action required as soon as possible. |
| Police patrols |
| Policing is obviously an issue, Cressida Dick was saying so yesterday on the news. As Westham has a new community centre within the fire station, and does not require Selective Licencing, then I believe a modern building should be provided as a community centre, which is welcoming of all groups |

Poverty and crime are a rational proven link. The areas shown on the map are in the shopping bar area mostly and not in the residential areas. There is a proven link between poor housing and health. The question is how to rehouse tenants who's domicile is in need of refurbishment? Where are they to go? How to support the Landlord who has problem tenants? Where will they go? Most people who are hard to live next door to have problems and often this is drug related. Better support to the Police and improved education to prevent drug abuse in the future with support and specialist housing for the drug abusers. Improved building fabric that requires less heating/cooling will help fuel poverty but this does not need the Licencing Scheme as Government Policy: Homes (Fitness for Human Habitation) Act 2018 is about to make a huge difference. With Climate Change will come ever more stringent EPC thresholds and this will make all the building fabric of this area and most of the Country change and for older properties a massive impact visually as insulating the easy bits has already happened the next phase is to insulate walls externally. In Torbay the overall proportion of homes that were not fit for human habitation was 2.7% and tackling this needs support not a stick. I would suggest that Improvement Grants are the only solution. Torbay Council has moved towards a system which gives financial assistance based on a combination of grants and loans (the "hierarchy of assistance") to tackle the back log of building refurbished needed. If the Licence Scheme has to come in [which I oppose] then of the 4,079 residential properties the 46.2% privately rented would generate 1877 x £Levy or around £938,500. Don't spend this on management spend it on Improvements Grants!! Say £50,000 to sort out each property that's 20 or so decent homes more if it a loan with interesting interest rates. Make these financial arrangements available to all properties in the area and thus all

Prevent landlords who don't meet the conditions from being landlords, in effect remove their licence to be a landlord. They make a profit so if they are not good landlords then hit them where it hurts. Too many take advantage of disadvantaged people forced by council cuts to turn to the private rental market, often to their detriment.

Proper enforcement of existing legislation.

Provide area for communal bins to alleviate tipping/ reduce fee fees for removal of large pieces of furniture - people without cars are unable to get rid of unwanted furniture without paying a fee, which low income people can not afford .

Putting a cap on Rent would address Crime & deprivation as people are less likely to steal or vandalize if they have money after rent to buy food.

Reduce the number and trading hours if licensed premises in the area.

Regulation of rental prices vs average local wages. If there was legislation was put in place, it would benefit the local economy greatly and reduce the social housing benefit bill, plus make saving for first time buyers more affordable.

Remove ALL Street drunks / drug users / homeless / fake homeless / beggars etc - esp by station, sea front and town center.

Scrap this scheme

Selective Licensing should be SELECTIVE. EHO already has many of the powers necessary to improve Housing Conditions. Charging Landlords, who already provide good quality accomodation and well managed properties will make them financially less able to continue such with their funds reduced and may indeed withdraw from the area possibly reducing the supply of the good quality affordable housing the schem is aiming to produce. Some Landlords will inevitably pass on the Licensing Fee in the rents thus disadvantaging some tenants.

| |
|--|
| Set certain standards, which are possible to achieve |
| Should only charge landlords who have had bad reports. |
| Social Housing providers should be made to look after their properties and tenants - they do not. |
| Sort out the issues they are responsible for. Maintain their own buildings, parks etc. Get the bums off the streets. Families cannot live in the town due to lack of parking so it has to evolve and the council dealing properly with begging etc will be of great benefit. |
| Sounds as if you have all ready decided on this being implemented . If introduced, any fee should be a one off and not based on a cost for each unit so a landlord with say for properties would pay the same a ll with one. Costs should be no more that £50.00 per landlord as this is not to be a tax on the landlords and a money raising exercise for the council. Finally based on the incompetence of the council overall, how competent is the council to run this? The olympics fiasco is perhaps a good example! |
| Spend less money on surveys and smarten up the town instead |
| Stop expecting people who are offering housing to pay for things the police and other services should be dealing with. This scheme will put some people off letting property and therefore increasing homelessness adding to the issues of people on the streets in Weymouth. |
| Strip all landlords of their properties altogether and transfer them to a Social Housing scheme. Landlordism is just a modern form of slavery gaining wealth from the misery of others. |
| swift enforcement action against landlords that fail to comply, given that the current proposal allows for intrim orders to be in place for up to 5 years. If following council intervention and identified issues being found a maximum period of up to 6 months should be given to address issues. If they are not addressed then enforcement action should be taken to protect the tennants. |
| Tackle the homeless, walk along the seafront and sort out people sleeping and living there! Licence The Bus! Why not tackle anti-social behaviour yourselves and monitor people on benefits? |
| The area has too many licenced alcohol establishments and it does not seem to be addressed. New ones in the area are still obtaining licences. |
| The cost of the scheme will NOT be passed onto helping me in the area, but just paying for new staff within the council to administer this scheme. The cost of the scheme to the landlord will be passed onto the tenant. in other words the people that it is meant to 'help' - pay for new staff within the council |
| The council already have powers but fail to use them. The council knowingly places families in unsuitable accomadation. build more social housing. |
| The Council and tenants have all the powers they need to take action on problems. |
| The Council is trying to shirk its responsibilities for public order, public health, cleanliness of residential streets and I suspect much more. I'm a local resident (DT3 6SG) that lived in DT4 8HX for over 25 year. I have 2 married children with families that live in Weymouth town centre. Your proposal will immediately up the rent. And how are Landlords supposed to address public order, personal health and street cleaning - that's your job. This licencing is a stupid idea. When costs are high and profits are low, Private landlords sell property. You'll have less property available for rent thereby creating a housing shortage. |
| The council MUST emend the scheme to cover the WHOLE of the Borough instead of limiting it to a single ward area. |
| The Council should make sure the town area is kept tidy and not look like a tip, which some areas do. Lead by axample !! |

| |
|--|
| <p>The council should spend money on the area instead of fleecing private landlords to fund what they should be paying for. The council should also be providing far more social housing itself instead of expecting private landlords to provide this.</p> |
| <p>the council tax paying public should expect the local council just to do the job they are paid to do</p> |
| <p>The first two questions in this section have not necessarily a causal relationship to rental property and the need for licensing landlords. Very bad research.</p> |
| <p>The focus should be on owners and agents not the location of the property. The TRIGGER for licensing should be individual failing property (dwellings) and be applied to all property belonging to the particular dwelling. Obviously a high degree of circumspection before enforcing the scheme. Reviews of performance every perhaps 3 years could lead to releasing the landlords from the scheme.</p> |
| <p>The Government has already taken them for all Landlords. However if the Council could take powers to immediately remove unsuitable tenants and help landlords get their properties back.</p> |
| <p>The high levels of deprivation are not the fault of good landlords. They should not be penalised due to the street in which their property is situated, with the insult of having to pay per property for a license which only has the detrimental effect on good landlords of an increase of paperwork and further work for the council which could be better spent chasing the landlords who are at fault. Weymouth is a small seaside town. As far as I am aware, Weymouth fades into insignificance with the types of crime you find in major cities. The main crime would appear to be drugs and drink, which is not the fault of the landlord... and in fact is already the burden of the landlord when tenants go as</p> |
| <p>The lantern Christian mission is doing more good than anyone ,it's police,cadas,alanon and social services etc that'll help these people from the rehabs ,nothing wrong with the single flats</p> |
| <p>The levels of deprivation in the area can only be addressed by the government policy and the council staff doing their jobs porperly to impliment it. The levels of crime in the area can only be addressed by the police doing their jobs properly instead of abdicating responsibility. Selective Licensing is an excuse for the Council's staff to sit on their hands but claim that they are doing something about the area's problems. It will no address any of the issues of the area.</p> |

The Park District is an area which is fair to say has its share of issues, but these are social issues that need an holistic approach and engagement with residents, homeowners, landlords, community groups – not arbitrary licencing. If there are rough sleepers and drug addicts loitering around the outside of Weymouth train station, how can that be blamed on private landlords? The council should be working with the letting agents, landlords and tenants inclusively – not treating them as separate entities and legislating against them. It is short sighted and acts to divide ('those scum landlords') from the community. I own a flat in the proposed area. I rent it out because I live and work abroad and wanted to keep a little something in my hometown in case I ever needed to return. I am a responsible landlord who uses an agent to fully manage my property. In using a professional accredited letting agent, I can sleep secure in the knowledge that I am meeting all the laws around safety and health and the wellbeing of my tenant that the law requires - that is a professional service that I pay for...why does this scheme not recognise the value of this service and work with it instead of trying to reinvent the wheel?! Do you actually understand this? Thanks to there being accredited letting agents out there, I can use them to ensure I am a responsible landlord because they tell me and I have to comply. Did you now, that the letting agent I use, actually works closely with The Lantern Trust in the Park District as The Lantern often has people who need housing but are having difficulty finding a landlord who will take someone on housing benefit? Yes, that's right, the letting agent is helping find people accommodation - vulnerable people - who the system has let down, who the council can't house, but private landlords - the ones who seem to be demonised here, are stepping up and offering accommodation where the council can't supply. Oh the irony. The letting ag

The problem in Weymouth town are caused by poor job oportunities seasonal work and poor investment in the area will Weymouth suffering badly targeted investment since before the Olympics, the road system is not fit for purpose so why would people come to Weymouth for holidays, the shopping is poor and if we loose Debenhams we may as well rename Weymouth to charity shops and a beach town. We lost Condor, New look, mod we gained Portland port. The future looking at currant planning applications is Weymouth is going to be the place to come and die. I assume DCH isn't going to be enlarged.

The proposal is based on the known statistics of high levels of deprivation and crime levels. Both these issues cannot be reasonably addressed through the licencing of private rented properties only. There needs to be a concerted effort to address the root causes of these problems. Licencing on its own is likely tp put up the cost to tenants of renting because the costs will just be passed on by the landlords. The aims of the scheme are generally well intentioned but put the price up for all rather than dealing with identified problem properties.

The scheme is a waste of money

The scheme is utter rubbish and will not address the issues. Its simply a another money making exercise against landlords.

The scheme should assist and back the private landlords who adhere to the scheme and look after 'good' tenants when they have problems with 'bad' tenants. A few 'bad' tenants should not be allowed to ruin the area for everyone else.

There are already agencies which deal with many of the aspects covered in the proposed scheme I realise money and resources are limited BUT this proposal is in danger of making another limited resource- decent landlords.

There are already wide powers, but you need first to identify what the problems are. Crime? A Neighbourhood Watch scheme. Fly-tipping? Improve the disastrous provision for rubbish collection and waste disposal provided by the Dorset Waster Partnership. If you must then put up some CCTV of high-risk areas, but really if fly-tipping is occurring it shows that the waste system is not working. Anti-social behaviour? This covers a very wide range of behaviours and everyone has their own threshold at which they consider behaviour to become anti-social. Street drinking? Weymouth already limits this in some areas. Noise at night? Powers already exist to deal with it. Aggression / intimidation? These

There are I believe cheap beds in the area, which are for overnight use only. These look rather seedy from outside and because they are ad hoc and not a tenancy they would not be covered, I would guess many of the problems of the area would come from these too!

There are obviously many properties in the proposed scheme area that fall far short of the statutory letting requirements and that these landlords do not fulfil their legal obligations. In an ideal world these should be prosecuted for not complying, but obviously this does not happen. Targeting non compliant landlords rather than all landlords would be a better option. Landlords are required to supply a tenancy agreement, EPC, CP12, deposit protection information, etc. Why can the council not prosecute those landlords that do not comply? If Dorset Council can bring about positive change it will be an improvement but I worry that responsible landlords will pay the licencing fee and others will avoid this and continue renting substandard properties as they have done for many years. I understand that there are hostels in Weymouth that provide shelter for ex-offenders and other people with challenging backgrounds. Some of these may wish to remain in Weymouth and rent less expensive accommodation or sleep rough on the streets. I realise that their problems are far more complex than not having a home but this is also an issue that needs addressing.

There are some properties that are in a poor state of repair both rented and owned it would make more sense to target those properties exclusively rather than broad brush an entire area because it generates income for the council

There is a power under the Town and Country Planning Acts to serve so called "tidy up notices" on property owners who let their properties become an eyesore such that the amenity of the area is seriously affected. I believe Dover Council has served many notices on private properties that have fallen into disrepair as well as other Councils. I do accept this is a specialist form of visual improvement for an area but as a retired Town Planner I have served such notices myself on properties in the area of the Council I worked for and the appeal process is not to the Planning Inspectorate but the Magistrates Court. I have never had a successful appeal but many prosecutions and successful outcomes.

There needs to be controls on the initial costs that are charged to private tenants in taking on a rental. Some are ridiculous. This would mean regulating the agents too which in some cases is more important.

These problems exist already and without a major strategy to inject an upgrade across these areas and a follow on program , then this drop in the ocean is only going to push up rents in the long term.

This feels like a good idea.

This scheme is awful and I am appalled it is being done in our name. Making landlords scapegoats for tenants is awful. Sort you own act out, provide better education and policing. Terrible terrible idea and survey.

This scheme will not solve these issues. All it will do is boost the coffers of the local council and discourage good landlords from owning and renting out property in this area.

This should not be self regulating. Council officials should do spot checks. Self regulation does not work.

this survey is biased and twisted there is a high crime level here and much deprivation which is not aided by badly behaving foreigners this has nothing to do with landlords we have this situation because of our bad immigration laws and lack of proper policing. when crimes around here are reported the police do very little regarding solving them. so we have very little faith in anything you lot say or propose your schemes are just that they solve nothing but simply push more responsibility on to the landlords you only have to look at the liars in government now to understand why we don't believe in anything you lot have got to say now and in the future stop wasting our money on these useless schemes and spend it on more police that's what we need here more than anything police that have actually got legs that is not wheels

To attack those whom are provided accommodation in the proposed area is short sighted in the extreme and challengeable in a court of law as discriminatory actions The council will end up paying huge sums in legal fees when it will be successfully challenged If you do insist on such a scheme it MUST cover all of Weymouth Silly me I thought it was the responsibility of the police force to address crime and anti social behaviour not providers of private rental property

Too many to mention here.

Unless the property owners are forced to do this, they simply won't do it. Therefore, I don't believe any type of 'voluntary code' would work and that this is the correct approach.

Unsure

Use the enforcement powers you already have to deal with problem properties. Inspect these problem properties more and if the landlords are not keeping their property in good order then force them to do it - conversely if the tenant isn't keeping the place clean and tidy or is causing other problems then do something about it like take their housing benefit away from them.

Use the legal powers the L/A all ready has.

Using police/neighbors schemes to walk in the areas regularly to prevent and report crime

We as an agent have always found the managed properties - ie properties that are managed by agents are fine as there is a person / professional body to act on any problems - the problems come when landlord who feel it is easy to rent out a property dont carry out the correct checks and follow items up

where is the evidence to back up any of these claims ? The council should provide evidence that any of this would work before anyone can answer these claims

Whist there is a soft touch to the wrong doers the problems will never go away, therefore, what ever the council choose to do, nothing will ever work.

Why legislate

Work with the agencies in town to raise standards in properties. This tarring all Landlords with the same brush. I see a mass exodus of landlords from the sector as yet another cost bites home. We have still to appreciate the effect the tenant fee ban will have as well as the full Section 24 implications. We are seeing a lot of Landlords selling as we speak and this new tax will just accelerate the problem causing a housing shortage thus rising rents. The tenant will ultimately pay - again as will the council when their Housing benefit bills go up.

| |
|---|
| <p>Would it be logistically possible to have a checking system with a qualified person, employed by the council, checking properties in the designated area in order to ascertain whether the laws concerning gas, electricity, etc., are being adhered to and that both landlord and tenant are in agreement over good working practices.</p> |
| <p>Yes address the issue of the influx of people living multi occupancy housing and are high users of services who are funded out of the W&P area. The cost of additional support should come with the tenancies.</p> |
| <p>Yes as already mentioned something needs to be done with late night licencing for pubs and clubs. The noise factor in the area from drunk and unruly clients of these places make life difficult for tenants - and actually puts off decent tenants (and who want to experience drunken clients fornicating on peoples door steps at two in the morning when they have come out of a late night club/bar. Something also needs to be done to tackle homelessness. I note that one property for sale at the moment is near the midland bank where there is frequently some poor homeless person or other sitting outside in the door way. Please tackle the anti-social issues and homelessness in the area as this is th</p> |
| <p>Yes council officers have all the powers now to sort out bad landlords, why are they NOT used ???</p> |
| <p>Yes implement the current powers which already exist.</p> |
| <p>Yes sort out the drug dealers. Then the crime level would drop. Any landlord using a Management company should be exempt.</p> |
| <p>Yes, address houses in multiple occupation over the whole of Weymouth and Portland instead. Also address the homeless on the streets of Weymouth and Portland.</p> |
| <p>Yes, the council and other authorities already have powers to deal with sub-standard housing, Anti-social behaviour and the requirement to ensure properties are safe e.g. Gas safety checks etc. A licensing scheme creates more bureaucracy and the issues of the park district will not be dealt with by a landlord licensing scheme. We use a reputable agent to help us comply with our legal requirements and do this to well to keep our tenants happy and our properties tenanted. The council should target the issues raised in this questionnaire directly not through this licensing scheme.</p> |
| <p>Yes. Use all your existing statutory powers and laws to target the specific problem properties, not penalise the majority or good landlords instead. JUST LICENCE AND PUNISH HARD THE OFFENDING LANDLORDS and praise and support the good ones with incentives.</p> |
| <p>YOU REFER TO LITTER I AM TOLD BY MY TENANTS THAT IT IS PEOPLE GOING HOME AFTER A NIGHT OUT WHO KICK OVER THEIR RUBBISH SACKS AND RECYCLING BOXES FOR A BIT OF AMUSEMENT....THIS IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE TENANTS OR THE LANDLORDS. THERE WERE LITTER BINS BUT THEY BECAME AN EYESORE BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT CLEARED AND RUBBISH SPILLED OVER INTO THE STREET AND THEN THEY WERE TAKEN AWAY AS THEY WERE AN EYESORE. IT IS NOT ONLY WEYMOUTH WHERE THIS HAPPENS CLEARING BINS SEEMS TO BE BOTTOM OF THE LIST AND THE TOWN CENTRE ALWAYS GETS THE BEST TREATMENT IT DOES NOT SEEM TO MATTER WHETHER THE SERVICE IS COUNCIL RUN OR PRIVATISED IT IS JUST AS BAD.</p> |

Q21 Any other comments you have about the proposal

1 How would the proposed scheme empower landlords to have an effect on the levels of crime? If a tenant of mine were to drink a beer too many and punch someone, for example, how could my licence-holding affect this? Otherwise sensible people can commit crimes. 2 You provide no real evidence that selective licensing can affect the social issues in the designated areas, just that you think it might. How would the licensing revenue be spent? Would it be absolutely ring-fenced? How secure would it be from appropriation by the next council to be elected?


1) Council should not get involved in administrating this big brother style scheme. There is no evidence of it working elsewhere and it will just turn landlords away to other towns. Weymouth will suffer. 2) There are plenty of other areas in the UK where landlords don't have to pay for and support a pointless licensing dept. And they will. 3) The net result will be empty buildings and streets, less income for the few remaining retailers and overall less income for the Council. 4) There are laws and regulations in existence for landlords and the Council should help the police enforce these within the need for penalising landlords and de facto their tenants.

1. Properties let through a reputable and professional agency are likely to have fewer problems than properties where the tenants deal directly with the landlord, perhaps the license fee should reflect this 2. This may well end up being a tax on responsible landlords

A good idea to have a look at the private sector, as the landlords have appeared to have had a "free reign" for the past few years, It must be wrong for the landlords to get rent paid by the public purse without recourse to a thorough inspection and I also think that the landlords should be called upon to maintain the exterior of their properties and to sort out the storage of bins etc. It seems to me that the source of any problems concerning these houses of multiple occupation lie with the management and cost of the properties therefore please give the landlords a thorough inspection along with the properties. if necessary via an inspection which will grant them a licence to let or not.

A good idea, tighter controls are needed

A good idea. I would licence all businesses so there is a fitness to operate a business!

A stealth tax which will mean higher rents causing more problems to the people you say it will help the landlords will just put rents up to cover the cost. Think that one over 

a very good idea for landlords to be licensed in this way

Absolute waste of time and money!

Accreditation fees will inevitably increase rents thus hurting the people that you are trying to help (something like £250 per year would need to be recovered in additional rent, which probably represents half a month's rent). This is likely to increase significantly for people using letting agents who will charge the landlord for any work that they need to do). Many, but clearly not all, of the problems of the rental sector are due to letting agents who tend to put their own interests above those of the tenants and the landlords. Nothing will change as a result of this change, except that more landlords will be tempted to use them to avoid DBS checks, forms, etc. You have made no effort to explain the problems that tenants are experiencing in this area, and why you believe that this scheme will address the problems. Therefore it is impossible for the people responding to this survey to provide quality inputs. I suspect that the decision has already been made and this survey has been put in place to provide a veneer of 'public acceptability'.

Action is required to improve the area but I do not agree this is the way to do it. I cannot see this reducing crime in the town centre, drug dealing or begging on the streets. I do see an increase in empty upper floors of properties in the town centre as landlords decide it's not worth the hassle and costs being passed on to tenants including the low income families it professes to help.

Agree that the current area identified has some ongoing issues, but if this is implemented then the council need to be mindful that this should not just be rolled out to other areas as a means of raising income !!!! It should only be used where social deprivation and increased crime levels are a known factor. If it is introduced in other areas then private landlords that do provide good accommodation will either sell as it will be another level of compliance and legal burden. Or landlords will increase rents to cover the costs, again to the detriment of the tenant.

Air B&B will benefit from increased availability.

All this does is penalise the good Landlords-again. If a Landlord is using an agency I feel they should be exempt from licensing. Those not using an agency would be encouraged to do so thus raising the standard of all.

An over bureaucratic solution to the problems of poverty.

Another layer of ineffective bureaucracy which will cost landlord's money and therefore raise rents or discourage the letting of property all this will deprive accommodation from those in need.

Any scheme should be cooperative with landlords to help improve conditions and not just be punitive in order to raise revenue. I wouldn't want a scheme that reduces the availability of properties or burdens tenants and landlords with unreasonable costs.

As a landlord I already have to fulfil a number of statutory requirements and work with an agent to run my property as well as possible. There are always disgruntled tenants, but it isn't always the landlord's fault. This treats all landlords the same and I would suggest that accredited landlords are probably not the problem.

As a landlord who likes to keep his property up together, why should we have to pay for a license? Landlords who don't care should pay

As a responsible landlord who already meets the criteria, this initiative is just an extra cost and it has not been indicated how this money will be used to improve the conditions specified (crime, education, social deprivation etc.,). Ultimately the landlords will increase rent to meet this - even though only £12.50 / month if £750 for 5 years - this is near the cost of a gas safety certificate. I would like to see more active use of this money to improve the social area, rather than seeming to put the blame for all these failings on poor landlords. Poor landlords need to be addressed, but as currently I am not a poor landlord, I'd like to see more benefit for landlords. As a quote from the last tenant who left in 2018 "... I'd like to thank you for allowing me to rent the house and for being a really good landlord"

As I said before, my only concern is that an increase in regulation will lead to a reduction in the number of rental properties on the market (especially cheap rental properties) leading to an increase in rental prices, housing debt, homelessness and cost to the taxpayer. Perhaps the council could consider funding additional debt work at First Point or the Citizens Advice Bureau to counteract these issues?

As mentioned I strongly feel that the council needs to look at other issues before putting the onus on the landlords. Of course if there are a handful of landlords who are not operating for the good of all this needs to be addressed but in other ways but the main cause of the 'problem' is not the landlords who are trying to hold on (and this increasingly is a struggle). The concern is that your scheme will only result in increased homelessness.

As previously stated I believe that the powers are already in place which the council fails to utilise. All the problem you list are really police, mental health and council employees responsibility not a landlord. I think the whole idea is wrong the problems you wish to solve are not with the majority of private landlords. Many housing association properties have antisocial tenants and visitors etc but are exempt. So it all a waste of time and money and will make no difference to the problems raised in the questionnaire..

As well as requiring landlords to address these many issues, please would the council also ensure proper provision for their ready access to information, guidance and practical support so that this is a coordinated effort all-round to make the designated area a better place in which to live and work.

Bad landlords let the area down, they don't actually live in the area themselves so they are not particularly bothered, but there are good landlords out there who get a bad name because of the few.

Basically a very good idea and required for the protection of the more vulnerable or low income side of society. However there is another side that some tenants have no respect for peoples property and so the landlord also needs protection from bad tenants

Brilliant idea.

Build more council housing

concerned that we are going down a selective 'tax' approach and only targeting the 'poor' areas....A tax for the 'park area of weymouth' Rented accommodation is not the issue here. It is poor job opportunities, low wages and no ability to put down a deposit for purchasing a house. targeting one aspect (and making the landlord the bad guy), is just hiding/deflecting the problem.

Could empty properties over shops be used as rented accommodation, there appear to be a lot of empty rooms over Weymouth town centre shops

Councils already have to hand a wealth of legislation to hand to act against any problems in any neighbourhood if they wish to implement such. Licensing is just a form of further Revenue Raising but if it has to be introduced perhaps it should be implemented free of charge for the first five years and then reviewed to see what impact it has made on society in general. If it is seen to be well worth it then I'm sure people will wish to fund it but if the service is doubtful then all it is another form of taxation. Private Landlords are suffering a lot recently from SDLT changes, mortgage relief changes, CGT changes and I see that since April 2016 it is estimated that 48,000 properties have been taken out of the private rentals market. I would very seriously consider selling up my properties and getting out of this area if Councils force this issue. That would then mean more tenants looking for housing and Councils should be thinking about providing these homes or otherwise they will be in a difficult position.

DO YOU REALLY THINK THAT IF ALL THE PROPERTIES WERE OF A HIGH STANDARD THAT THIS WOULD KEEP AWAY ALL THE UNDESIRABLE TENANTS AND THEIR UNAUTHORISED GUESTS. PEOPLE HAVE TO LIVE SOMEWHERE AND SOME PEOPLE HAVE VERY LITTLE REGARD FOR THEIR SURROUNDINGS. WHEN I CLEAN UP AND REDECORATE A PROPERTY FOR RE-LETTING SOMETIMES IT IS KEPT IN GOOD CONDITION AND OTHER TIMES I AM JUST APALLED BY THE LACK OF CARE AND MINDLESS DAMAGE SOME OF THE TENANTS HAVE HAD LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OF KEEPING A GOOD HOUSE. THEIR PROBLEM IS ALMOST CERTAINLY DOWN TO BAD UPBRINGING OR PERSONAL HABITS AND CONTACT WITH THE WRONG TYPE OF FRIENDS. ONE DIDNT PAY THE RENT AND CLAIMED THAT HE WAS BROKE BUT WHEN IT CAME TO THE END OF THE TENANCY HE HAD SPENT A FORTUNE ON DAFT PRESENTS FOR HIS CHILDREN BUT COULDNT BE BOTHERED TO TAKE THEM WITH HIM SO I HAD TO CHUCK OUT MANY PRESENTS THAT HAD NEVER BEEN OPENED. SERIOUSLY WHAT CAN YOU OR I DO ABOUT THIS SORT OF MINDLESS ACTIVITY

Does it matter as it's clearly going to go ahead regardless of what people think

Doing something is better than ignoring the problem

Evidently you the council, know the bad areas, the houses, landlords and their tenants sort them out.

Fees are far too high and no obvious benefits to it.

For too long, unscrupulous landlords (of which there are so many) have made vast amounts of money out of high rents and vulnerable people without any regard to their wellbeing or the area in which they live. Their primary concern is making as much money as possible out of their investments for doing as little as possible rather than providing decent homes for people. As long as they have an income stream and their investment continues to grow through increasing house values, they will not do anything unless forced to. I fully support the Council and hope they do all that they can to ensure the scheme results in better living conditions and a much improved area for all who live there.

forcing landlords from the very good to the bad to pay for any licence, is a very bad idea as they will only pass on any cost to their tenants, that may be ok for some on benefits, why should I or my landlady pick up the tab for the bad apples, don't forget there are many other landlords and even housing schemes in Weymouth and Portland (council estates) whom evict troublesome tenants and the housing dept tend to rehouse them in the park district, again I and many other working people will end up paying ever increasing rents and rates

From my experience as a landlord, former councillor and member of the Police & Crime Panel I do not believe that the proposed approach will achieve the desired objectives.

Go for it. But tenants should have responsibilities too - at the moment all the weight of the law comes down on the landlord - it should be equal on both sides.

Great idea but will only really work if all landlords are covered

Having been a landlord some years ago and having worked as a managing agent, I know the need for private landlords in this day and age. I feel it best to keep them onside and work with them rather than pile more responsibilities their way when, as I well know, there are some tenants who do not know how to 'keep house' whatever they were given to live in. I understand the government is now introducing a 'tenant fee ban' which to me is crazy! The more you give to people, the less they appreciate it - that's human nature! If they have earned it themselves, they will look after it better. All that said, no-one likes to see a fellow human being sleeping on the streets, in doorways or wherever they can find shelter. I'm afraid that until drugs are out of the equation - and many other social issues which there is not enough room to mention here - there are always going to be problems in the rented housing sector.

Housing demand in the Borough is very strong, and rents are rising. Additional costs will always find their way either to push up rents or to push down house values. The latter seems unlikely to be successful, and I believe that this will cause landlords to seem to pass on the costs in higher rents, and is likely to be the final straw for some landlords to leave the market. Private letting is increasingly unattractive with the Government seeking to encourage owner occupation instead through a variety of policies so it is likely that those houses will be lost to the rental sector, further increasing the upward pressure on rents and reducing the opportunities for those not in a position to buy or not wanting to buy to find accommodation. This looks to me like a lazy attempt to make it look like the Council is doing something while failing to address the perceived problems and simultaneously causing significant harm. I should add that as we are HMO landlords and already subject to HMO I

[http://www.torbay.gov.uk/DemocraticServices/Data/Council/20060207/Agenda/\\$Revised%20Torbay%20Private%20Sector%20Housing%20Renewal%20Strategy%20-%20Appendix%201.doc.pdf](http://www.torbay.gov.uk/DemocraticServices/Data/Council/20060207/Agenda/$Revised%20Torbay%20Private%20Sector%20Housing%20Renewal%20Strategy%20-%20Appendix%201.doc.pdf) Torbay seems to have their act together with no Levy. Remember there is no profit in a dilapidated property, Landlords Building Insurance requires all the measures set out in the Legislations from and including 6 monthly Inspections to being in good repair. Property which needs investment is an opportunity for our local building trades and motivated first time buyers. The current law allows local councils to prosecute where a landlord fails to make improvements they have been formally instructed to undertake. Off loading the cost of doing the statutory obligation to all Private Landlords is not acceptable the cost should be born by the guilty.

I am a landlord outside the area proposed, but have no doubt whatsoever that if implemented, the scheme will be extended to all rented properties in the Weymouth and Portland area as a revenue raising initiative.

I believe it is the responsibility of both landlord and tenant to work together. Always with this kind of cooperation, it is usually the few who get involved and they are usually the good ones of both sides or the pompous know it alls. It needs cooperation of both sides and a mixture of backgrounds. I believe it is a good idea to improve the area, good licensed landlords would be a good start and good tenants who go through a selection process. I think this will not be easy and both sides will benefit in the long run, On the other hand, I've watched "if you don't pay, we will take it away" on the TV and it appears to me that the law is wrong SOMETIMES re the expulsion of bad tenants but I also believe that early intervention can help in some cases and changed laws protecting both sides should be revised. It is very difficult and a fine line. Landlords invest to make money, tenants need homes - good mix. Bad landlords and bad tenants need addressing. Licensing and references/selection processing is good but I think all should go through estate agents to protect both sides and estate agents are already registered (not the word I'm looking for but hope you know what I mean).

I believe some form of registration and follow up checks on landlords is essential. We live next door to an HMO which is currently in a dreadful state of repair and this is not being addressed. We have lived here for more than 20 years and since this house became tenanted about 13/14 years ago we have had to endure some dreadful conditions both from the condition of the house and from many of the tenants. At one point I couldn't use my back garden and hated using the front entrance because of the groups of undesirables loitering out there. It was closed down at one point. Presently the occupants are pleasant enough but the landlord appears to be leaving it to rot.

I believe this will set an example if introduced and can maybe used on other deprived areas of Weymouth and Portland

I disagree that landlords are the problem. The social issues in the area will not change with licensing. Current legislation already requires standards to be maintained regarding most of the issues in the license and action against those failing to meet minimum standards would be more effective

I do feel that reputable landlords are being unfairly scapegoated with this. The small income I receive after agents commission, maintenance/repairs & keeping up to regulations with utilities is necessary to my monthly income. This high cost of the proposed licence & increased administration involved may mean I will end up selling the flat. The agents I use will charge me for time for extra admin so it may not be viable to keep letting my flat. Many of us landlords, like myself, only let out one flat & do not have a portfolio containing multiple properties. I have tried to comment on the proposals as constructively as possible & taken much time for consideration with this questionnaire so I do hope my comments are of help.

I do not agree with this proposed scheme because - even as a tenant and not a landlord myself - I believe it should NOT be a landlords responsibility to deal with anything other than their own property. The street itself and any anti-social behaviour by foot-traffic should remain the responsibility of the council and the Police. It is unrealistic to expect a landlord of a single property to be responsible for everything that happens on the street outside. Landlords should look after the outside of their building of course, but the street outside should remain the responsibility of the council.

I don't think this proposal is a good idea. If it did succeed raising letting property standards, (doubtfully) it would inevitably raise rents and make more homeless. You are asking landlords to police tenants and visitors behaviour, the refuse collections and returning of waste receptacles, maintain the surrounding area in which their property stands. A lot of which are out of a landlord's control, but is the tenant's responsibility. Give their tenants references to!

I don't agree with it

I don't know why you're bothering to ask residents about this, because: a) it is obviously going to be beneficial on all fronts and b) you never take any notice of what people put in these consultations anyway

I don't think the map goes far enough, it should include Carlton Rd, Glendinning Ave and Kirtleton as well. It's a really hard one as there are great landlords that really look after the tenants and properties, but there are so many other dubious ones where people are living in appalling conditions where they are not listened to for months on end and the properties are falling apart. Some people in the third world live better than some people in these areas. My daughter herself who had at the time a 6yr old was living in a house where everytime it rained water poored through the ceilings down to the ground level and knocked out the electrics and was like it for nearly a yr. Nothing got sorted just patch up jobs, luckily she is in a lovely rented house now at Lanehouse. And a friend of mine had no hot water in her shower for 8 months. These people shouldn't have to live like this it makes people ill. Obviously though the drug problems in the area especially around the train station area,

I feel the proposal is a good idea as a lot of the area looks very run down. I do feel though we cannot entirely blame ALL tenants and landlords as some home owners are to blame as well. Having said that a licensing scheme for landlords would make sure they adhere to certain criteria regarding their tenants, their building etc and penalties put in place if they fail. There are lots of houses which are multiple occupancy and these do attract certain types of people visiting. I myself live in a block of 3 flats with me as an owner occupier and also flat 3, flat 2 is a holiday let and the owner lives away, she also has other properties in the area. In the past she has rented out to basically whoever pays the rent and they haven't been the best of neighbors with Police called, shouting, parties, arguments, damage. It would be good if within this scheme there is some protection or assistance for neighbors living next door should that type of thing happen due to a private landlord not doing proper checks etc

I feel the scheme is punishing good landlords who work hard to ensure their properties are of an acceptable standard. I don't feel there is enough help for landlords and the focus is on bad landlords and not bad tenants.

I have long supported and lobbied for such an approach in this area of Weymouth (as I have also done for other areas of the County) and would like to see its introduction as soon as possible. I would hope that a full evaluation of the scheme will be carried out after a reasonable period of operation and that, if evidenced to be a success, consideration be given to potentially widening the scheme out into other areas as well.

I have other landlord friends who have also experienced problems. One had a completely new kitchen ruined and removed. Another had all the electrical sockets and switches removed. The landlords didn't do it - the tenants did!

I hope the council have plenty of property ready to house the many homeless families who will lose their dwellings when the landlords throw in the towel and admit defeat in the battle to make a living.

I hope this isn't just another money making scheme and that real action will be taken to improve housing for all tenants. Having previously let private properties to council tenants, I can from experience say that they are also a cause of the problems, private landlords should not be held as solely accountable for the state of the town and local housing issues.

I live in the Park District and I am a home owner. When I considered moving here having heard poor reports of the Park District I knocked at least 50 doors and spoke to residents and not one single person was rude and all liked where they live, there is a real community spirit here which can be further built upon. It is clear there are a number of landlords here that do not fulfill their legal obligations to their tenants but are happy to keep taking the money so if the licensing is enforced a lot of the issues will be addressed. There are HMOs locally with no facility to dispose of household waste so it ends up on the street. If proper references were taken for tenants, the difficult people would find themselves excluded, so they will either conform or hopefully can be placed by the authorities in to housing association properties that are better equipped to deal with these individuals than private landlords, Housing associations have staff that keep on top of rent payments and are trained to advise on benefits etc, a better solution for everyone.

I personally do not think that any of this proposal will reduce anything in the town and will just push it further afield, by making this area a selective Licensing area it will then make it difficult for prospective buyers to purchase in the area and will give the town a bad name which will then reduce the tourists that attend each year

I strongly disagree with the proposed licencing scheme - there is already enough legislation in place and this scheme would only serve to incur unnecessary costs for the majority of decent landlords who already comply with the rules and regulations. Decent landlords would be paying for the failings of the small number of landlords who do not comply and this is wholly unfair. As a landlord who does everything 'by the book' - what would I be gaining from paying a licencing fee?

I think it could work really well if it means everyone works from the same page and feel a pride and need to make the area work . I feel lucky to be near the beach ,and it has many positives but I think health wise there is something very neglected about the property I am in .The pigeons at the back and unkept abandoned basement makes you wonder what is going on ,if it is affecting your Health . As tenants you try and change things but it can be a waste of time.

I think it is an excellent idea. Landlords in Weymouth profit greatly from their tenants and should take some responsibility and if they won't they should not be allowed to be private landlords. If a Landlord has criminal convictions they should pass the responsibility of managing their property to someone else and agree to have no contact with their tenants

I think it is very pleasing that the council are intending to address the issue of the rise in private landlords especially since the release of properties from the responsibility of the council. It is essential that landlords are held to account over their commitment to tenants (apart from the obvious safety and comfort issues such as gas, electricity, water etc but also not overcrowding) and ensuring the maintenance the fabric and look of the building.

I think the licensing scheme is a good step towards including the quality of property management in the Melcombe Regis area.

I think the scheme can be seen as a positive but for the landlords with multiple properties it could work out as expensive and like any other business those costs will feed their way back to the consumer by way of rent increase.

| |
|---|
| I think this will result in landlords leaving properties empty. |
| i think to make landlords keep paying is wrong the tenants should look after the property and if they dont should be made to pay for any damage that they have caused. it use to be that tenants use to be grateful to have a home and look after it with pride but now they expect everything for nothing. if all the landlords put the homes up for sale because of the new laws that are being put upon them what would the council do then |
| I think you need to include something to support the landlord. As in a clause where if they are owed rent for a few months you will support them in getting it or helping relocate the tenant. This may be a reason a landlord would want to join the scheme. |
| I wish you good luck and hope the scheme goes forward and is a success. |
| I wonder whether putting even more costs and onerous paperwork onto the Landlord will actually address that fact that cheap housing is necessary for those that are less well off? Surely it would be better to finance more policing and community care. |
| I'd like to know what the licensing fees will be spent on and would like to be assured that it is ring-fenced to only be used in the area and not used on topping up council short falls |
| If landlords are already using a reputable letting agency which covers all the points proposed and to whom they are already paying a fee, they should be EXEMPT from the licensing fee. |
| If successful, a push should be made to have it applied nationally. |
| If this scheme is adopted, then a Register of ALL Landlords MUST be held and be available for scrutiny by the public on demand. It is patently obvious that any fee charged will be passed directly to the tenant as those landlords working through an Agent already lose part of their rental income to that agent albeit a small amount (£2-£3 p/w). |
| If you are to go ahead with this, you need to improve the Quality of tenants more so than the quality of landlords or property! If a register of BAD TENANTS is kept this will help adviod a lot of these issues. |
| If you're going to license private rented accommodation license all of them, or just the bad ones that you get complaints about. |
| In my opinion, the Park District could potentially be a pleasant affordable area for local first time buyers. Instead, as your report confirms, it has been targeted over the years by landlords some of whom have been looking for cheap property for multiple occupancy. This in turn has attracted vulnerable people to the area. The licensing scheme would ensure that such people were not being exploited and ensure that accommodation in the area reached an acceptable level. |
| In view of the growth of privately rented properties in the designated areas over the the last 25 years, steps are required to address the issues that these residences bring. They are undoubtedly required however certain landlords are happy to take the rewards without recognising the responsibilities they hold. |
| It seems that the tenants get far more rights & with little responsibility |
| It is about time that Landlords,who lets face it make a large income out of human suffering should be taken to task. The area in Weymouth affected is a haven for drug dealing and crime and the landlords must be made to be more selective with their Tenants or have their licence revoked. |

| |
|---|
| <p>It is excessive and just an income generator, penalising responsible landlords. It will also add to the costs for landlords which they will have no alternative but to pass onto tenants (as some many costs now fall to Landlords and the market cannot bear these extra charges on Landlords). Other area in UK have concluded that licensing will not achieve the desired result. Also this survey has not been widely publicised so it is not fair to make a final judgement unless more interested parties have a say. The survey needs to be advertised in the area - The Dorset Echo (particularly on Thursdays as the 'property day') and in the High Stree, library and local property managing agencies.</p> |
| <p>It is not necessary and shouldbe scrapped, work within the existing legal framework and enforce bad behaviours of both rogue landlords and tenants instead of diverting resource to this licence scheme</p> |
| <p>It is wrong. It is short sighted. It is not dealing with the issues that exist in that area holistically. The issues in the Park District are social issues. Residents (be they home owners or tenants), businesses, community groups, landlords, the council, they all need to work and communicate TOGETHER. This proposed licence scheme will only further divide the "landlords" from the rest of the community but they are an important cog in the community. The fact that by using an accredited letting agent ensures the landlord is meeting all legal requirements in relation to annual gas safety checks, smoke alarms, fire escapes etc and are certificated at the correct time periods, will not be recognised if the licencing scheme goes ahead. It is not fair to lay the blame for problems at the feet of one group of people who are part of the community cogs and are trading legitimately and fairly. It is very concerning that the problems the Park District face are not being looked at from the bigger picture.</p> |
| <p>It needs to be appreciated that there are at least as many bad tenants as there are bad landlords, and good landlords need to be supported where they are trying to provide good quality, comfortable accommodation despite the damage and unpaid rents they experience.</p> |
| <p>It will only increase my rent...</p> |
| <p>It will only make local landlords push up rents making it worse for every tenant that's renting in the local area.</p> |
| <p>It's clearly a money making scheme for the council.</p> |
| <p>It's a money making scam that will just boost council coffers and be passed on to tenants or make more homes become holiday lets.</p> |
| <p>It's good to see this initiative</p> |
| <p>It's long-overdue!</p> |
| <p>JUST GOING TO PUT UP COSTS TO THE TENANTS</p> |
| <p>keep it simple ,, keep it cheap. There is a known problem with houseing or there would be empty council houses, dont make things difficult.</p> |
| <p>Landlords who use the full management services of a recognised letting agent shouldn't also have be a licensed landlord - the agency's requirements should be sufficient. The council needs to be careful that its actions don't lead to a significant reduction in the amount of available private rented housing.</p> |
| <p>Landlords will only increase rents to pay for this thus increasing problems for tenants.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>Licensing in itself will not bring about any benefits and will just be another bureaucratic exercise, the cost of which will be passed on to already hard-pressed tenants, unless it is accompanied by effective enforceable penalties for those who ignore the requirements of the scheme e.g. improving accommodation. You should thoroughly research to ensure that there is not already legislation in place which could be used to bring landlords to account e.g. Public/Environmental Health before commencing the scheme and spending resources on possible duplication. What do you want the scheme to achieve and how do you propose to deliver this? A paper exercise and fee will amount to nothing.</p> |
| <p>Make it easier for tenants to complain about landlords to the council. Use existing powers to ensure they follow the requirements of existing legislation. Produce a default set of requirements that all landlords and tenants must follow based on the existing legislation. Make it clear that there will be a spotlight focused on "bad" landlords and "bad" tenants. Make it clear that this only one part of plans to improve the lot of the poorer, "deprived" residents of Weymouth.</p> |
| <p>Making landlords pay a licence fee to be able to rent their property out will have absolutely no affect on the core problem of people who choose to drink, do drugs, commit crime and live in filthy conditions of their own making due to not hording junk and not cleaning up after themselves (admittedly not always the case but happens more often than is acknowledged). You could start to solve this problem immediately if you stopped housing benefit being paid to anyone who applies for it who intends to live in this area. Housing benefit for people who live there already obviously must be kept as is or they would be in trouble but over time this will stop more people of that ilk being able to move in - it will however just move the problem elsewhere (Abbotsbury Road for example - this is another area with a growing problem) and penalise those people who are genuine for want of a better word. The council should think about building its own council housing provision again somehow and see h</p> |
| <p>Many small private landlords are good. It's the tenants that are the issue on many occasions landlords of multiple properties. If the tenants have any convictions then they should be declared so that landlords can decide wether to give them a chance. Or not.</p> |
| <p>Might deter private landlords coming forward</p> |
| <p>Might make even more private landlords sell up, thus worsening the situation as regards availability.</p> |
| <p>My concern is that the cost of licensing will be added to my rent and also unfair to target responsible Landlords.</p> |
| <p>My main concern is that he cost to landlords in the scheme will almost certainly be passed on to tenants, and some may not be able to afford it. I would like to know, if my rent goes up as a result of this scheme, will I be entitled to claim an increase in the Housing Benefit that I currently receive?</p> |
| <p>My reason for disagreeing to discounted fees is because, in my opinion, the fee is a relatively small amount over a five year period, given the amount of rent the landlords will receive in that time.</p> |
| <p>Needed to help people who rent to have decent homes to live in and not be afraid to complain about conditions of property for fear of being evicted. To reduce crime and give people pride in their area.</p> |
| <p>No other than I do hope this is a confidential report</p> |

On paper this system looks good. Practically it raises many issues. 1. People that buy properties to rent them out are doing it for the money. Landlords will up their rent they charge to cover the cost of the licence and repairs they need doing. This then has knock on affects to tenants who can no longer afford the rent. - and this will happen. 2. Like any system introduced in this area, it will only work if it is monitored and managed correctly on a regular basis. There is no point issuing licences then not having a good system in place to check up on them. Houses can deteriorate very quickly and not having visual checks on a regular basis the system becomes a waste of time. Just providing electric, gas etc reports once a year can be easily "got around" and doesn't mean the property on the whole is kept to a good standard. Like the current parking system in the area you will have residents who follow the rules and buy permits and then other residents who do not buy p

ONCE AGAIN , I WILL SAY , IT WILL NOT WORK IF THERE ARE NO STAFF TO FOLLOW UP ANY PROBLEMS . THE VAST MAJORITY OF PEOPLE WHO LET PROPERTIES DO IT TO MAKE MONEY FOR THEIR PENSION ETC , WHY WOULD THEY WANT TO GO THROUGH ALL THE GRIEF OF A LICENCE AND ALL IF THE TENANTS ARENT MONITORED ON HOW THEY LIVE . as YOU ARE PROBABLY AWARE IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO REMOVE TENANTS FROM YOUR PROPERTY EVEN WITH THE CORRECT PROCEEDURES

Once there is care put into these properties (which can only happen once the landlords are held to account) then the knock on effect could be really beneficial to the area as a whole. If tenants feel that the place they live in is cared for, managed and safe, then the large majority of them would have respect for their environment, and would look after it in turn. We do this in our house, and there are small pockets of carefully managed rented properties that do the same.

One of the worst proposals i have heard from the council in recent years. This surveys first question should be is this scheme a good idea, then why or why not. Forcing yet another costs on landlords means £750 per year less to spend on upkeep. Don't introduce the scheme then no costs to meet.

Only landlords who have caused problems in the past should be required to be licensed. Others should be left to manage either with or without agents and be left to do this without heavy beaurocratic interference if it is seen to be managed correctly and legally.

Only that the area should be extended, and other measures such as further sensible parking restrictions considered

Only that the cost of implementing this scheme is rather expensivefor landlords.

Other activities and an ongoing monitoring of the properties will be crucial, otherwise this scheme is going to look like it's just a way to raise money for the council, with little benefit for the residents.

Overall across England private letting is a total mess. Bad Tenants and Landlords. Some Lettings Agents bordering on the criminal (not in our area thankfully.) These things can make everyday life difficult for good Tenants, Landlords and Agents. Perhaps it's time for such a proposal to be rolled out across the country.

Overall I think a landlord should only pay for one licence; but have a sliding scale. For example landlords with 1-5 properties, 5-15 properties etc - the cost of the licence goes up according to the banding.

Parking is a nightmare!,,

| |
|---|
| <p>Presumably the Council is speaking with local letting agents for their perspective, local housing sector knowledge and insights, as well as for the perspective of their tenants and landlord clients - e.g. Goadsby, Wilson, Cornerstone, Martin & Co etc? Thinking about how the Council could capture and identify any repeated poor practice by certain landlords or agencies. Is there something the Council can do to introduce an approved/Council recognised 'Good Letting Agency' accreditation standard of some kind for the Weymouth area as part of this project? This could help reassure prospective tenants that they are dealing with a reputable letting agent, who works with a register of reputable landlords.</p> |
| <p>Responsible landlords already meet the standards proposed under the scheme being considered. The scheme will unfairly involve significant extra costs for landlords who only let to holiday makers who are well satisfied .A better solution would be to do a campaign inviting contributions from tenants who feel they their landlord is failing to meet the standard required.This targetted approach will be less costly to administer and should be more effective;It could also be anomous.</p> |
| <p>Scrap the shit</p> |
| <p>See above</p> |
| <p>See above</p> |
| <p>See above</p> |
| <p>Seems to be a job creation scheme for Council Officers and suffers from the "something must be done syndrome".</p> |
| <p>Selective licensing would be appropriate for landlords who are abusing the system, not upkeeping their properties, and not caring about the tenants. However the landlords cannot be responsible for their tenants actions. There are numbers of landlords who do not live in Weymouth and are reliant upon the estate agents' vetting, and obviously it is financially in the estate agents' interests to secure rental agreements. The proposals fall down in a number of areas. If the council want to make the community a better place in which to live, then the community is what needs addressing. More community facilities and activities.. other than pubs. Bring the community together so that people look out for each other. It is pointless to point the finger at the landlords, many of whom already struggle to make ends meet due to tenants with undisclosed addiction or mental health problems.</p> |
| <p>Should be a national scheme to protect all tenants but especially vulnerable ones.</p> |
| <p>Should be applied everywhere, private rentals need reform</p> |
| <p>Should have happened years ago</p> |
| <p>Should you wish to police the actions of substandard landlords the powers are already in place. Compliant landlords should not have to pay for enforcement actions against the few bad land lords in the area. If the problem was as extreme as you suggest we would have seen the local courts inundated with enforcement actions against landlords.</p> |
| <p>Some Private rented accom is fine but some particularly in Walpole street is appalling - the outside of the building is shocking and brings the whole area down. Landlords should be prosecuted for not keeping the outside of there properties well maintained and make sure that they have enough bins etc for rubbish collection etc. If they don't they should be fined.</p> |
| <p>Sooner the better.</p> |
| <p>Strongly support proposal. Cost of licence to landlord seems cheap given high relative rents in area - £100 for room in shared house per week - 6 bedroom house so cost could be covered in one week by this landlord</p> |

| |
|--|
| Strongly supported and long over due |
| Surely adults can make their own decision on where they live. Without taxing landlords which will increase the prices on rent whether you say it won't, it will. Those who should register won't so you are just taxing law obliging landlords. Your questions are deliberated worded to get the responses you require. Why can't you just leave people alone and stop trying to control things you can't and make money out of people in a different way. |
| Target the drug rehabs,hostels and HMOs, don't put rents up for the poor of Weymouth already suffering some of the lowest wages in uk,£5 a week is the difference between a meal out or another boring week |
| Thank you for this survey .It does fix the problems on us who live here and we are suddenly are asked to do something rather than just moan but do nothing.We all know the difficulties the Council have with money and from government so thank you for your work. |
| The area would improve if properties were let to families rather than single unemployed/unemployable men who drink & fight and give the area a bad name. |
| The buy-to-let sector is under attack at the moment with massive amounts of red tape/inspections/compliance and costs for landlords plus tax changes which have made it largely unprofitable. Many landlords are selling up and this simply drives rents up as the supply of property decreases - the new tenants bill in April will impose more costs on agents and landlords which will inevitably be passed on in the form of higher rents. Generating yet another surcharge may well appeal to cash-strapped councils as a revenue generator (just think of all those £700's dropping into your bank account!!) but the people who will suffer ultimately will be tenants. Current mechanisms for reporting substandard properties are in my view adequate. Also, please remember that crime and antisocial behaviour are not caused by landlords, they are caused by residents and dealing with them are the responsibility of the police. Would you similarly try to imply that estate agents are responsible for crime caused by people they sell properties to?! |
| The cost implication certainly suggests this is just a money making scheme for the council as there are issues raised that should have been tackled anyway. I write this as a remnant who currently has an excellent landlord but have in the past had bad ones. Council and police in the past have been of no help. |
| the costs will be passed onto the tenant via a higher rent. alot of tenants are struggling to pay rent now due to sanctions and other circumstances rent of a property is not seen as a priority anymore so tenants dont care you need to make them care to make a better environment. all my tenants have missed rent dates on a regular basis and i work with them. regarding rubbish tenants who do not a vehicle available to them struggle to get rubbish to the household tip i have also seen people living in park area putting carrier bags of rubbish in street bins |
| The Council have been on about this for ages and it is clear the way this "consultation" is set that the Council will get their way and ensure the right people fill out the forms to get landlords to pay for new staff. |
| The council should also have a mechanism that automatically informs HMRC that properties are being rented and by whom. There is too much tax evasion being exploited by property owners who are only interested in lining their own pockets. |

The critical thing is managing the EXTORTIONATELY high private rental costs versus social housing which is a direct contributor to social deprivation in the area, as many private tenants get ZERO maintenance schedules on their properties and limited rights whilst paying FAR HIGHER than the equivalent paid for equivalent social housing as there is simply not enough available. Meanwhile landlords with multiple properties are not declaring most of the income gleaned from their portfolios (asking for direct bank transfer to personal bank accounts) and therefore defrauding the Tax office of and therefore the Council (indirectly) of potential income. There are no regulations (as there are for social housing) that limit the increases in rental charges and no checks or monitoring done on people wishing to be landlords when compared to the tenant. The effect of these things being that social deprivation rockets due to the utter absence of social housing for low income WORKING families as (from PERSONAL experience) they are simply told "...there is no guarantee that your claim will EVER be seen IN YOUR LIFETIME..." when they apply, as the private landlords monopolise a virtually unregulated market depriving families of valuable funds they could be spending in the local area improving the LM3 figures of the local economy.

The elected councillors should look at the bigger picture and not just try to get their names in the local press. The Council's office have the legal powers they need. Councillors should make the Council officers use the power they have.

The evidence particularly about crime levels and property conditions of private sector properties versus other forms of tenure does not indicate the conditions of bringing in selective licences is met. This scheme would require a massive increase in the staff needed to inspect all properties and the existing scheme for HMOs has already proven these type of licensing schemes do not work. This scheme seems more about "something must be done" than finding a low cost solution for what problems exist. Generally when an owner occupier sells to a private landlord the first thing that happens is the property is brought into and kept in a much better condition. More about creating more local government jobs than solving a problem.

The fee is much too high. My husband is a landlord for a property in Scotland and he pays £55 for 4 years.

The fees seem ridiculously high. Most properties are rented through agencies where all of the requirements of a good landlord are addressed.

The licensing scheme could make landlords sell up. This would reduce the numbers of rentable properties and affect the ability of homeless people to find accommodation. Also this could adversely affect the parking problems that exist in the area.

The more I looked into this scheme the more it angers me!! Yes I agree that landlords should maintain properties let. But to blame landlords for crime and anti social behaviour in Weymouth is an absolute disgrace!! It's not the landlords fault for fly tipping, more than likely it could be a house owner! This whole scheme is a joke it's just another way of local councils making money. Why don't you spend more time looking at Weymouth Town Centre and do something about that instead

the only road you resurfaced here was then dug up 2 weeks after it was not the worst road round here either I think your proposal stinks as do all the other hairbrained ideas that you come up with

the whole of Melcombe Regis should be covered

There are so many other things that need to be addressed in the area. Tackle the homeless. Check out how many from The Bus give that as their home when in the courts.

| |
|--|
| <p>Think it should be scrapped, we have good private landlords who look after this rental property. We don't want their costs to go up for this unnecessary license - it is not needed.</p> |
| <p>Think this is an awful proposal and totally unnecessary. Any costs incurred will be passed onto tenants making private renting even more expensive. Think anyone actually living working owning in the area would agree only problem is multiple occupancy so stop allowing that and sort out the parking issues. Lived in the park area for over 20 years and believe no different to any other area in Weymouth. This us just yet another money making scheme. We already pay parking permits for no guarantees parking. I do not want this scheme introduced</p> |
| <p>This is a positive step forward to address a serious problem that has got progressively worse in Weymouth over recent years. I would also suggest you restrict the licences for HMO's as these properties attract the worst tenants. It's time to drain the swamp.</p> |
| <p>This is a terrible, lame idea for dealing with deprivation in the area. We have a lot of good landlords and only a small amount that are bad. The main issues in the area need funding. We've had rehabs close, Mental Health services cut, schools funding cuts, people are only terrible seasonal wages. The solution is to elect a better government willing to invest money into the people instead of spending taxes on stupid businesses that don't trickle down.</p> |
| <p>This is only one part of the equation, an increase in policing and employment opportunities are required to address the issues found in the area.</p> |
| <p>This is such a positive way to improve the quality of housing in the area, and make a positive change for tenants especially for low income families.</p> |
| <p>This licensing of landlords is becoming another way of taxing. It creates a department within the council that effectively just consumes money. If you have a managing agent, they are the professionals. They should possibly have licenses but that's it.</p> |
| <p>This must be done sooner rather than later.</p> |
| <p>This proposal is a waste of time and money and only provides an excuse for the council staff to not do their jobs properly. This survey is designed and laid out to be appallingly bias. It is a disgraceful attempt to obtain the result the council staff desire by phrasing the questions in a manner to give the answer they wish for.</p> |
| <p>This proposal is discriminatory and will cost the council large sums in court I have now changed an investment of £250k I was intended to make this year in light of this illegal proposal - well done your proposed policy has already had the effect that will be replicated across the business investment community</p> |
| <p>This questionnaire is setup in a way that highlights many issues of the Park district and then will lay this as evidence for a licensing scheme. i.e. the questionnaire is not a fair proper independent analysis seeking honest views of the licensing scheme proposal. A questionnaire that is not biased needs to be used to seek views and opinions fairly.</p> |
| <p>This scheme is needed.</p> |
| <p>This scheme needs to be introduced as soon as possible.</p> |
| <p>This scheme will inevitably lead to rent increase. If it is called Landlord Licence scheme why are you proposing to licence every property? Why not just every Landlord? I think it is another obstacle for Landlords and will result in some Landlords giving up and the council will be left with more homeless and having to pay for more people in bed and breakfast accommodation. It seems like a money making paper exercise and the questions are formed in a way for you to be able to say people are recommending it.</p> |

This survey seems to be very biased towards tenants. I own and subsequently rent a property in the proposed scheme area. This property was my home until I moved to live and work abroad in the EU over eleven years ago. During the years I have lived in/owned the property I have maintained and made substantial improvements to the said property. The property has been rented/managed via licensed agents in Weymouth throughout this period. Everything that is being suggested in the proposed scheme I currently apply in accordance with the agents. Tenants are strictly vetted via the agents and the property is inspected quarterly. Neither landlords nor agents have any control over health or antisocial behaviour issues. These issues have to be the responsibility of the individual tenants. It is extremely important to me that my property is maintained by myself but also maintained and respected by the tenants who rent my property. I do agree that there are unscrupulous landlords but there also many more unscrupulous tenants. Weymouth needs to address many problems which have been in existence for very, very many years. I also feel that council housing projects/tenants have also led to the degeneration of some areas in Weymouth. These issues are not assigned solely to Weymouth and are, seemingly, endemic of society nowadays.

This web-site not particularly helpful. The link (early pages) to Scheme does not work

This whole scheme is a red herring

To suggest that housing alone is responsible for the high crime rates, high unemployment rates and low employment opportunities is negligent. Whilst it would help, there would inevitably be tenants who, despite having the best opportunities to help themselves and society, choose not to and scuttle chances and willingly fall back into old habits. It is a difficult question with a multi-pronged approach needed to counter it

Total waste of time this has been proposed in other areas of the Country and then not taken up . Boscombe for example

We are very happy with our private housing and landlords but where there are issues they are caused by the social housing element in the area. This proposal will not solve that - unless of course it is getting private landlords to pay for the trouble caused by social housing tenants and that is neither appropriate nor fair

We feel unable to continue with this survey as it feels like a money making scheme for the Council. We do not have this information about the area. We do know that there is sub standard accommodation in this area and tenants have to pay exorbitant prices for shocking, damp conditions. We also feel that you as the Council should not be asking us these questions but should be conducting an important enquiry to make sure tenants are protected, good landlords provide good housing and bad landlords have to raise their standards.

We own a very nice flat in excellent condition that is rented to a first class well employed young man and fully managed by a professional local property agent - Martin and Co. It is sited in The Carriages, Chelmsford Street DT4 7QS. We spend a lot annually maintaining the flat and the block as do the other owners as this is a requirement of the leasehold. Conditions are monitored by the management agent annually. As husband and wife joint owners would we both have to pay even more to do what we already do well, and both pay for a DBS/CRB check when we have both retired from the NHS and Dorset County Council and still have the certification? We don't think you should include those who are already doing the right thing and can prove it. The flat was left to us by parents as a means of improving our lives and this is what we aim to do for our tenant.

We think it right and proper that Landlords and Freeholders should have a responsibility to owners in multiple flats whether they are owned or rented. Being on a licensed register with the council would be helpful. Maybe it would make Landlords of properties both shops and dwellings maintain and in good decorated order

We work very hard to provide high quality housing in the area. It takes up much time, effort and money to do so, with no safety net if tenants have rent arrears or trash a property, despite passing all the usual checks and references. Social policing of people's lifestyle choices is not the job of landlords and they should not be punished for actions taken by tenants who promise to behave properly and then do not. If we could evict the bad ones immediately then we would, but sadly we are not allowed to. As a fit and proper landlord already, we will sell up in the district and reduce the number of rental units available if licencing is introduced. The yields won't work for future landlords so the units will be purchased by owner occupiers not tenants.

What help / assistance are the council offering to the landlords? This scheme sounds one sided and acts as if all landlords are untrustworthy as opposed to just a few. Maybe licences should be held by people owning HMOs as these tend to be the ones that are poorly looked after rather than one tenant / family per property households. also what assistance does the council give landlords in relation to troublesome tenants as part of the scheme?

where is the evidence to back up any of these claims? The council should provide evidence that any of this would work before anyone can answer these claims. so far it just appears to be a money making scheme for the council.

WHERE ON EARTH DOES THE COUNCIL COME UP WITH SUCH A HIGH LANDLORD FEE - WE ALREADY PAY FOR GAS CERTS - ELECTRIC CERTS - CO2-SMOKE-HEAT ALARMS-REGULAR MAINTENANCE & ACTIVELY TRY TO HAVE GOOD RELATIONS WITH TENANTS. WE CANNOT SEE HOW THE COUNCIL CAN POSSIBLY JUSTIFY SUCH A HIGH FEE - IF A FEE HAS TO BE CHARGED IT SHOULD BE SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER AND PAYABLE MONTHLY NOT AS A 5YRLY PAYMENT DESPITE ANY COUNCIL ADMIN FEE ADVANTAGES OF COLLECTING ONCE EVERY 5YRS. WHAT EXACTLY IS THE FEE TO BE SPENT ON. SUCH A HIGH FEE WILL ULTIMATELY LEAD TO INCREASED GENERAL LEVELS OF RENTAL COSTS TO TENANTS AT TENANCY RENEWAL !! THE FEE SHOULD BE LOWER AND THAT SHOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN AN PRICED OPTION IN THIS SURVEY NOT A VAGUE POSSIBILITY AS PRESENTLY

Whilst the objectives of such a scheme are commendable, the Council should not be losing sight of the valuable role that private landlords play in addressing the shortage of social housing. They should not be penalised by government policy which sought not to replace housing disposed of through Right to Buy and the Council's retrograde decision to hive off its own housing stock to WPH in 2000, subsequently to be subsumed into what is now Aster. Rather than being intent on charging landlords for licenses, the Council and Housing Associations operating within the Borough should bare the cost of ensuring that properties within the private rented sector are of a reasonable standard. AH contributions received through the planning system could be quite reasonably used for this purpose, especially in the absence of a comprehensive programme by the Council in partnership with registered social landlords to provide more homes for those in need.

Why penalize landlords who are providing a service ??? The tenants are the problem !

Will there be a complaints procedure so that neighbours and other members of the community can register concern about the landlord fulfilling their license obligations to the tenants and wider community.

with more control there wouldn't be as many nuisance neighbours. we own our home but can't afford to move. we have terrible problems with neighbours on one side yet the landlord is nowhere to be seen

With reference to a specific area, Park District; local organisations have made great strides in improving the common areas but have great frustration with reluctant or absentee landlords who ignore tenant problems. I have lived adjacent to the area specified above for 20 years approx and have seen a marked improvement over a period of years, followed by a slow deterioration as the volunteer organisation members age. It must be very difficult to maintain a devotion to a cause over a long period when there is little real threat to the pockets of the landlords with respect to punitive action for misdeeds. Money rules!!

Yes as a matter of fact there is, any councillor is more than welcome to inspect my property at any given time with the consent of the tenant to see if it matches up to their high standards, (the same high standards I doubt would be applicable to their council properties), I have nothing to hide but I resent you preparing the way in this well written, well thought out, survey cleverly leading you to agree with said proposals which we all know proposal's are just a forewarning of things to come! I do not wish to pay out anymore, it's bad enough the taxman bleeds me dry for VERY little in return without the council jumping on board, the council in general makes enough money from me, if or should I say when these *proposals* go ahead I will have to rethink very carefully about my future in the rental business and if indeed I can afford to do this anymore, knowing if I sell up the taxman will take more money again from me, congratulations, on your latest idea, your gonna make the current housing crisis a damn site worse than what it already is! I wonder how much the individual who thought this 1 up is making at the expense of others? will that information be available??

Yes. Please differentiate between bad and good landlords in Weymouth and Portland. Perhaps a landlord should be assessed for the NEED to licence him, say if tenants make a complaint to the council? Why should good, decent and law abiding landlords who charge fair rent and maintain the property and pay attention to tenant safety and contribute hugely to alleviating the housing crisis in Weymouth and Portland be penalised financially. £550-750 is a lot of money to someone who has one or maybe two properties that are their only provision for retirement income and who look after their tenants well. Please make licencing SELECTIVE based on need to licence to reward good landlords and please realise that many landlords are not wealthy and only own one or two small properties in lieu of say a personal pension plan.

You and the government are driving out the good landlords - too much regulation and tax changes - we will be selling up soon

You mention the scheme could cost £550-£750 for a Landlord. I already have an HMO licence which costs roughly the same every five years. Would I need BOTH in order to operate? It seems that the HMO licence is very similar to your proposed new Landlord licence ie. evidence of annual gas safety certificate, fire alarms, etc. You mention about "addressing high levels of crime" in the area. This is not really the 'fault' of Landlords. There are many different factors in high levels of crime in a certain area, not just rogue Landlords. Tenants need to take responsibility for their actions, cuts in Policing needs to be re-instated, the breakdown of the family unit contributes to individuals negative personal circumstances, funding for addiction treatment services has been cut and now needs to increase, funding in mental health services has been reduced and now needs to be increased in order to have an affect, etc, etc. Responsibility for negative behaviour should not be put onto Landlords, although rogue Landlords probably 'contribute' to negative behaviour in some way.

you need to help the people in hostels and HMOs behave more responsibly, these blight the area and quality of life for residents in single dwellings, you've really got the wrong end of the stick in this problem, let's hope local councillors see sense and stop unnecessary rent rises as in other trial areas, £3/5 rent rises a week may not seem alot but its the difference of a meal in Wetherspoons once a week, a birthday present for a granchild or night out at Bingo once a week to meet friends. Lets hope you really care about the poor and not add to their troubles. Yours most sincerely Dorset Coastal Properties

You've identified a problem but your solution is not sufficiently focussed but is then too narrow. Bad landlords may have property elsewhere and that too should be included. The focus should be on landlords.

Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.

Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.

Your only trying to do this to raise more money without any thought consideration and good judgement, furthermore where will all this money go will it be used in the local area I somehow fear not.

Your questions seem biased to getting answers that agree with licensing. You are making the area sound like a place no one would dare venture in to, Tenants and owners in the area must feel very downhearted!