

Registered Provider	Date received	Registered Provider Response to Consultation	CDC Response to RP comments
Bromford	08/01/21	Bromford wanted to meet to discuss the proposed charge, which they felt they had not agreed to.	CDC Housing Assistant Director met with Bromford w/c 18/1 to discuss the proposed charge. Subsequent charging has been acknowledged.
Sanctuary	01/06/21	<p>Sanctuary felt that the amount that CDC proposed to charge was higher than expected, and more than budgeted for. They believed that although the amount was in line with charges made by other Local Authorities in the area, it was higher than the national amount (with an average advert cost being £50). They would have expected the charge made by Homechoice to be nearer the lower end of the local scale.</p> <p>Where Sanctuary are working in partnership with other CBL scheme they receive a statement with a financial breakdown of out of pocket CBL running costs including upgrades, 3rd party advertisements and admin costs for staff specifically running the system, so they are able to see the cost, contribution from the local authority and how the advert fee is arrived at. Is this something you are able to provide, we would normally receive this on an yearly basis? As a paying partner we would expect that there would be regular meeting, quarterly, held between CDC and the RPs to discuss how the scheme is performing, directions of travel improvements/enhancements to the system, and running costs. We would also expect that there is an Service Level Agreement (SLA) in place to ensure that it meets the needs of both Cherwell District Council and RPs. Are you able to confirm your intention to implement a SLA at the same time as any proposed charges?</p> <p>In section 1.4, Sanctuary would like to see the percentage of nominations for Sanctuary reduce to 75% to be inline with other providers. This would not necessarily mean they would only nominate 75% of true voids, it is often the best method to allocate through Local Authority CBL schemes. However it does allow them more flexibility to meet the needs of their residents and proactively manage their voids, particularly when it comes to properties where they are aware Homechoice is likely to be unsuccessfully e.g. aged defined/HfOP properties above ground floor. It will also help them to ensure we do not exceed our internal budgets and control costs.</p> <p>In section 3.4, can we confirm how many nominations will be provided or will this be picked up in an updated SLA covering Homechoice. They would normally expect a minimum of 3 nominations, preferably 5, to be sent through, which they would work through in priority order. This allows them to more effectively allocate properties should the first applicant be unsuitable or refuse the property.</p> <p>In section 3.8, Sanctuary would like to see the number of cycles reduced from three to two, before they are able to consider allocating properties via alternative methods as appropriate.</p> <p>In section 3.10, Sanctuary would need to be able to refuse applicants that do not meet their own internal allocations policy.</p>	<p>Legal advice has been taken, and an SLA will not be needed alongside the Nominations Agreement. A cover letter will be sent out alongside the nominations agreement, which will cover the details Sanctuary has asked for. CDC can also provide a breakdown of the the Allocations service.</p> <p>Section 1.4 - Sanctuary's percentage of nomination: remain at 90%.</p> <p>Section 3.4 - will remain as only 1 nomination at a time</p> <p>Section 3.8 - Changing to 2 cycles rather than 3, with option to repeat more.</p>
A2 Dominion	23/12/2020	A2 Dominion asked if they will receive a refund if they do not reach the amount of lets that their fixed charge roughly corresponds to (based on a 3-year average of lettings data).	There will not be a refund but what would happen if drop in lettings would be reflected in the reviewed calculation and the charge in the following year would therefore reflect any reduction in lets.
Thrive	14/01/2021	<p>In sections 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8, Thrive would like 2 cycles rather than 3.</p> <p>In section 3.10, they would like to apply their own criteria to reject nominations.</p> <p>In section 6, Help to Buy Agent should include wording "(or successor body)".</p> <p>In section 12, they would like more detail on reports they will be asked to complete.</p>	3.10 - RPs will be informed that CDC are reviewing the Allocation Scheme, and that they will be asked to comment. RPs who have referenced their own Lettings Policy / Allocation Scheme, will also be asked to see a copy of it.
Sovereign	18/01/2021	<p>In sections 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8, Sovereign would like 2 rather than 3 cycles.</p> <p>In section 3.10, they want to apply their own lettings criteria.</p> <p>They have commented that they are lucky not to be charged so far but £75 seems high and they believe it to be the highest in Oxfordshire. Charge should be for successful lettings only.</p>	Sections 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 are changing to 2 rather than 3 cycles. Charges will only be for successful lets.
Clarion	13/01/2021	Queried the data protection section - defines both parties as data controllers but some clauses read as though the RP is a processor of CDC.	Checked with Legal and Information Management colleagues, they felt that the wording was done in the right purpose. Noted, no further action required.
Places for People	13/01/2021	<p>Places for People welcome 3 cycles.</p> <p>Places for People want to apply their policy for refusal, in reference to clause 3.10. (They have shared a copy of their Lettings Policy).</p> <p>Places for People want to let their own percentage of voids to anyone - not just those in housing need, to 'balance' their communities, in reference to clause 3.16.</p>	Changing to 2 rather than 3 cycles, in light of other comments. But PFP will still be able to advertise in 3 if they choose. PFP will need to check the condition: attached to affordable housing in terms of who qualify for publicly funded affordable housing.

Metropolitan Thames Valley	22/01/2021	<p>Section 1.4 - Metropolitan Thames Valley cannot agree to 75% of nominations in each financial year, due to having very little stock in the district and therefore rarely having voids, but are happy to agree 75% nom rights on a rolling basis.</p> <p>Section 2.2.1 - change to "The death of a tenant where there is no statutory or contractual right of succession".</p> <p>Section 3.3 - it is not always possible to provide 4 weeks notice, especially in cases of evictions.</p> <p>Section 3.8 - 3 cycles would have a negative impact on their re-let times.</p> <p>Section 3.10 - Please amend - Our applicants are assessed in line with the criteria in our own Lettings Policy.</p>	<p>Section 1.4 - wording has been updated to say "in e financial year, or on a rolling basis for RPs with fewer 4 voids in the district during the financial year."</p> <p>Section 2.2.1 - "contractual right of succession" has added.</p> <p>Section 3.3 - wording has been adjusted to say "The must endeavour to give notification to CDC of all Fir and re-let properties at least 4 weeks ahead"</p> <p>Section 3.8 - Will be changed from 3 cycles to 2 cycl</p>
CDC Build!	18/01/2021	Will CDC Build! be charged or not?	CDC Build will be charged in the same way as other landlords in order to ensure consistency.
Stonewater	25/01/2021	Stonewater accept the amended nominations agreement. They don't have a full signed copy of any previous nominations agreements with CDC, so will apply this agreement to all of their stock.	No changes required.
Paradigm	29/01/21	Can an explanation of the true voids definition be provided please. Where will downsizing fit? 3.3 Add wording to acknowledge that 4-6 week timescale for CDC being notified of a property may not always be met. 2 cycles of advertising requested rather than 3 cycles. Amend to provide that Paradigm's refusals will be based on its lettings policy criteria and its pre-lettings checks. 3.13 - the mix of properties cannot be guaranteed. Objection to charging and not being consulted on charging.	The definition of true voids is set out at 2.2.1. Housi that wish to downsize are prioritised on the housing register. The RP could also expedite a move within 1 own stock using the percentage of voids that sit out this agreement. Agreed to wording re timescales. A to 2 cycles of advertising as per a number of other f Agree that RPs will apply their own checks at the pc nomination but we will not change the agreement t would undermine application of the Allocation Sche Mix of properties is desirable but we undertand tha cannot be guaranteed.