

Appendix 3 - HOUSING STRATEGY CONSULTATION RESPONSES

DATE	RECEIVED FROM	ISSUES	RESPONSE/ACTIONS
3/12/2018	Cherwell District Council – (Bicester Healthy New Town Programme Director)	<p>Page 12 Section 2.1 – I think there is an opportunity to link up the work Cherwell District Council undertakes to increase awareness of initiatives to promote warm, energy efficient homes with the National Health Service. Can I suggest that you add : working in a co-ordinated way with local health partners to ensure that residents who are most in need are able to access appropriate support.</p> <p>Page 12 Section 2.21 - I suggest that you add an additional bullet point which states: - Increase use of technology to enable older people to live independently</p> <p>Page 13 Section 2.5 - The last bullet point refers to using the learning from Bicester Healthy New Town. I would suggest that we need to articulate how housing can support the development of healthy communities by:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing residents with a secure home that they can afford • Having a home that is healthy (warm, dry, and safe) • Developing a mix of attractive housing options that support ageing well and which enable residents to feel connected to their community • Supporting the energy efficiency of homes in order to reduce the consequences of fuel poverty <p>Page 15 Section 3.3 - You state the need to broaden housing choices for older people – you may wish to reference the Older People’s Strategy Living Longer, Living Better produced for Oxfordshire’s Health & Wellbeing Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader options would also be of benefit to millennials. 	<p>Agreed – added at 2.1</p> <p>Added : ‘Promote use of technology to enable disabled and older people to live independently’</p> <p>We believe we have covered this in section 2</p> <p>Reference added</p>

		Awareness of how hard it is to get on the 'housing ladder' is very high and I think we need to specifically refer to the needs of 20-30 year olds in the strategy	
31/12/2018	Deddington Parish Council	<p>As a matter of top priority Cherwell District Council should be applying for government funds - as grants or loans - that have recently been promised to local authorities that are building their own affordable housing.</p> <p>At present it is very difficult to get on the Cherwell District Council housing register. To live in unsatisfactory accommodation, or with parents, and have a low income is not sufficient - you have to be in fairly desperate circumstances to qualify. This means people have to pay often unreasonably high rents to private landlords - often for less than ideal accommodation - and the council subsidises the landlord by contributing housing benefit.</p> <p>Provision for homeless people is clearly hopelessly inadequate in Cherwell district, as elsewhere in the country - and has got worse.</p> <p>How much better to build and own housing yourself as a council, charge a genuinely affordable rent, receive the income yourselves and use it for repaying loans, maintenance of existing stock or building new housing.</p> <p>I notice part of the action plan is to identify council-owned land. Clearly this would make building new developments yourselves much more economic if you didn't have to buy land.</p> <p>If council-owned housing were much more widely available, it would probably drive down rents in the private sector, and reduce the need for housing benefit.</p> <p>In your action plan you speak of focusing on particular housing needs - for the elderly and the young, for example. If you are</p>	<p>Acknowledgement 02/01/2018</p> <p>Agreed - we access Homes England funding for our own developments of affordable housing through Build! and via the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal.</p> <p>Housing register – we have 1,000 households on the register and it is open to any eligible household to apply. Local connection is required. We agree that more affordable housing is needed hence our focus on increasing supply.</p> <p>Our homelessness services work to prevent homelessness before crisis occurs and we provide temporary accommodation for families and vulnerable single people/couples</p>

		<p>primarily reliant on commercial developers providing "affordable" housing on their new estates, it is unlikely to be of the type of housing needed nor in the location needed. Nor is there likely to be enough new affordable housing to make serious inroads into your housing list.</p> <p>I realise this council is by no means the worst but I do blame it for freezing the council rate for so many years - proudly - while council services deteriorate, including the provision of housing. This appears to be ideologically driven and not facing reality nor your responsibilities. Also to be tied to outdated Thatcherite ideology hostile to the provision of council housing suggests there is not a real will to solve the housing crisis in the best, most economic way for all parties. Encouraging rural exception sites, for instance, though not in themselves a bad thing, is a way of shifting the responsibility from the actual housing authority to bodies with much less experience and expertise and far fewer opportunities for economies of scale - ie, parish councils</p> <p>You can do better.</p>	<p>who have lost their accommodation. We are working with registered providers to develop affordable housing though land led schemes as well as Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>We accept that housing needs outweigh supply and we are looking at ways to step up delivery including the delivery of properties for social rent.</p>
08/01/2019	BPHA – (Assistant Director of Development)	<p>Enviably track record on the delivery of affordable housing in the district in last 5 or 6 years – inspiring to see your achievements listed</p> <p>At 1.3 (page 9) you talk about encouraging Registered Providers to take a proactive approach to land led opportunities, what sort of initiatives were you thinking about?</p> <p>Have you given some consideration to imposing the Housing Quality Standards through the planning system to improve the quality of new build homes in both the public and private sector?</p> <p>I notice you are keen to pursue further opportunities to convert offices to residential– this is as you are probably aware one of the</p>	<p>Acknowledgement 09/01/2019</p> <p>Examples : sharing the list of sites with extant planning permissions – with Registered Providers – to encourage them to consider these sites for development, promoting the Growth Deal funding opportunities to encourage Registered</p>

		<p>Government intentions to extend the Permitted Development rights. Whilst this does bring people into the town centres which is vital for sustainable communities, we do need to be mindful that these conversions often sacrifice quality and amenity space.</p>	<p>Providers to build in the district, looking at opportunities for further affordable housing delivery at Graven Hill.</p> <p>Agreed – town centre developments must build sustainable communities, and promote health and wellbeing and may suit particular target groups.</p>
10/01/2019	<p>Respondents at Stakeholder Consultation Event (16 attendees) Priority 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People being released from prison – avoiding street homelessness/Issues about lack of credit rating – wider system issue? • Lack of consistent protocol for referral/support • Tenancy support insufficient • Homeless Pathway –complex needs/location • Private Rented Sector – Bond scheme for homeless referrals • Issue about rent arrears (under 8 weeks) • Share landlord information (Registered Providers) Aspire Model • To provide data on levels of need (Mental Health) • Move on – Bromford “My place” model • Social Housing Guardianship – support for tenants – 10 units in Oxfordshire - volunteer support in return for low rents (8 hours per month) • University Halls of Residence – premises (vacant) • Transition by Design (social enterprise) employment/charity • Ex-offenders – consider housing as key to reducing re-offending • Co-housing – research Community led housing funding and information on-line for those interested in co-housing 	<p>These are useful points – many relate to the Homelessness Strategy. We will specifically include the need for accommodation for young people e.g. well managed, affordable Houses in Multiple Occupation and other Private Rented Sector options. We will look at the Social Housing Guardianship model.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Council owned land • Difficulties in getting things through Planning – is this a capacity issue? • Transient leadership – Registered Providers and Developers need to know who's who • Need Planning representation on Housing Board • Private Rented Sector is inaccessible – can't place single homeless • Need well-run and managed Houses in Multiple Occupation – Registered Providers will build if we can find someone to manage • Can Registered Providers deliver Private Rented? • Obligation to provide self-build on sites 	
10/01/2019	Respondents at Stakeholder Consultation Event Priority 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is essential that we hold developers to account – Registered Providers are spending 'up to 18 months' resolving significant issues arising because properties are 'not built properly in the first place'. • Council is signing off properties that are not fit, or are not built to the planned standard. • Lack of skills in the construction sector – potentially to get worse after Brexit. Need for a construction skills academy? Also consider the housing options available to construction workers who are on insecure contracts. • Interest in modular factory built units to improve speed, consistency and quality of new builds • Faithworks reported problems delivering furniture to many new build properties because of access and design – especially getting upstairs in flats – Aspire suggested that they contact IKEA social works re flat pack units but this wouldn't resolve the issue of lack of space or help reduce waste through reusing existing furniture • Need to ensure bus routes are available to new builds at an early stage to avoid social isolation. Aspire noted that they 	<p>Agreed – we have strengthened 2.4</p> <p>This is a concern. Cherwell District Council has funded the Apprenticeships Training Company whose focus is apprenticeships in construction.</p> <p>Modern methods of construction is part of the Growth Deal ambition.</p> <p>Faithworks's experience corroborates our concerns about some</p>

		<p>have Community Transport services so may be able to assist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Registered Provider properties are in poor condition – damp and minor disrepair Suggested Action: Private Sector Housing Team to visit Faithworks to ensure staff and volunteers understand our services and can signpost effectively • Faithworks to discuss with Registered Providers a project to retain white goods and carpets when property is vacated – appliances could be PAT tested/carpets could be cleaned and Registered Provider could have a disclaimer. • Co-housing/ Community Led Schemes – research document will soon be available from Oxford City Council. Explore options in Cherwell eg: using empty homes or other buildings as co-housing projects and “peer led” housing for care leavers • Tenancy Ready Training in Private Rented Sector – Aspire and Connections Support already do this • Oxford City Council are using their Tenancy Strategy to insist on lifetime tenancies and social rent in Registered Provider Accommodation to “lead by example” and also insist on 5 year tenancies in all dealing with Private Rented Sector 	<p>new build properties and their suitability for adaptation and access. We will help broker dialogue between Faithworks and Registered Providers about retention of white goods/carpets etc.</p> <p>Our Housing Standards team is here to help tenants of Registered Providers as well as Private Rented Sector tenants and we do assist tenants affected by poor conditions.</p>
10/01/2019	Respondents at Stakeholder Consultation Event Priority 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 3.1.3 – access to Housing Options service is difficult as there is no bus service between Bicester and Banbury. It is difficult to understand how the telephone system works and conversations need to be jargon free. Face to face housing advice needs to be available in Bicester, Kidlington and the rural areas. Need a resource prior to hitting the Housing Options Team eg: Community navigators, legacy of Trailblazer. • Action 3.1.4 – Choice is very important – if people are living somewhere that they want to live it gives an incentive to pay rent, obey rules etc 	<p>A mystery shopping exercise has been commissioned from Shelter to identify barriers that customers experience and improve access to our service.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drug/criminal exploitation – multi-agency working is essential • Ability for people with complex/high needs to sustain tenancy – need to think about viable options/support clients may have had a trauma which has led to poor behaviours, can take a long time. • Sofa surfers are rough sleepers in waiting • Shared housing is a viable option for some – need incentives from central government, may be difficult to manage and service charges can be high. • Access to private rented for sofa surfers – only option may be the Housing Register • Affordability many people in work are unable to afford Affordable Rent • What happens to people who have been evicted from Social Housing • Domestic abuse cases forced to move out of area • Take positive risks – giving people a fresh chance • Need to raise awareness of choices – there is a sense of entitlement to join the Housing Register which is not an immediate solution • Action 3.2.1- it is unclear that band 4 is for those without a reasonable preference • Access to the Housing Register may be difficult • Housing Register applicants are not notified if application is not renewed/closed due to lack of information. Applicants with No Fixed Abode are being sent letters but where are these going to – use support agency address if possible • Action 3.2.2 – Applicants need to understand why decisions are made regarding offers of accommodation. Need to implement clear steps to move back to where they want to live. • Independent living can result in social isolation. People need confidence to move to a new area – look at creating 	<p>These are useful points and will inform improvements to our Housing Options service.</p> <p>The Allocations Scheme is being kept under regular review to ensure it meets the needs of people affected by domestic violence and we work closely with the refuge provider to ensure people who want to remain in Cherwell are helped to do so.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>intentional communities and co-operative living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the proportion of new builds/re-lets of nominations • Support networks help sustain tenancies 	<p>We will include data about allocation of new build properties vs re-lets in the State of the District's Housing Report</p>
15/01/2019	<p>Young Peoples' Panel (Approximately 6 partner agencies attending)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns around the level of rent arrears (those attending mentioned arrears of several £1000s) that some young people have accrued while in supported housing and the potential impact this has on their ability to be considered for move-on accommodation via Cherwell District Council's housing register. • A need for move –on accommodation with some low level of support – we discussed the model of 'Peer-Led' units being established in Oxford which are 3x 3 shared housing units with some floating support specifically for care leavers. • A need for foyer type accommodation to be separated by age group; so separate provision for 16-18 year olds so those entering provision don't have the same 'freedoms', for example to be out late at night, as older residents. • The group also flagged concerns about the general lack of provision of mental health services for young people including unacceptable wait times for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service referrals and then first appointments. • Concern was also expressed about the reduction in Early Intervention services and the impact this may have on young people coming into the Pathway as they reach 16 – potentially increasing demand in years to come. Population growth around Bicester in particular was also noted as a 	<p>Acknowledged – Assistant Director is leading on accommodation related Social Services Commissioning at Oxfordshire County Council as well as Housing – so there are good opportunities to review and resolve these issues.</p> <p>The issue of rent arrears in the pathway will be addressed in Oxfordshire County Council's commissioning of the new service to start in April 2020 – a review of rent and financing of the pathway as a whole is needed along with more communication between the pathway providers and their social worker or personal advisor.</p>

		<p>potential factor in future need.</p> <p>These have also been raised as part of the recommissioning of the Young Person's Pathway by the County Council.</p>	<p>Regarding move on accommodation – Oxfordshire County Council has flagged this as an issue in all district consultations. In addition Oxfordshire County Council is launching The House Project which is a peer led housing project for care leavers. We are hoping that 2 shared houses will be populated in the spring.</p> <p>We are reviewing the use of the pathway for mixed ages and how we all deliver our statutory responsibilities most effectively.</p> <p>The need for additional support for Mental Health and other complex needs is also something we are aware of and will be addressing in the recommissioning of the service.</p>
16/01/2019	Oxfordshire County Council, Children, Education and Families	<p>We welcome the emphasis in the strategy on providing a range of affordable homes and the acknowledgement that social rent is the only truly affordable option for many people.</p> <p>We would like to highlight the needs of Care Leavers for whom</p>	<p>We recognise the need</p>

		<p>shared accommodation is the most realistic independent option. Like many authorities we are experiencing an increase in the number of children taken into care and suitable move-on accommodation for this group is a particular pressure.</p> <p>We are aware of 18 single young people seeking to move on from our Supported Housing Pathway in the Cherwell area over the next 18 months. We believe that Houses in Multiple Occupation managed by a social registered landlord would provide a stable and affordable option for young people moving into independence</p> <p>We also expect 2 young families per year to move from the Supported Housing Pathway in the Cherwell area. They would need two bedded accommodation within easy reach of shops. Properties managed by a social registered landlord would be ideal.</p> <p>A thorough review is taking place of our young people's supported housing pathway and we hope that a significant portion of this provision will continue to be in Cherwell. At present there are 17 units of accommodation for young families, 35 units for single young people and 3 units for young people not able to live with others. We are seeking in the meantime to increase our provision for Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers in Banbury.</p> <p>We welcome the intention to work with partners to develop detailed understanding of specialist housing requirements.</p> <p>Under Action point 2.2.3 we note the commitment to provide 6 units of self-contained supported housing. We anticipate that 6 young adults with learning disabilities per year will require supported housing in the Cherwell area. In addition, we predict that 4 young wheel chair users will require adapted properties in Cherwell</p>	<p>for shared accommodation for young people including care leavers and we will be looking to source this through a registered provider or the private sector or in-house. Care leavers are an identified priority group and we will be working with the county council to improve housing supply and outcomes for this group.</p> <p>Agreed – we need a plan</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Properties for this client group need to have enough space for large electric wheelchairs to manoeuvre and to be strong enough to support ceiling track hoists.</p> <p>We note the commitment under Action 3.2 to keep the Allocations policy under review. We are hopeful that we can agree a protocol to allow potential foster carers to be considered for suitable housing which would allow them to fulfil their foster caring role.</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to work with you more closely in the support of vulnerable families, some of whom may be deemed intentionally homeless. We are piloting a protocol which outlines additional support to be offered to allow “intentionally homeless” families a second chance at maintaining a tenancy.</p>	<p>for meeting this quantified need.</p> <p>This protocol is in draft and will be adopted by March 2019.</p> <p>This protocol is in place and will be used to support vulnerable families to become tenancy ready.</p>
16/01/2019	Cala Homes – (Affordable Housing Director)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very interesting and clearly set out – no issues with the Strategy • Pointed out typo re numbering on p15 	Acknowledgement sent 16/01/2019
21/01/2019	GreenSquare Group - (Lettings Manager)	<p>Key Achievements – 8th bullet point should be amended to “We inspected 438 Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) to ensure appropriate standards are achieved and maintained/ 9th bullet point – this doesn’t read quite right – what does it mean?</p> <p>Priority 1, Why is this Important 2nd bullet point – This commitment may well be a factor but it is kind of at odds with “why is it important” as there is no explanation why there is such a commitment and detracts from the issues in Cherwell district. Maybe it should be included as a bullet point at the end with “Furthermore we have a commitment....</p>	<p>Changes made to clarify both these points.</p> <p>This bullet point has been moved.</p>

		<p>What we plan to do – para 1.2 last bullet point - How will this be achieved?</p> <p>Priority 3 objective 3.2 should read “Review the Allocations Scheme to ensure it meets housing needs”.</p> <p>Sounds like it will be under review and not finalised. The allocations scheme in itself cannot meet housing need. It is more that the scheme supports fair access to affordable housing taking into account people’s needs.</p>	<p>There are opportunities to step up development within the parameters of the Local Plan. We recognise that we would need to resource and develop this work as we have focussed more on development in Banbury and Bicester over the last few years.</p> <p>Agreed – the housing register meets the needs of low income households with a level of need that meets scheme thresholds. We also need to meet needs through new developments and better incentives/engagement with private sector landlords.</p>
22/01/2019	Campaign to Protect Rural England - (Chairman)	<p>Thank you for your invitation to contribute to the district council’s housing strategy. We have read your paper and appendices on the subject and would like to make the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agree with your aim to supply more affordable homes, but much so-called ‘affordable housing’ is beyond the reach of many people, especially in Oxfordshire. This may be partly the fault of employers paying insufficient wages and developers insisting on excessive profits, but we believe that you should address the serious shortage of social housing. 	<p>Acknowledgement 30/01/2019</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support all efforts to increase energy efficiency and to reduce the running and environmental costs of new homes e.g. by the use of ground or air source heat pumps and underfloor heating. We would much rather see solar panels attached to the roofs of buildings than in the middle of green fields, but care must be taken to ensure that they are not obtrusive. Panels should be positioned to reflect the structure of a roof e.g. by matching the size and shape of existing tiles. • As an organisation supporting the protection of historic environments, we urge developments to take account of local distinctiveness and landscape character. While there is a case for the use of good-quality modern architecture in an urban environment – and for factory-manufactured housing (which can speed up delivery and improve quality) – we believe that buildings in and around villages should generally be of traditional design and materials. • For districts such as Cherwell where pressure on the countryside is so intense, we urge the Council to build housing at a density that is appreciably higher than the current practice: we would like to see a target density of seventy houses per hectare in both towns and villages. Such a policy would help protect more of the countryside and at the same time make houses cheaper and more affordable. Terraces in towns and villages are more energy efficient than detached homes, and of course they need less land. High density in Oxford City would also reduce pressure on the Green Belt, which we believe should be protected far more strongly than it is at present. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The minimum density of housing is set at different levels for urban and village areas and is much higher in the urban areas. We believe 70 houses per hectare are too high for rural areas. The Partial Review of the Local Plan is likely to confirm a minimum density level of 30 in rural areas, based on the 2018 Housing and Economic Land</p>
--	--	--	--

			Availability Assessment (HELAA). The HELAA is a technical study that determines the suitability, availability and achievability of land for development and was produced with input from a number of Cherwell District Council services.
22/01/2019	Cherwell District Council Service Leads Consultation (9 attendees)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no reference to Gypsies and Travellers in the document, evidence – need, publications, policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy BSC6 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 sets out the requirement for accommodating the needs of gypsies and travellers and travelling show people. This was based on the Gypsy and Traveller Housing Needs Assessment (Jan 2013) and Needs Assessment for Travelling Show people (2008) ○ Since the Local Plan adoption, a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people Accommodation Assessment (Oxford, Cherwell, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse) was published in June 2017. It was envisaged that this would help to inform the preparation of Local Plan Part 2. This assessment takes into account the Government's new definition of a traveller. ○ The 2018 Annual Monitoring Report provides the most up to date position on Cherwell's position on travelling communities (pages 33-39). ○ If assessing against the adopted Local Plan Policy BSC6, we will need to deliver 29 pitches. However, if we are looking at the latest evidence which has not been tested through Local Plan examination, we will 	We have reflected these needs in the State of the District's Housing document.

		<p>only need to deliver 11 pitches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For Travelling Show people, the need is 14 plots (BSC6) and 5 plots (latest evidence) <p>Oxfordshire County Council recommends sites of no more than 10 pitches in order to best meet the needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do we have a definition for Keyworkers? The Partial Review commits to “some” for Keyworker accommodation for Oxford’s need – Strategy needs to mention the County wide work ● Community Led Schemes – there is nothing in the Local Plan so would have to be part of the Affordable Housing requirement ● Affordable Housing Supply figures need to be consistent and need to be gross figures ● Need something in the Strategy re the definitions of affordable housing in the new National Planning Policy Framework ● Need to link Housing Development with employment and have new development near to the nodes of employment ● Can we do more work on private sector housing in Bicester ● Need to state for each action whether we are going to Lead, Support, Influence or Monitor ● Strategy is too woolly and not SMART enough – need a timeframe for actions that will happen after year 1 and we need to state how we will monitor this ● Do we need to give more general housing advice – need to decide if we have enough resource for this ● Promote the Homeshare scheme currently being rolled out in Oxford by Age UK 	<p>Figures have been re-checked and gross figures used throughout.</p> <p>We have reviewed the commitments in the Strategy and attempted to make them firmer/clearer.</p> <p>We are developing work to help keyworkers as part of our wider Housing Options offer i.e. going beyond homelessness to other priority groups that have a housing need.</p>
23/01/2019	Connections Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Connections are getting referrals from clients placed in “affordable” housing who are struggling financially, some are having to look for transfers to cheaper properties 	<p>Providers do undertake affordability check before accepting new tenants and we would not nominate clients to</p>

			housing that is unaffordable for them. However, people's circumstances do change and we will provide debt and money advice through Citizens Advice, help with Benefit take up including Universal Credit and where necessary, help to find new accommodation.
24/01/2019	Staff consultation (7 attendees)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategy seems well thought out • Better infrastructure is required eg: a ring road round Banbury • Housing Choices – more housing options for first time buyers eg: Rent Plus schemes/range of options in villages including options for young people/suggestion of a static caravan/cabin site where people could purchase a unit and stay for a maximum of 15 years to help them get on the property ladder • Social rent/Living rent – Living rent would make some places very expensive. Living rent would leave local people with more money to support the local economy/affordable should mean that you can afford to rent and also live and do daily activities/if you are not working you should still be able to afford to rent/live even those who work struggle to afford rents • Older people – options are required for intergenerational living – not just market options a “knock on” benefit would 	<p>We agree that more options are needed for young people trying to get accommodation and get on the housing ladder. Some of this is about promoting options and offering advice.</p> <p>The properties let through the housing register are at social rent (around 50% of market rent) or affordable rent (up to 80% of market rent). We generally advise that a household</p>

		<p>be employment for parents of young children and flexible working for older people. Extra Care is required but this needs to be affordable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warmer Homes/Fuel Poverty – are there any schemes which provide grants for insulation for those in work/need for better information about options for improving insulation and heating in older properties which are difficult to insulate/need to talk to Communications Team regarding communicating quickly and effectively information on switching providers, boiler schemes etc/oil is expensive and many areas have no gas • Private Renting - too expensive Cherwell District Council should be more proactive regarding promoting the advice it can offer tenants 	<p>should not be spending more than 30-35% of their income on rent but this can vary according to household circumstances.</p> <p>Yes – the Affordable Warmth Network is supported by Cherwell District Council and can help. Our own Private Housing Team can also help and advise.</p> <p>Agreed. We have no powers to cap rents but we can help tenants be aware of their rights and can assist where landlords are not complying.</p>
25/01/19	Cherwell landlord and resident (Via letting agent/ Landlords forum)	I think the section 2.3 on the provision of new accommodation above or connected with commercial premises lacks ambition. I think the action plan mentions only four new units before 2020. There seems to me to be plenty of potential in Banbury for many first and ground floor conversions of commercial property into new residential units and it would be nice to see the council making much more use of the potential in this way, through planning consent and grants etc. We can no longer assume that high streets will be fully occupied as retail units.	Acknowledgement 28/01/2019
25/01/19	Partner @ David	The Tripartite has the following detailed comments, which it is	Acknowledgement

	<p>Locke Associates, on behalf of the Tripartite (University of Oxford, Merton College and The Smith Trust) who own and control most of the land at Begbroke proposed to be allocated by Policy PR8 of the Draft Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need (‘the Plan’).</p>	<p>requested are considered by the Council before progressing and finalising the Housing Strategy:</p> <p>1. Firstly, the Tripartite has significant concerns about the proposed greater requirement and preference for social-rented affordable housing. Whilst it is acknowledged that social-rented housing is an important element of affordable housing, the Tripartite considers employer-linked affordable rented housing at Begbroke to be entirely appropriate for directly meeting Oxford’s unmet needs especially as Priority 1 (Section 5, Objective 1.2) refers to:</p> <p>a) the Council being committed to helping Oxford City Council meet its need for 1,400 homes per year;</p> <p>b) increase the supply and uptake of affordable housing for key-workers;</p> <p>c) diversify the provision of affordable housing;</p> <p>d) develop affordable housing for people from Oxford; and</p> <p>e) contribute to the Oxfordshire Growth Deal programme to ensure housing targets are met.</p> <p>In addition, Section 5, Objective 1.3 refers to the Council working in partnership with private developers and landowners to gain greater control over the delivery of housing, which is consistent with the University’s strategy and approach;</p> <p>2. Secondly, in respect of Priority 2, the Tripartite considers that this objective will be realised via Policy PR8 and other policies in the Plan, on the assumption that the Plan and allocation are found ‘sound’ after the completion of the examination by the Inspector;</p> <p>3. Thirdly, in respect of Priority 3, the Tripartite considers that this is consistent and compatible with the University’s aspirations as it refers to ‘the need for key-worker (another term for employer-linked) housing [being] high.....particularly for those working in Oxford City, and the Housing Options service needs to reflect this.’ This is strongly supported;</p>	<p>25/01/2019</p> <p>1. Agreed – it is not our intention to be prescriptive about the proportion of affordable housing that should be social rented but we do need to look at ways to increase social rented housing as the only truly affordable option for many of the households we work with.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>4. Fourthly, also for Priority 3, the Tripartite supports the Council improving relationships with the local private sector to increase innovation and support development of the market. The Tripartite believes this is consistent with the provision of employer-linked affordable housing (affordable rent) along with “build-for-rent” as set out in the revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018). The University will also consider including some accommodation, which comprises ‘rooms in shared houses’, to meet specific accommodation and affordability needs;</p> <p>5. Fifthly, in the Council's Annual Action Plan, as set out above, the Tripartite would support close liaison with the Planning Policy Team given the issues set out and also encourages and supports close liaison between the Council and Oxford City Council on initiatives to meet Oxford’s unmet need, given that they comprise part of the same Housing Market Area and there is a need for joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</p> <p>I trust that these comments are of assistance and request that they are carefully considered by the Council and the Strategy amended to take the Tripartite representations into account</p> <p>I attach the following documents, which comprise the Tripartite representations on the Draft Housing Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Lock Associates Letter on behalf of the Tripartite dated 25 January 2019 • Appendix 1 – Letter of Dr David Prout to Councillor Wood • Appendix 2 – Statement in support of University subsidised staff housing • Appendix 3 – David Lock Associates Note on Amendments to Draft Policy PR2 of the Plan • Appendix 4 – Policy extracts from Draft Oxford City Local Plan 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – this partnership is underway.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>25/01/19</p>	<p>Savills - instructed on behalf of The University of Oxford, Christ Church, Merton College, Exeter College and Trustees of the Water Eaton Estate</p>	<p>The Clients collectively own land at North Oxford proposed for allocation in the emerging Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) Partial Review under emerging policies PR6a and PR6b.</p> <p>As part of these allocations there is a requirement within the emerging policy to provide up to 50% affordable housing as part of the 1180 dwellings proposed. The Clients have previously submitted detailed representations to the Council relating to provision of affordable housing within the emerging allocations.</p> <p>The definition of affordable housing in this context is as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF). As you will be aware, the definition expands the types of tenure that can be considered to be affordable housing including key worker accommodation and starter homes.</p> <p>In this regard, it is expected that a significant proportion of affordable housing on the emerging allocation will be delivered by the University of Oxford, Colleges and by Registered Providers. Indeed, the University's Strategy 2018-23 contains a commitment to commence construction of at least 1000 subsidised units of accommodation for University/College staff by 2023. Attached is a statement produced by the University on its approach to subsidised accommodation for staff that was recently submitted to the Council to assist in the examination of the Part 1 Local Plan Partial Review. Such an approach needs to be taken into account within the Housing Strategy document.</p> <p>Against the above background, we have the following comments to make about the Housing Strategy document.</p> <p>Page 6 – Last line in the table - it should be clear which Cherwell Local Plan the document refers to. This should be the Part 1 adopted Plan and the emerging Partial Review Plan dealing with</p>	<p>Acknowledgement 25/01/2019</p> <p>These representations are being taken in to account as part of the Partial Review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Partial Review is not yet completed so we still refer to the Local Plan</p>
-----------------	---	--	--

		<p>Oxford's unmet need.</p> <p>Page 8 – second bullet point in relation to the Oxford City need - it should be made clear that this is a total of 4400 dwellings over the planned period to 2031 and with the expectation of 50% of this being delivered as affordable housing which aligns with the policy position within the City.</p> <p>Page 8 - sixth bullet – this states that social rent is the only truly affordable housing option for many people. The National Planning Policy Framework contains a definition of affordable housing. This sets out varying tenure options under the holistic affordable housing title. It is therefore considered to be inappropriate simply to refer to social rent in this paragraph. We would recommend that the text be altered so that it refers to the wider definition set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Page 8 – subheading 1.1 – last bullet – this refers to drawing on internal “data and intelligence from that of our partners”. This should extended to include major employers in the local area, for example the University of Oxford and Colleges.</p> <p>Page 9 – third bullet – this refers to ensuring that the development of new housing contributes to vibrant and sustainable town centres. We are unclear of the relevance of this criterion and how this would assist with the Housing Strategy. It is recommended it is deleted.</p> <p>Page 9 – subheading 1.2 first bullet point – this refers to exploring the viability of delivering homes for social rent within new developments. The tenure mix required on any site is set out within the policies contained within the adopted and emerging Local Plans. Changes to planning policy would be required to affect this</p>	<p>2011-2031 as the adopted document.</p> <p>The allocation policy for affordable housing in Cherwell that is intended to help meet Oxford's unmet need is currently being worked on.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is guidance and does include a wider definition of affordable housing. But we may take the view that we need more homes for social rent – as a local need within the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>Agreed – we welcome employer data on the housing needs of keyworkers.</p> <p>The Local Plan sets out the ‘rules’ for developments of 11+ units in terms of affordable housing %.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>change.</p> <p>Page 9 – paragraph 1.2 second bullet point – this refers to increasing the supply and uptake of affordable housing for key workers. The Clients are fully supportive of this approach and are investigating this in the context of emerging allocations PR6a and PR6b.</p> <p>Page 9 - sub-paragraph 1.2 fifth bullet point – this refers to developing affordable housing in identified sites for people from Oxford with unmet housing need. This specifically relates to our Clients land under the emerging allocations. It is recommended that this criteria is changed to working alongside the landowners and house builders bringing forward allocated sites to develop affordable housing to meet the needs arising from Oxford’s unmet needs.</p> <p>Page 9 - sub-paragraph 1.3 first bullet point – this refers to seeking the maximum amount of affordable housing when negotiating with developers on new schemes. The wording should be amended to state the aim to seek the required amount of affordable housing in line with planning policy when negotiating with developers on new schemes. The National Planning Policy Framework lays down clear rules on viability issues which may dictate that a lower amount of affordable housing than the maximum would be appropriate when delivering a particular scheme. The Strategy should acknowledge this.</p>	<p>However this does not dictate what % of affordable rented should be social rented and this is an issue for CDC to take an view on and discuss with developers.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed - reworded.</p> <p>This is understood – the actual % affordable housing delivered an any particular site depends on viability but we aim to maximise affordable housing delivery. In relation to the Growth Deal we are seeking additionality above and beyond minimum affordable housing</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Page 10 - sub-paragraph 1.4 last bullet point – this refers to reviewing internal resources and structures. It should refer to links within the Housing and Planning Departments to ensure a joined up approach to maximise delivery of appropriate housing tenures to meet the identified needs within the District.</p> <p>Page 14 – fifth bullet point – this refers to key worker housing. As mentioned previously in this letter the University of Oxford and Oxford Colleges are seeking to deliver a significant proportion of key worker accommodation to meet the needs of the University and Colleges over the next 5 years. This aspiration is therefore fully supported and should be taken in to account in the Housing Strategy.</p> <p>We would welcome a discussion with Officers to fully explain the needs and aspirations of our Clients and how the Housing Strategy 2018-2023 can be amended to take on board these aspirations and ensure successful implementation and delivery.</p>	<p>delivery.</p> <p>Agreed – this refers to our collective resources and must involve good joint working between Housing and Planning.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>We are engaged in the Keyworker housing workstreams coordinated by Oxfordshire County Council and understand the level of need.</p>
25/01/19	Estates Department University of Oxford	<p>The University of Oxford welcomes this opportunity to comment on the District Council's draft Housing Strategy 2018 – 2023.</p> <p>It is actively engaged in supporting the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need ('the Plan'), as explained most recently in a letter dated 6 December 2018 from Dr David Prout, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) to Councillor Barry Wood. The University's strategic objective is to develop its landholding at Begbroke (PR8 in the Plan) to provide a substantial amount of residential accommodation for University and College staff at a subsidised rent for key workers (including</p>	Acknowledgement 28/01/2019

		<p>academic staff, early career research staff and technical and support staff). In order for that objective to be realised, provision for key worker housing or employer-linked housing would need to be recognised as meeting affordable housing requirements by the Council.</p> <p>To support this objective the University has prepared a paper 'Statement in support of University provision of subsidised staff housing', which has been submitted to the Council as part of the examination of the Plan.</p> <p>It appreciates that this Housing Strategy sets out Cherwell District Council's plans for its own housing service for the period 2018-2023, although the strategy acknowledges that much of what is in the strategy is aspirational and can only be delivered with its partners. The University, as a landowner in the southern part of the District, is keen to be recognised as a valuable partner for the District Council.</p> <p>The University fully supports the three Priorities in the draft Housing Strategy:</p> <p>It would be pleased if the Housing Strategy could acknowledge the part the University's plans can play in assisting the District Council meet its objectives to increase the supply of key worker housing especially to meet the needs of Oxford. The accompanying District Council's State of Housing 2018 report explains that the housing that is required to meet Oxford's unmet need will be expected to include specific provision for key workers using Oxford City's definition. The draft Proposed Submission Draft Oxford Local Plan 2036 sets out Oxford City Council's clear support for the provision of employer-linked affordable housing (Policy H3 and related paragraphs 3.22-3.23), which is its approach to the specific provision for key workers.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>There are a number of instances in the draft Housing Strategy where the contribution to be made by the University could be recognised, as follows:</p> <p>Priority 1: “Increase the supply and diversity of affordable housing to ensure the right types of housing are available in the right places.”</p> <p>The draft strategy explains that Cherwell’s need is 1,140 homes per year until 2031 (35% of those being affordable) and that the Council has committed to helping Oxford City meet its need for 1,400 new homes per year over the same period.</p> <p>Under this priority the Council outlines how it plans to ‘Deliver a range of affordable homes that meet the needs of local residents and workers. (Section 5, Objective 1.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the supply and uptake of affordable housing for keyworkers • Diversify the provision of affordable housing through innovation and partnership working i.e. shared ownership, self-build, custom build and community-led schemes • Develop affordable housing on identified sites for people from Oxford with unmet housing need and contribute to the Oxfordshire Growth Deal programme to ensure housing targets are met <p>The University is offering, as a partner, to meet each of these bullet points. As part of the Tripartite it has consistently promoted the development of employer linked housing as affordable housing to reflect the clear recognition the University and colleges wish to develop their own land for their own purposes. With 1,950 dwellings proposed to be allocated at Begbroke, provision of 50% or 975 as affordable key worker - or employer linked housing at PR8 would make a significant contribution to meeting the needs of Oxford and be directly related to many of the housing and related</p>	<p>Rewording included at 1.2 to reflect this point.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>problems faced by the University’s staff in the city. This should be recognised in the draft Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Priority 2: “Improve the quality and sustainability of our homes and build thriving, healthy communities” The draft strategy explains that Cherwell District Council wish to ‘Improve the quality of new homes and the existing housing stock’ (Section 5, Objective 2.4). The University’s approach to the residential accommodation for its staff would meet this objective via Policy PR8 and other Policies in the Plan. This should be recognised in the draft Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Priority 3: “Enhance opportunities for residents to access suitable homes and have housing choices”. The draft strategy describes that housing needs outweigh supply of social and affordable rented housing so it is necessary to widen the housing options on offer, which could include self-build opportunities at Graven Hill, shared ownership, rooms in shared houses and private rented sector properties. It also explains that the need for keyworker housing is high across the county, particularly for those working in Oxford city, and the Housing Options service needs to reflect this. Under this priority the Council outlines how it plans to ‘Increase opportunities for people to access low cost home ownership and good quality private rented accommodation’ (Section 5, Objective 1.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve our relationships with the local private rented sector to increase innovation and support development of the market <p>The University is offering, as a partner, to develop on its own land for its own use good quality private rented accommodation. It is proposing to build subsidised housing for rent for its staff through the innovative ‘build-for-rent’ model. The National Planning Policy Framework (2018) in particular makes it clear that ‘build-to-rent’,</p>	<p>We work to the National Planning Policy Framework and are open to models of affordable housing that are diverse and targeted at groups with evidenced need. This could include good quality affordable rented private sector units.</p>
--	--	---	--

		defined as 'Purpose built housing that it typically 100% rented out...part of a wider multi-tenure development comprising either flats or houses...on the same site and/or contiguous with the main development...offer(ing) longer tenancy arrangements of three years or more, and typically professionally managed stock in single ownership[p and management control' is categorised as a form of affordable housing (see Annex 2: Glossary to National Planning Policy Framework (2018)). This should be recognised in the draft Housing Strategy.	
25/01/2019	A Private Landlord	<p>As a private landlord who takes pride in providing good standards of accommodation and who invests in the area I would like to see the council engage directly with landlords to tell us what specifically they want and need.</p> <p>This should happen particularly at the planning stage. If we need to target a better Energy Performance Certificate or more accommodation for a particular category of people like people with disabilities it is always possible. However as a landlord as we aim to meet those requirements they also need to more supportive of our plans and not be a hurdle that we need to get over.</p>	Agreed. We have a Landlords Forum and newsletter and need to find ways to help landlords be aware of their responsibilities and how we can work together. Collaborative working with responsible and positive landlords is a priority for us.
25/01/2019	Results from Survey Monkey – Statistics:	<p>61 total responses</p> <p>46 from CDC residents 2 x residents of other LAs nearby 1 x private landlord 1 x registered provider 1 x other local authority 2 x statutory partners 3 x CDC staff</p> <p>Do you agree with the 3 Priorities? Yes = 56/ NO = 5</p> <p>The Action plan outlines the range of actions that the Council plans</p>	<p>92% agreed with the 3 priorities, 8% disagreed.</p> <p>34% agree, 45%</p>

		to take over the next year (2019/20). Do you think the actions will deliver the strategy? Yes = 21/ No = 28	disagree, 21% did not answer this question. We need to ensure the action plan directly relates to the strategic commitments. The action plan is only for 1 year and will need to be developed and refreshed year on year.
Specific responses as follows:	Bromford - from Survey Monkey	"We welcome the opportunity to respond to the consultation outlining Cherwell District Council's Housing Strategy 2018 – 2023. Bromford have been, and are an active developing partner in the District. We welcome the importance of place, alongside people in the foreword to the strategy. Bromford is committed to developing homes in areas that people want to live in and the environment and feeling of place and belonging is vital to the development of sustainable communities and support the District's aspiration to achieve this. Bringing all elements together, including jobs, transport, shops, infrastructure and having a coordinated approach to how they interact with new housing is something we support. Bromford are committed to developing and building partnership relationships and ways of working with ambitious, forward looking Local Authorities, where the local authority and Bromford's aspirations are known and understood and complement one another. Therefore, we welcome the commitment from the District in the strategy to work in partnership with key stakeholders in the delivery of affordable housing. We support the objectives of the District's proposed strategy priorities and respond to each element of the consultation as below; Priority 1 - Increase the supply and diversity of affordable housing to ensure the right types of housing are available in the right places 1.1 Understand the need for a full range of affordable and specialist housing in the district including	These are all useful points to be taken in to account in our assessment of housing need and in our conversations with RPs about the delivery of affordable housing.

		<p>type, tenure and location. We support the improvement of understanding specific housing needs and would encourage the District to engage with registered providers to include the valuable data and insight that we have, particularly in relation to affordable home ownership. We support the endeavour to work with parish councils and local groups to develop plans on how to respond to the housing needs in the villages. We also support the commitment to ensure that new development contributes to the vibrant and sustainable communities the district is aiming to create, however we would request that the District considers the impact of the emergence of large estate management charges that are occurring on many new developments, which negatively impact the affordability of both rented and aspiring affordable home ownership customers. This is exacerbated where there are the requirements for large open spaces as an example, which are then having to be privately maintained. One potential proposal could be to seek to limit, or cap the level of estate charge that can be levied on affordable housing delivered through S106.</p> <p>1.2 Deliver a range of affordable homes that meet the needs of local residents and workers. The commitment from the District to also support the unmet housing need of Oxford City is similar to that of South Gloucestershire, Bath & North East Somerset, North Somerset and Bristol. It might be beneficial to speak to colleagues in these areas in relation to the progress made and some of the challenges that have been discussed.</p> <p>1.3 Work in partnership with private developers, Registered Providers, landowners and new communities to gain greater control over the delivery of housing including affordable housing. We welcome the commitment by the District to work closely with all partners and would welcome the opportunity to work with the District in relation to the opportunities to deliver more affordable housing. As an association we are forecasting to deliver 194 new homes in the district this year, with our aspirations aligning with the District. Bath Road, Banbury : 78 homes for older persons, delivering 42% affordable housing in the shape of shared ownership and affordable rent opportunities, as</p>	<p>We have noted the estate management fees issue and the impact on affordability and will look at how to address this.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>well as 46 properties available for market sale. 1.4 Maximise and make best use of financial assets and resources, including those of the council, registered providers and Homes England, to deliver affordable housing in the district. We support the District's commitment to reviewing its land holdings that could be considered for affordable housing, we would also urge the District to consider what it defines as 'best value' return for any land identified, whether this be a monetary value or whether outcomes that meet a number of the District's ambitions would be considered valuable. Priority 2 – Improve the quality and sustainability of our homes and build thriving, healthy communities 2.4 Improve the quality of new homes and the existing housing stock. We support the District's aspiration to demonstrate that increased standards in new build housing are deliverable and this aligns with our aspiration to deliver quality homes. We would request that the District consider what it means when it defines quality, as this could include size, layout, components, location, services, local provision. Bromford envisages that view is required to ensure that both the quality and quantity of housing is balanced. Priority 3 – Enhance opportunities for residents to access suitable homes and have housing choices. We support the District's objective to increase the opportunity to access low cost home ownership and feel that there is opportunity to work in partnership to raise the profile of the options available to individuals, to work with the District to increase understanding of various home ownership products.</p>	<p>We recognise that more could be done to promote low cost home ownership options and we need to take a role in this.</p> <p>We are committed to working with Registered Providers to ensure affordable housing is of good quality and can be adapted when people's needs change.</p>
	<p>A CDC employee - from Survey Monkey</p>	<p>2.4.1 I would like to see a commitment to using the full range of new powers for the enforcement of the Private Rented Sector</p> <p>2.1.1 "Increase awareness" is not measurable. An additional quantitative action could be added e.g. improvement of X Energy Performance Certificates/Standard Assessment Procedures or Y grants etc. 2.4.1 add additional enforcement-focused actions (especially relating to new powers)</p> <p>I would like to see the following elements become central to</p>	<p>We have put in place policies to enable us to use our new powers under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 for example and are committed to taking enforcement action where education and informal action have not</p>

		<p>enforcement of the Private Rented Sector: Driving up landlord/agent knowledge Removing the [financial] benefits of non-compliance and working to make Private Rented Sector enforcement more cost-neutral (putting burden of enforcement on rogue landlords and ensuring non-compliance does not pay). Key to this is exploring innovative options for charging for services, civil penalties, rent repayment orders etc. A strategic Private Rented Sector energy efficiency project incorporating the Housing, Health and Safety Rating System, thermal imaging etc., enforcement of Minimum Energy Efficiency Standard, grants, loans, and promotion. Possible opportunity to apply for specific project funding? Future work will likely be needed to increase tenant awareness of the housing (suitability for habitation) bill</p> <p>Licence is a noun, e.g. a landlord's House in Multiple Occupation licence. Licensing is a verb, e.g. the process of Houses in Multiple Occupation licensing.</p>	<p>been successful.</p> <p>Agreed – typos have been checked.</p>
	<p>Previous resident, renting nearby – from Survey Monkey</p>	<p>The houses will not be truly affordable.</p> <p>Make the houses significantly cheaper, including rental properties.</p> <p>Rental market for professional locals who are stuck in expensive rentals and struggling even though they have a good job.</p> <p>I am a teacher with 30 years' experience. Following divorce I am having to rent. I earn £2600 a month and my rent is £1500. I am expected to help my eldest child with university fees as my salary is above the threshold for a full loan. It is ridiculous that I cannot afford to live in the Oxfordshire area as a single parent. Universal credit gives me £245. If I lived in the North of England would be considered well off. There needs to be a huge change in the price of housing.</p>	<p>Average house prices are high but we could advise on possible options for someone in this income bracket.</p>
	<p>A resident of</p>	<p>The council should be prioritising council housing over housing for</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>private ownership or rent. The addition of council housing should be added to future years' plans.</p> <p>Yes...the current housing in Banbury is based on private ownership but mainly private rental ownership which pushes prices to buy and rents up. The town need a large amount of council houses and flats to rebalance the market.</p>	Cherwell District Council has developed its own affordable housing through development arm Build! and we work with Registered Providers to deliver affordable housing for rent. We want to do more to deliver affordable housing.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>It will work where focussed, but I suspect it will mean little to middle income earners</p> <p>Help increase insulation further, support self generation, and practical guidance on heating (not just turn heating down 1 degree)</p> <p>Renewable energy people can buy into without currently having funds for solar panels. Wider use of thermal cameras to identify poor insulation.</p>	Agreed – we need to promote the help available through the Affordable Warmth Network.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	I think we definitely need more affordable housing in the district, which has clearly been addressed in this strategy. I think shared-ownership is an excellent way for people to be able to afford to get on the property ladder and I think there should be more shared-ownership opportunities in the district. However, as good as it is for us to be providing affordable housing, I think the current rule of providing 35% affordable housing on schemes of 11 units or more needs reviewing. For some developers, this rule may mean that a development idea has to be scrapped altogether as it wouldn't be financially viable. Perhaps it would be better to have this rule on a sliding scale and/or more flexibility for developers. And to compensate for this, maybe CDC could consider building larger sites which are purely for shared-ownership.	Developers can deliver below the percentage of affordable housing required by Planning but only where they can demonstrate that the scheme would otherwise not be viable and this is corroborated through Cherwell District Council's own analysis.

	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>We need affordable housing and lots of it £300,000.00 for a house is unattainable by the normal person</p> <p>Make developers build more affordable housing</p>	Noted.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council - from Survey Monkey	<p>There needs to be a stronger core commitment to social housing quotas in all new building projects, properly policed and adhered to, alongside an increase in council-held social housing stock.</p> <p>Increase Cherwell District Council's housing stock; redraw contracts for new building projects; make infrastructural improvements partly the (well structured) responsibility of developers; make planning permission contingent on Cherwell District Council's own infrastructural projects (GPs, schools, transport links, shops) and on the developers' own contribution to such improvements; make planning permission information more public and easier to access</p> <p>Infrastructure link with housing projects. Better planning and consultation. Bigger Cherwell District Council social housing stock. More stringent housing affordability criteria.</p>	<p>Build! holds and manages around 200 affordable units owned by the Council. We have identified the need for more homes at social rent (as opposed to 'affordable' rent) but there are challenges in terms of grant funding to achieve this.</p> <p>We take the message that Housing and Planning need to work closely together on affordable housing and infrastructure for housing.</p>
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>Significant increase in council owned affordable rent properties. Private rental is too insecure. Council built homes to replace the ones sold off due to Central Government policies</p>	<p>We have 150 households that we have successfully helped in to the private rented sector (PRS) via Cherwell Bond Scheme. Many of these tenancies have lasted for years and are stable. The PRS does have its place and is a positive option where it is affordable, well managed</p>

			and good quality. We know that more affordable housing is required and this tends to be delivered by RPs and Build!
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>With central government, you need to enforce planning regulations in particular the requirement for developers to actually build homes that ordinary people can afford and not let them get away with excuses as keeps happening.</p> <p>Lobby central government for legislative assistance to achieve your goals. Expose developers which renege on promises.</p> <p>Good luck and make sure homes are built in appropriate places, close to facilities and not scatter gunned all over the area.</p>	Noted. We will scrutinise and challenge viability assessments where necessary when developers argue that affordable housing delivery requirements cannot be met.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	Too many houses are being built for the wrong reasons and in the wrong places, such as flood plains	Noted.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	Council consistently fails to take account of people's needs	Noted.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>Always empty promises .</p> <p>You need to look after existing properties. Cherwell heights a disgrace. Pot holes dirty street signs. Road down bankside is disgusting . New roundabout you built in the middle weeds . All paths up Cherwell heights need attention. Look after what you've got before building more. Schools full senior schools overcrowded.</p>	Noted. Housing is still in development on this site.

		Gp surgeries full . Better roads everywhere is gridlocked.	
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	No more building. Think of wildlife rather than the council tax. Save Greenbelt. Stop destroying habitats to line your pockets. No more loss of Environments. Plant more trees. Replace the ones you cut down with indigenous trees that will be beneficial to indigenous wildlife. More English Oaks and Horse chestnut trees... Not Sycamores. Plant more wild indigenous flowers. Put up more bird, bat & bug boxes. No more Houses.	Noted. We aim to meet the housing needs of our communities that do not have access to suitable, affordable housing and at the same time preserve wildlife and plant life wherever possible.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	Very slow getting things done always a hold back, excuse after excuse Eco friendly , solar panels, etc Transport for the elderly and the young and not just for bretch hill who have buses every half to a hour service should be spread out evenly. Teenage park where they got something to do like a bmx ,skate board, basketball, netball park , Jogging park not enough for 10yrs old upwards to do in this town Should be more focused on the elderly not retirement flats like little bungalows with a garden old people like garden growing vegetables or flowers and it keep them active Also the young one bedroom flats/house be a good starting point in life make them to have responsibilities having a housing officer to check on them	Noted. We recognise we need to do more to deliver the diversity of housing that older and young people need.
	A resident of Cherwell District	I am against the new housing development that Cherwell District Council is trying to get passed and using taxpayers money to do it.	Noted. We need to balance new

	Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>There is no infrastructure in place for the housing increase. It's a nightmare now trying to get to Oxford in the morning, what will happen with 1000 plus more cars on the roads. It now takes 3 weeks to get a doctor's appointment, what will happen with 4000 new homes. Flooding will increase and what will happen with the beautiful walks we now enjoy with our family and 4 legged friends, not to mention the wildlife, where do they go. This is not thought out and it seems all the Councillors that are for this, live outside the area waiting to get backhanders. Why should Yarnton, Begbroke & Kidlington build houses for Oxford, they have many abandoned houses/locations they can redevelop within their own City.</p> <p>These houses are not going to help the homeless, look at the houses being built in Botley and surrounding areas. £600,000. Build within Oxford, do not use the Greenbelt!</p> <p>As stated above, this is totally ludicrous. There are more suitable locations for Oxfords unmet housing needs, try their own City limits where the roads would not be overcrowded to get into the City. All the unused buildings where we would not have to build on our precious greenbelt.</p>	development with the need for jobs and infrastructure. We are committed to sustainable transport options and to designing this in to new developments.
	A resident of Cherwell District Council – from Survey Monkey	<p>For a period Banbury people should be given priority in all sorts of houses that are to be built, Too many 4/5/6 bedroom properties being built.</p> <p>Concentrate on local people, Stick to greenfield areas set out. Fight planning in these areas.</p>	Noted. We are aware from our register that there is a particular shortage of affordable 1 and 2 bedroom properties.
27/01/2019	A Resident of Cherwell District Council	<p>I am more than a little surprised that many of the tasks proposed in the 'strategy' are not already being done. Is there reason for these being included at this stage? e.g. Isn't there already a definition of 'affordable', in the Cherwell context, and if not, why not? .</p> <p>I have concentrated my attention on Appendix A, as this will lay the</p>	The affordable options that CDC allocates through its Housing Service are homes for social rent and at affordable rent (up to a maximum of 80% market

		<p>ground for future action and have to say that this document is not laid out in a very economical way, requiring 10 pages of paper when probably fewer would have sufficed had the acres of unused spaced been properly utilised.</p> <p>Also commenting on the document is not easy as the there is no 'consultation response' provision as is usual in Cherwell consultations.</p> <p>Could the tabulations be re-cast in a fashion that provides a blank column (on the right, say, as columns 1, 3 & 5 could be narrower ?) and also provide this in a format that allows comments to be inserted in this 'blank' column on an 'interactive' basis before return.</p> <p>This would avoid an enormous amount of work for commentators in identifying the subject of comment? The tabulation in this form would also allow those without Internet to return their comments by post.</p> <p>To receive comments opposite the relevant item would surely aid analysis?</p>	<p>rent). In terms of development we work to the NPPF and our planning requirements are 30%/35% affordable housing within new developments. This can include low cost home ownership options but cannot be wholly so.</p>
16/01/2019 (approximate date)	Comments on Social Media via repost on Banburyshire Info – total of 48 comments	<p>Affordability (x7 posts in total) Build 'Affordable housing that is actually affordable' (x1)/ 'I'd like to see council housing, not housing association or unaffordable'(1)/ build Council housing (x2)/ Social housing (x2)/ Concerns about rent levels in Sanctuary properties (existing tenant) (x1)</p> <p>Sanctuary (x1 post) Concerns about sanctuary not doing repairs (x1 post)</p> <p>Improvements to infrastructure (x 7 posts) 'Infrastructure BEFORE we build anymore bloody houses! (x1) Roads/ repairs to roads (x2 posts) Request for a 'ring of nature walks/ cycle paths around Banbury so there are free things for people to do. (x1) More places to park/ estates with pubs with a garden for kids/ shops/ doctors/ dentist close by/ bus route/ 'stop building close to</p>	<p>Noted – these points are useful in our conversations with partners and confirm what a number of commentators have said.</p>

		<p>roads then fencing them off so you have to go round in circles' (x1)</p> <p>Build a hospital/ improve the Horton (x2)</p> <p>Housing design standards (x3 posts)</p> <p>'Build upwards a few stories rather than sprawling estates where everyone overlooks everyone else' (x1)</p> <p>'No more rabbit hutches for people to live in' (x1)</p> <p>Build more 1 beds for single people (x1)</p>	
--	--	--	--