

Housing Allocation Policy
Public Consultation - All Comments

Amendment 1

Strongly Agree

“This is a more proactive way to try to deal with this shortage.”

“There is a big shortage of bungalows and houses. Local residents are finding it harder and harder. Some are over 200 in a queue for bidding. I think local people should be first to be allocated whatever is in their vicinity. I myself was number 1 when bidding for a much needed bungalow yet still failed in the bidding.”

“I’m in a 3 bed with difficulty getting upstairs. Yes it’s private and I’ve got 2 bannisters to help me. I need a 2 bed bungalow. Would free up a 3 bed house for someone to get them off the waiting list. So many rules.”

“Yes definitely, there is single people in 4 bedroom houses and people with only 2 or 3 kids in 4 bedroom houses while there’s 7 or 8 people in tiny 3 bedrooms.”

“Something towards decorating costs and to move.”

“I strongly agree because the house I’m in would be perfect for a family while it’s too big for me and my husband.”

“I am nearly 51 and disabled and have been bidding for bungalows for months. I am still waiting to be assessed and have been stuck in the bronze category since day one. Do not drink, smoke or take drugs and am getting nowhere. I feel like St Leger Homes have and is treating me unfairly to other especially other people that I know and are of a higher priority.”

“My mum is disabled and can’t get upstairs. She has been living in a 3 bedroom house on her own for years. She has been trying to downsize to a bungalow with no success.”

“This also saves money on adapting homes for people with equipment like stair lifts when they may be better suited to single level living.”

“I would like to downsize please.”

“I am in a three bedroom three storey property, there is now just me and my partner. Both have mobility issues so very rarely go up to the third floor. Yes the third bedroom comes in handy when grandchildren come to stay but not absolutely necessary.”

“As long as those who don’t want to move don’t have to.”

“I would suggest you also incentivise them to move to smaller houses as well as flats and bungalows.”

“Positive incentives would be more beneficial than the current negative penalties system. Positive incentives could include financial support for redecoration, flooring and moving home. The financial barrier of moving may be holding some people back.”

Agree

“I agree as I am 3 bed roomed and I need a 2 bed roomed as my son has moved out now and I can’t afford to stay in a 3 bed roomed.”

“So long as it is an incentive, not forced/pressured.”

“Hopefully you will not make older people move if they have no interest in doing so.”

“Will also help the family in the larger property re bedroom tax, and also help home families in need. But it would need to be a suitable, substantial incentive.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Agree with an incentive only but not to force people from homes they may have been in long term and want to remain in.”

“I would feel that someone may feel that they are being forced out of their home. They may be happy where they are and may have lived there many years and feel it’s their home. To then be told we need you to move to a smaller home but we’ll give you an incentive is just going to add pressure.”

“Not everybody is happy to be accommodated in a flat or bungalow.”

“I understand why you would do this but what about the people who are already waiting for a bungalow? They seem to be rare already? Bidding queues are very long for these.”

“They will have priority as you will move them 1st to rehouse families. Leaving those in my situation waiting even longer.”

“Some people may have lived in that home all their life and have friends around them. We own our house but it’s no longer suitable for our health, it’s in poor condition and would not give us enough money to buy anything else. I do agree that asking people to downsize is a good option but should not be made a rule. If they are willing to move then ok but all it does is change the problem around so that there would not be enough smaller homes.”

“Because you are not helping me to get a bigger house.”

“Terms of the let – why a single person is in a 3 bed property when smaller would be suitable. Rental history through family – be offered a property within the area they resident in.”

“Why do they need an incentive? They’re already getting cheap rent, you’re the landlord, you tell them what to do!”

“It should be the person’s choice.”

“This is all well and done if you have smaller properties and people are not forced to move to areas they do not want.”

“How can I decide if I don’t know what it is?”

“If they are willing to pay they should have the choice.”

“I own my bungalow which is too big for me...I can’t get help to move to a smaller one. Because I own house I do not qualify for benefits or help to maintain my home or to qualify for a council bungalows. I have never claimed a penny for any benefits, this is not fair. The council could build cheap bungalows for such as me to buy for cash when mine is sold.”

Disagree

“I believe it will end up leading to people being forced out their family home.”

“Some people may have took care of these properties and made a home of it, we need more given to us.”

“It’s fine if it really is the tenant’s choice, but I feel single people will be ‘pushed’ into flats rather than bungalows. Also, who decides if a property is larger than their needs? Our council house is tiny.”

“Those waiting for a bungalow will be penalised and have to wait longer.”

“There isn’t the stock of bungalows to support this.”

“If you’re eligible to have that property you should be allowed it. Also you shouldn’t be penalised as you don’t yet have kids.”

“I was told a council house isn’t your home. Help them to move or give a deadline to leave.”

“If married couple want to downsize they are not usually offered 2 bedrooms even if sleeping in separate rooms.”

“Bungalows and downstairs flats should only be allocated to the elderly and those with limited mobility and/or with health issues.”

“If you can offer to them, offer incentive to all when moving into a new property.”

“Flats maybe but there isn’t enough bungalows for people who need them now and to put people in them that don’t need to be there is just forcing us who do need them to have to wait longer.”

“I think tenants may be forced to accept housing in areas where no one decent would want to live rent free such as Edlington, Mexborough, Denaby, and others where the crime rates are appalling. Many people would feel vulnerable in these areas as they are not safe. So it’s not just the size of the property to be thought about.”

“Some people may have lived in these houses, and lived in Doncaster in particular for decades or all their lives, only for them to be moved to accommodate people with no connection to Doncaster. They may be moved to an area where they have no friends or family. It is basically a serious breach of these peoples’ human rights to live due to their family being reduced in size due to bereavement or over circumstances.”

“You need to build more bungalows with garden space, people remain active longer, this would encourage those who like a little privacy.”

“I’ve been bidding for years and got nothing, so that more people before me again.”

Strongly Disagree

“This would be devastating to many residents and may even result in needless early deaths. Whatever happened to ‘an Englishman’s home is his castle?’ We need more council homes to be built since the disastrous ‘right to buy plan’.”

“We have lived in our home for 46 years spent thousands of pounds over that time bought up 3 children here. It would cause untold stress for us to move now. Think of the pressure you are putting on people late in their lives.”

“Because I apply for council house 5 years ago nobody call me and text me I don’t know how long I wait.”

“Residents may voluntarily wish to be rehoused to a smaller property if they are provided with savings benefits e.g. reduction in rent and lower heating/fuel costs. However, if they wish to remain in their current property then they should be allowed to do so as they have likely put down roots, becoming part of a community, being supported by friends and neighbours. Relocating would mean ripping people from their lives they have built up and support around them. By doing this, DMBC would only create a larger problem to solve – a catalyst which would involve facilitating an increase in a range of mental health issues – including depression, anxiety and isolation. These issues are already at an all-time high, woefully underfunded to address current levels without exacerbating this further and making more people miserable. All of the above is neither fair nor acceptable.”

“Disagree as to move from a house to bungalow will cause problem for people that reach the age for a bungalow then will have problems getting them because issued to someone from a house.”

“People that have lived in houses for years deserve to keep that house until they are no longer able to and until they reach out for help.”

“The population of Doncaster has steadily increased over time but more council houses haven’t been built to reflect change. 20k council houses is paltry compared with the amount of families in need and offering tenants incentive to give up their homes for the sake of rehousing a few families is not going to tackle the problem, especially while there are also so many empty council properties that have been abandoned. The only way to solve this issue is to build at least another ten thousand houses. It may also be a good idea to disallow St Leger properties to be sold and then put up for rent.”

“If living in a house too big for needs should just be made to move.”

“To uproot someone from a community/neighbours/friends where they may have lived all their lives or for a long period can cause many problems for an individual e.g. mental health needs, loneliness, isolation etc. It’s not the individual’s fault that selling off council houses and years of under-investment in building new council homes has caused this problem.”

“We are not cattle. These should be our homes not accommodation. Well after our children have left, the memories remain along with the physical things we have worked so hard to fill this home with. A home for our grandchildren to frequent, a home with a garden in which to play. These things cannot be downsized without emotional harm to us and the family unit.”

“These policies always start with an incentive. Eventually when it’s realised that you will literally have to pay people to move out of a home they are settled in and have many happy memories of, the policies will become punitive and manipulative to harass people out of desirable properties.”

“I agree with the incentive but believe it should lie with the tenant as this could cause unnecessary stress for many people.”

“Why people should lose their houses if probably majority of them spent lots of money already to maintain and improve their properties.”

“People who have spent a lot of money on the house and garden and pay rent shouldn’t have to move. Many people have invested 1000s of pounds and hours getting their home and garden nice.”

“Shouldn’t force people to downsize if they don’t want to, and a lot of these flats are in rough areas where people don’t want to live because they fear for their safety.”

“Stope forcing people out of homes they’ve lived in for years & years. They live in communities where they have put down roots. They could have a job nearby, do volunteering work & have long-standing friendships. Build more houses in every community, of different types, like bungalows, then they might voluntarily move. Nothing worse than feeling you are not welcome & being forced out. We pay rent, not live on benefits, but even if we did claim benefits, you shouldn’t be treated differently.”

“You don’t get a house any quicker and yet since you brought this in, I have to pay bedroom tax. I am already in debt with my rent. You don’t waive the bedroom tax. And you won’t offer me a house unless I pay off my debt which I’m trying to do. You should waive the bedroom tax if someone’s actively looking to move and bidding.”

“People should not be forced to move to a flat or bungalow. People should have the right to a house. This is discrimination.”

“Consider everybody as an individual. People’s choice.”

“You do not have enough affordable 2 bed houses. I couldn’t afford to live in a new build but under your new rules I would be pressured to move.”

“Bungalows should be for the over 60’s or disabled.”

Did Not Answer

“There is not enough bungalows now so that would make things worse. Downsize people into smaller houses or flats...not bungalows.”

- 2 response redacted due to offensive language
- 7 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 2

Strongly Agree

“I am in lower band and wanting to swap homes. I don’t want to remove a home from the market just switch properties which would open up the one I am currently in.”

“Think this amendment is fairer and would give the families who think they have no hope of being housed.”

“Everyone who is on the list is on for a reason. I’m on a general band and it’s impossible to get a look in on the homes. Everyone should have a fairer chance and should not be penalised because you feel it’s not a priority but it is to our family and will be for many more people. It’s not fair.”

“I agree with this. I moved in my house when I was on the top band. I hate being away from family, I had to change schools now I’m stuck with no help. I can’t move, I bid all the time but now on the lowest band so will have no luck in moving out this hell hole.”

“Strongly agree with this as I have been trying years to be homed and on a general band are finding it impossible to be homed. Everyone has needs to why they need to be home on the list and no one seems to care.”

“Yes definitely, been overcrowded years still waiting for a 4 bed.”

“I wouldn’t want to be miles away from my family.”

“Better that families are not split up.”

“Families should be eligible for access to a house regardless of their relative needs.”

Agree

“All though I agree, I have been on the list over 5 years and haven’t got anywhere near a bungalow in the area that I wanted. I am in a private rented house and have problems getting upstairs.”

“Agree with it in some part. Maybe give a 1 person or a couple a 2 bedroom house in case they have kids etc. but don’t give a single person a 3 bedroom house.”

“Depending on the circumstances, this could help families that need to live nearer to their work for example, or to reduce care needs of a family member living close by.”

“I have been on waiting list for 15 years waiting for 3 bed house in a particular area as I was made to take the house I had under the old system and this is not right.”

“I am currently on a transfer band due to massive antisocial behaviour issues and I have no idea how long this will take.”

“I have been on the housing list since 2008. I have had to stay with private rent because I am not classed as priority. It’s not fair.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“I think it’s a good idea but again myself and my husband are on gold medical priority and can’t get rehoused.”

“I don’t understand this amendment or what it means.”

“I think that depends on the family needs.”

“I think it should depend on their circumstances. For instance a family may not be prioritised on medical grounds but if they have harassment from neighbours etc. it should be allowed as a priority but if they just fancy a change then it should go to families or single occupants that are in need.”

“I don’t understand the question.”

“I don’t really understand this question enough to comment on it.”

“And again I’m in silver and you not helping me.”

“I didn’t quite understand the question.”

“I don’t understand the question.”

"I understand the need for balanced communities, but there's a reason for the banding and this feels like circumventing the system."

"Not sure I really understand this?"

"This one is tricky as it kind of undermines the banding system which already priorities based on the individual family's needs."

"We need more council bungalows suitable to keep old folk in their homes instead of going into care."

Disagree

"Re let means they have previously had a house and misused the house so giving them another house wouldn't benefit anyone."

"How is the council to impose what they think peoples' needs are."

"Disagree, because it's dependent what you think is lower needs. For those people maybe is big need, but you think it isn't and it's not fair. People know better what they need, not just that you decided. All small things matter to look in to everything properly."

"I thought people in lower bands had lower need. Why would you not provide housing to the people in most need?"

"Surely whatever is available should go to those with highest need?"

"Fault of Doncaster council not building homes after the right to buy came in force."

"Your proposals are at odds with each other. You want to get tenants out of houses too big for their needs but then you want to give some oversize ones for social reasons."

"Priority should be given to those most in need. Those who are homeless, living in emergency accommodation, such as hotels and also those living in poor conditions."

"Does not really give much details as to what a 'balanced' community means but I feel the weight of allocations should be on the need for the housing in question. This sounds dangerously like tick box allocations for the sake of 'balance'."

"I think it should go on priority of needs, when everyone is in suitable housing then maybe."

"Those who have urgent needs should be considered first."

"There's not enough houses etc. in desirable areas. There's not enough choice. Build more all over then you might see voluntary movement."

"Should stick to date order."

"Some people have others who live with them and also need a carer. To force them to live in a smaller home could prove problematic."

"It would appear to be in direct contradiction to amendment one and a pointless thing to do."

"The banding system exists for a reason, albeit more should be done to allocate the correct band to the applicant as swiftly as possible."

"What are the lower needs circumstances in what circumstances would be offered if working rent."

“Family homes should be retained for families. While families are still on the waiting list they should be prioritised family homes.”

Strongly Disagree

“Because people in lower bands will as always be last fact.”

“Yer right so how come I bid on property and still not getting nowhere even bidding out of the area I live.”

“I’m single parent who work full time and in this times when must rent house, pay all bills etc. My application is always on the last queue. I live in house with mould, expensive heating because it’s old house. In my son’s room there are marks on the ceiling after rain.”

“Not enough housing stock.”

“If they still can afford the rent and they don’t have any difficult circumstances, I don’t see the point.”

“The people who don’t have a house to begin with would still be forgotten about and ignored.”

“What is the point in giving out whatever spare family homes that you have to those with lower needs? Everyone on lower needs will be bidding on family sized houses and it would be unfair for the ones who have not received them.”

“Common sense would suggest that in a housing crisis, the most needy would be prioritised. This isn’t to say that more council properties shouldn’t be built though, to meet the demand for all on each banding.”

“There is already a high demand for those in high need as it is without reletting to those with lower needs. If this change happens, there will be a larger lack of houses for those with high need.”

“People with the highest priority and need of rehousing should come first.”

“What that means? There will be houses available for people in higher needs only, so victims of criminal situations? What about communities living nearby already?”

“This would make families stuck on the list longer.”

“There aren’t enough houses for those with priority need.”

“If they don’t meet the requirements 100% they can private rent.”

“You should make sure those that are in the most need are prioritised correctly.”

“People in higher bandings with a great need are already struggling to get suitable housing.”

“An individual knows their needs.”

“Don’t understand how this makes sense if there is a shortage of family accommodation.”

“Communities where properties are classified for 60+ age end up with young families next door with noise and nuisance. I suffer from it. 3 properties near me all 60+ properties are occupied in their 40’s.”

"I disagree with this as just because a family has a suitable property to live, they may be personal circumstances that they need to move because of and this is not taken into account when it really should be."

"Priority should be on need only."

Did Not Answer

"Do not understand the question so am unable to pass judgement!"

"Council houses shouldn't go to people who are anti-social and look after the properties. If you moved them to hard to let or kicked them out into private sector then the issues would resolve itself."

"Not sure on this question."

- 5 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 3

Strongly Agree

"Otherwise larger families just have no chance of finding a home or getting any support so children suffer the whole family suffers."

"It should go to people who need 4 beds or a 3 with a dinner room but nothing ever comes up."

"I am one of these people needing a 4 bed property. Also homeless at the moment and nothing is available because people who are less in need are getting these before myself or others in similar situations."

"If they only need 2 bedrooms they wait for 2 bedrooms. Then you will get rid of the issue you've raised in question 1."

"Prioritise those with the stronger need."

"Yes, let the larger families who need the bigger homes have them because they are so rare. It's common sense really and fair, especially if they have been waiting a long time."

"Definitely bump those with larger families up in the queue before those with a smaller family. They are more in need and there is less stock, so those who are not as vulnerable should not be taking away from those who are more needy."

Agree

"I know a single women with no children in a 3 bed house."

“Makes sense but there should be a limit on the amount of time a family has to be on a waiting list as they may get bypassed time after time.”

“Agree due to the lack of 4 bed houses so yes should be offered to larger families.”

“My understanding in bidding for a home was you could only bid on a house suitable for your needs. Surely it's common sense to save the bigger homes for larger families.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“I think that also depends on how long the families have been on the waiting list. I don't think it would be fair for a smaller family to be waiting for over a year for a house and a larger family be waiting one month and they get a house. I think length of time still should be considered.”

“I need a 4 bedroom but I am not getting anywhere.”

“If 4 bed is needed fair enough but nothing stopping them bidding on a 3 bedroom and being successful in obtaining that above someone who has been waiting to be homed longer.”

“Why are you letting them bid on houses they don't need? But then again what you class as need may be wrong for instance I don't agree with the policy that a child under a certain age should share a room with another child of the opposite sex of roughly the same age.”

“Difficult one, if you need 4 or 5 to 'get ahead' people will make sure they have 4 or 5 – sister moves in etc. so provides option for misuse.”

“You need to treat everyone equal so not sure if this is feasible.”

“Why should they be given 3 or 4 bedroom property they can live in smaller accommodation depending on sex of children. Some 2 bedroom properties are large enough to fit 2 bunk beds in for all same sex children.”

“Only if the resents can afford to pay rent without getting state benefits to do so.”

“I agree that if they are 2 parent families and one is working. I do not agree to one parent families on benefits, it only encourages them to have more children and claim more benefits.”

Disagree

“Everybody should have a fair chance of finding a home. I'm not in a priority band, living in a crowded home without fair opportunities of finding a home for myself and 2 year old son.”

“I have been waiting for a bungalow for about a year with only 1 bedroom.”

“Shouldn't take priority bigger families, little families need a home too.”

“If they choose to have larger families, why should the taxpayer foot the bill for a larger council property?”

“The higher up the 'chain' should be served first.”

“I think it should depend on how long you've been waiting.”

“It should go on circumstances, not on the size of the family. People will just keep having more children to be a higher priority if they know it will get them a house.”

“If people are eligible for 3 bed properties then they should only have the right to bid for a 3 bed property.”

“Do not agree that those people who have chosen to have large families should receive preference over those who have acted responsibly and had smaller families.”

“Circumstances are different for everyone. People needing smaller houses or less bedrooms may have a bigger issue in their current housing situation.”

“I don’t really think that would be fair. Especially if someone is going to miss out on a home just because someone else has more children.”

“People on the list should not be punished and pushed further down the list because the council has less stock of larger housing.”

“I don’t think that large families should be given priority over families with only 1 child. That 1 child may need more help.”

“You can’t base their priorities on number of bedrooms required, there may be a greater need for someone needing less e.g. more risk of homelessness, expectant mothers etc.”

“If they are able to pay they should be able to choose what they want.”

“Children are able to share bedrooms.”

“Spend money making smaller houses bigger. Where council houses have large gardens you could build sideways or possibly upwards.”

“There may be exceptions but the majority of larger families who are wanting council housing are 2nd even 3rd generation benefit claimants who are happy to rely on the system to support them and will have child after child without little thought on how they can support them as the benefits system will. Some families have 2 working parents and still don’t earn enough to support the families, they should be given equal priority.”

“Do we need to give birth every year to get a house.”

“Small families sometimes need larger houses.”

“Everyone should have equal chance to a property regardless of number of children.”

“It’s almost like a free for all as it is. Everybody is playing the waiting game. If a larger family already has a 3 bed then I don’t think others bidding on 4 beds who are entitled to bid on 4 beds should be penalised or made to wait longer when there are so few properties to bid on during each cycle.”

“If you cannot afford children, do not have them.”

“People may well need the extra room for a child with special needs, or an ageing parent.”

“It is not a housing priority if someone chooses to have a larger family. These things should be considered by the people whose choice it is to have large families.”

“If people choose to have larger families then that is entirely their choice but should be able to sort their own housing needs before having more children and not expect to jump the queue or take priority over anyone else who needs housing.”

“Only stop people bidding on 4 bed if 3 bed is adequate. Do not allow people with larger families to be prioritised for 3 bed houses above families for 3 beds.”

“People need to wait their turn. Why should people keep getting pushed back down the list. It’s very distressing and frustrating.”

“Because it isn’t fair to people who have been on waiting list for quite some time and are getting nowhere.”

“Some families need larger properties.”

“Because some are over populating their homes, if they have large family due to separation from partners yes but those who have say a 2 bedroom why would you carry on if your home is not big enough.”

“Some smaller families need homes just as much, and they are also struggling to get them.”

Strongly Disagree

“People who are awaiting 3 bedroom house could end up having to wait longer.”

“As you are just giving them to anyone.”

“This doesn’t specify if a larger house is needed for medical reasons. If a larger family needs a bigger house with no medical reasons, help should be given to them find private rentals with registered landlords.”

“I don’t feel this is fair as it will mean people waiting longer and forcing more people into private accommodation like myself which is expensive.”

“All potential residents should be treated equally.”

“They already have a home.”

“People who have got many children shouldn’t be put into priority or bigger housing. It was a choice to have more children so why should normal families suffer.”

“This is completely unfair. They should not be rehoused first due to what size house they need. If you only allowed people who need 4 bed houses bid on them that would solve the problem.”

“House the ones who need it most and who have waited a long time, people shouldn’t just jump the queue. We all have urgent needs, those with medical problems should be considered and the families with disabled children or a child. Not for the number of kids they have.”

“Both families need to be housed so neither has priority. Suggest more housing stock be built to reflect the council’s changing needs and to adequately address and fulfil its obligations. 400 out of 20,000 is woefully under-represented at only 2% of its stock. Use 106 money from developers to create new social homes in new developments.”

“The priority of rehousing need should trump the number of people in the family.”

“Why bid for bigger than what they need.”

“There seems to be a large proportion of people needing 3 bed houses. To stop them getting 4 beds would mean that there is even less chance of those on lower bands to be eligible for 3 bed houses.”

“All families should be treated the same regardless of size.”

“All families need a home not just the bigger ones.”

“The larger families will not reside long in a smaller home due to overcrowding etc. so may as well rehome a smaller family that would likely remain in the property for a while. Why should a family that’s smaller not be considered just for their choice to not have children or expand their family etc.”

“Priority should be based on need rather than child count.”

Did Not Answer

“Do they pay for the extra bedroom? If so leave them alone. If not then 3 beds only for them. One rule for 1 and different rule for others.”

“That would depend on how much longer they have been on waiting list surely.”

- 1 response redacted due to offensive language
- 9 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 4

Strongly Agree

“Definitely but this needs to be handled more efficiently than current i.e. feedback time on any further information required should be quicker.”

“People who rarely go in to arrears tend to be targeted for arrears than them that have owed arrears for years in my experience.”

“Yeah see nothing wrong with this.”

“You’ve hardly supported me at all and I’ve had to get my MP involved repeatedly.”

“Currently working with two families due to be homeless any day now. It is very stressful knowing that they aren’t even in platinum yet despite court proceedings to evict them.”

“Sustain should include misuse of property too.”

“Past history of failed tenancy, shouldn’t be allowed a tenancy unless they have support from outside agency in place.”

“The impact of this is so widespread affecting the wellbeing of all within the household and other difficulties managing the cost of living.”

Agree

“That also works in giving council houses to people who can well afford to buy.”

“You don’t help after you’ve given a tenant the keys, that’s it you’re not bothered about complaints or how unhappy they are or how crap the house is. We have no support, we hate our house and was just left to make do.”

“If they ask for help yes – but should not be a condition of getting a house.”

“They could of lost jobs or partners or become ill.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Nothing will change either way.”

“Other housing associations have properties available on home choice. I strongly disagree with their rents being higher. This adds up to an extra £200 a month for a tenant. Their stock is superior but why should tenants pay extra? Let them advertise on home choice but keep the rents in line with the council rents. Otherwise it’s only the well to do retirees that can afford them and that’s not fair.”

“Where else would these people live? Council property is one of the cheapest housing but I agree the council cannot afford to lose money”

“I hope that this doesn’t mean that if an individual that may struggle to pay or manage a property won’t be offered one. Offering help is all good and well, but what if at the end of the support it’s clear that the individual may struggle. Aren’t these very individuals the ones more likely to become homeless and then as a result fall into a downward spiral of homelessness, poverty and poor mental health?”

“In depth financial checks should be taken as a priority. Only when in depth checks are taken can you then determine whether they need actual help or they just want a cheap place to live.”

“Thought this was already being done.”

“Not convinced this would help with priorities.”

“I am unsure as to how this may help those who struggle to maintain a tenancy, as they will still need to be housed somewhere?”

“Don’t understand this.”

“You need your rent paying just as much as anyone else.”

“I’m not sure. There would then be a risk of those who may be deemed more ‘risky’ in terms of their financial security, or those who are more financially vulnerable from being turned down council housing, which is their very best option (considering social and private renting, buying would obviously be unachievable).”

Disagree

"This is very misleading, as tenancy failure can cover a lot of issues. The main one being unpaid rent as well as abusive and antisocial behaviour. People who already are guilty of this kind of behaviour, do not usually change just because they have moved to another property. No matter how much support is in place."

"Circumstances could change, collect info at time of offering a property."

"Too much personal data is spread too much."

"If people are at default with their tenancy then they need to prioritise their money and if they can't pay rent for the accommodation they are in, what makes you think they will pay rent for a council property. They won't pay."

"Then where they going to go. Offer them something cheaper."

"This is only going to stop people who can afford it to be put further back down the queue."

"Because it's not fair people have been waiting years and we still don't get rehoused even in the areas new builds are made and having been local tenants for years."

"This could potentially cut off vulnerable individuals and households and make it more difficult for them to find a social rent. More focus should be placed on working early to maximise income and working with partners to manage and 'jam jar' budget. This could be made a condition of tenancy where appropriate."

"What would you be asking for? How could people prove if they can afford a property or not?"

"There's no good reason why they should fail unless they're squandering their housing benefit on something else."

"The process is complex enough as is."

"Circumstances could change so collect when a property offered."

"I may be able to afford it now but things change? Will you collect this at other times other than at application?"

Strongly Disagree

"This would lead to an increase in homelessness."

"Why are they unable to afford social housing? Support to maximise income and support to maintain tenancy."

"As a labour council I am shocked at this proposal. Being poor should not put you at a disadvantage of having a roof over your and your family's head. Circumstances can change and what went before doesn't necessarily mean that it will continue in the future. If the council has concerns about rent payments then if the residents are receiving benefits they can arrange for this to be paid directly to the council. As with people using food banks – interventions can also be provided – Citizens Advice on a one to one basis on money management etc."

“Everyone deserves a chance at affordable housing. A lot of people are really struggling such as myself.”

“Why would you want to house a tenant knowing they will not keep up with the rent? So then you want to delve into their lives even further. If someone isn’t going to be good at managing their own money yet alone bills. More expensive.”

“Speaking from personal experience there isn’t any more information I possibly could have given or received. The tick box system still remains. And private renting remains unaffordable.”

“Circumstances change from one week to the next.”

“The process and information needed to get on the list takes long enough and this would take longer to sort and get on the list.”

“People should still be offered housing even if on little money so they can claim help. It seems like penalising those on low incomes. You don’t have the right to know what a person’s income is. You already do shorthold tenancies.”

“The information I gave didn’t support my application in anyway so I don’t think it matters what information you ask it’s disregarded anyway.”

Did Not Answer

“St Leger told me that I should move out of my house. My life has been destroyed because of anti-social tenants. Give people a chance but if they destroy lives kick them into private sector. Don’t get managers to victim blame and discriminate against quiet bill paying tenants.”

- 5 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 5

Strongly Agree

“Make sure that ‘guidelines’ around ‘no fault’ are clear as this may be open to abuse. Communicate these guidelines to all agencies who are likely to be supporting these individuals.”

“I feel this would get abused by people seeing a faster route to priority and place their self as homeless. Saying that, I also feel genuine homeless should always be a priority.”

“I agree with this as I will not become platinum until my time in my current house is sold therefore will be homeless and in temporary accommodation until a 3 bed home comes available that fit my needs being disabled.”

“As I’m homeless I strongly agree.”

“Agree as long as these homeless haven’t turned to substance abuse or alcoholism.”

“You said it all in your explanation above.”

Agree

“Although I think that detailed and enhanced checks needs to be made as to the legitimacy of their homeless claim.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“As above.”

“Depends if the person is looking for jobs or if just want to live by benefits.”

“Have so many properties for homeless depending on circumstances.”

“Needs basis – if 2 people presenting at civic – more on a needs basis to families etc. rather than an individual”

“It should be assessed on needs of the applicant, for example not giving bungalows or 2+ bedroom houses when these are in need for other applicants with physical (disability or age) need for them. Homeless and vulnerable 1 person applicants could be housed in a bedsit or a 1 bedroom flat.”

“How will this work with proposed amendment 4? E.g. where something is identified that puts the applicant at risk of tenancy failure?”

“Without stock you can award as many as you like platinum, it becomes worthless.”

“Unfortunately, there are many people who are considered homeless – however, they’re making it nigh on impossible for people to get a house – as they always come first. Almost makes it good practice to kick your kids out so they can be classed as homeless so they can get somewhere to live.”

“Homeless should be given priority but if the person has been homeless several times and been rehoused every time, they should not be given priority over other people on the list yet again. The homeless do get a lot of support but they don’t always accept it or appreciate it. I agree if it is through no fault of their own.”

Disagree

“Some people have been on the housing list for many years, and are no closer to accessing a council property, than when they first applied. Some people, especially single people, find it difficult to access a council property, whilst still living with someone. Yes, they may have a roof over their heads, but that doesn’t mean they are happy where they are. Not everyone has the means to pay a deposit and extortionate rent to go private. Everyone should be treated as equal.”

“People would prefer to make themselves homeless so they get a better house or more bedroom. I’d say it’s the ‘easy way out’ even though it’s not needed.”

"I think if you're in temporary accommodation because of no fault of your own, should be on that band but the ones that live on the streets shouldn't be because they have chosen to be homeless through drugs and drink. If they are on the street for drugs and drink they will just end up back there after 3 or 4 months when they've not paid their rent."

"There are too many waiting for a home. If you look at how many bidding every week, one property was 148 bids, that's not counting other properties. Why are homeless in first place. St Leger Homes are out of date with a lot of things, how they got a contract I don't know."

"No fair on others."

"Should award platinum to who is overcrowded."

"See amendment 1."

"If this is due to be implemented you need defined criteria of what 'no fault of their own means'. Budget has increased to 80k a month accommodation and hotel clean-up bills for the homeless. They have no respect for anything the council do to help them so why should we help them when they aren't willing to help themselves?"

"All people on waiting lists as this one should be equal."

"Platinum status should be used only for those people with severe disabilities or are in need of specific accommodation needs."

"Temporary housing is still housing and they are not on the streets."

"Everyone who applies for social housing needs to be considered as private rental is extortionate and the housing that some of these private landlords charge the earth for are not fit to live in and the landlords take the money but are not held responsible for the upkeep of their properties."

"I disagree with the 'only being able to afford council accommodation' as I believe your assessment for this would fail a lot of working class families. No one on less than 50k a year can afford private rented properties and anyone who can would not be looking for a council property. I earn a reasonable income but there's no way I could afford private rent, I'd end up bankrupt."

"Need to investigate if the case is genuine."

"If these people are prioritised to platinum every time. There is no incentive to sort their housing issues out. And puts other worthier people down the list."

"People could make themselves intentionally homeless just to get platinum band?"

Strongly Disagree

"I'm meant to be at top of silver as got a child under a SGO order but council don't care."

"They need to go to work it's a lot offers. Other people disability, single parents, elderly should be priorities."

"I've worked all my life, lost my house through no fault of my own. Did the council help, no. Been on list since 2013, it's a joke. Had to move with 3 kids 9 times."

“Everyone needing a home is a priority – each individual or family has a very good reason in asking you for help. As I see it, the council is only looking to save money on temporary accommodation by prioritising these poor souls above other poor souls. You need to provide more new homes and increase the housing stock – that is the only sensible resolution to addressing these oversubscribed issues. Flat sharing and multiple occupancy residential blocks could be built – utilised even as a stop gap.”

“Why award platinum to only homeless applicants? You are again prioritising people on a list that is not fit for purpose you need to build more houses and release more abandoned properties instead of relying on the very few you already have?”

“This system is already being abused. I have personal knowledge of people who have made themselves ‘homeless’ in order to gain priority status to bungalows.”

“If someone is homeless then why just platinum. I would have thought they would be happy to get any home in any band. We all want to be in platinum.”

“This isn’t fair to people already on the list, everyone is on the list for a reason already.”

“They need time to work with other agencies and deal with ongoing issues that made them homeless before being ready for own tenancy and also should have continued support in place. Current time limit is applicable.”

“Often cause distress to other tenants through drug misuse and anti-social behaviour.”

“Once again this council is rewarding bad behaviour, the most likely cause of all their ills.”

“I think some tenants play the system and get housed when actually they are not homeless.”

“More help needed for older generations they should be treated equally the same as moving can be traumatic for them.”

Did Not Answer

“Homelessness isn’t a choice in some cases. Some people need support. St Leger manager told me a tenant of nearly 9 years with no problems other than anti-social neighbours that it’s ok to be harassed and threatened in my house because of lifestyle. This would make me homeless and my child. The council doesn’t care they fake it to look good.”

- 10 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 6

Strongly Agree

“They have a place to live they can wait there safe where they are. Unlike some vulnerable people looking for a home.”

Agree

"I think this platinum priority is open to abuse and individuals on this band can become complacent and think they don't have to make the effort to accept."

Neither Agree nor Disagree

"Everyone should be the same."

"Unclear question."

"Depending on what type of property is awarded."

"Circumstances again."

"Where would the people moving out move to? Again it is reversing the problem of who lives where."

"That depends on the situation of the person/people."

"I don't understand what your explanation means."

"On assessment basis."

"Don't really understand."

"Supported living is vastly expensive, if people do not need to be in it they should be helped to access independent living, however, I would agree that a homeless person should take priority over the priority backdate."

Disagree

"There should be more affordable properties for single people to have access too, then this problem would not arise. The council need to build more affordable properties to accommodate single people."

"Moving people from supported housing into independent living is both good for those affected and frees up housing for other people who have a current need for supported housing."

"Everyone who leaves supported housing should have priority."

"Maybe restrict priority to the real neediest."

"Equal rights, one person shouldn't come over another when they both are in need of help."

"Should look at all avenues available."

"Surely the majority of single homeless cases require accommodation in supported housing projects before moving to independent living, thereby reducing the chance of failure and a return to homelessness."

"They still need to be housed and you would be making them homeless by not offering them a place."

“If someone is eligible for platinum then it should be awarded. This is a form of positive discrimination.”

“They might not have any other option.”

“Everyone should be treated fairly.”

“Doncaster is attracting the wrong sort of people by being too lenient.”

Strongly Disagree

“Again, this would be grossly unfair to all those good people that have been waiting for such a very long time.”

“People leaving supported housing have as much need if not more than some to a long term solid tenancy i.e. leaving refuge to avoid any more emotional upset and if children to find them a solid settled area to grow up and thrive.”

“No there will be people who are ready to live independently taking space in supported accommodation.”

“Some people have been on the list for quite some time waiting to be rehoused. Why should they now be penalised. There is little difference if you have been waiting a long time for a hospital appointment, only to find you must wait even longer. We are sacrificing someone’s life for another’s – this is so very wrong.”

“Think this is a no brainer, who thought this needs to think again.”

“If people are able to live independently after supported living they deserve that chance and doing this could see them homeless and at risk.”

“No, people that are in supported housing should be rehoused immediately upon their discharge. If they fail they can go back into supported housing.”

“If their homeless or living elsewhere and are single with no children they should be grateful for any kind of council home.”

“Widen the priority to both groups and change the formula to provide more housing to both groups. The backdating was created in the last review in 2018 to reflect the need to let up the bottle neck for those in supported housing. I cannot see how this change would improve either cohorts’ chances.”

“Surely this will mean that these applicants will remain longer in supported housing projects? Or worse: they will become homeless if the project removes them without anywhere to go to?”

“This is ridiculous the majority of homeless cannot manage their own tenancy straight away, people coming from supported housing and have continued support are more likely to succeed. If you go ahead with this you will be setting people up to fail.”

“Rewarding bad behaviour again.”

Did Not Answer

“If the staff at St Leger didn’t do what their mates wanted, people would get the support they needed.”

“Vulnerable or homeless people should be housed in the first instance into communal living quarters which are managed. To assess their needs.”

- 3 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 7

Strongly Agree

“I have fled domestic abuse and I am in an unsuitable property where domestic abuse occurs next door which directly impacts my mental health.”

“I’m one of these people and I feel like the delay is just increasing the danger I’m in day by day.”

“I have to escape domestic abuse from December and I’ve still not got a property as I have been messed about. I’ve only just been allocated gold been waiting since December.”

“Domestic abuse victims should be your absolute priority, forget the people who can’t be arsed to work, forget those who are homeless taking drugs, domestic abuse should be top of the agenda in every case.”

“Strongly agree they need a house ASAP to get away from the abuser because if not they will just be trapped.”

“I have been looking for years and bidding on properties and got nowhere.”

“One million percent, help them to become safe.”

Agree

“Agree but most get back with their abuser once rehoused.”

“Need to be assessed on need and how quick they need to be rehoused.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Without more properties available for you to use, you cannot be 100% compliant with.”

“I have known some people to say they have been in a domestic relationship to just get help from housing to get a house quicker or to get moved quicker.”

“Don’t understand.”

“Don’t understand the question, do not know what is in the act.”

“I think domestic abuse victims should get some priority but definitely not more than other families that also are in need through no fault of their own.”

“How vulnerable because each case is different.”

“I do not understand the act so again can’t say too much but why can’t the abusers be removed from the home instead? I would agree to giving the abused a new home provided the abuser was not allowed the old home.”

“Don’t understand.”

“Not sure what the act states.”

“I’m not sure about this as I know young girls have played on this to be homed quicker. Think strict evidence should be applied for this such as case number from police to prove it’s actually happening.”

Disagree

“There are people waiting for homes every week bidding so then they lose out. There is over 600 every week bidding to move etc. this will reduce their chance getting a place.”

“All need to be treated equal.”

“Only if there are children involved. Most people have family or friends that can accommodate a single person while they get on their feet.”

Strongly Disagree

“Anyone can claim DV with an incident number. Anyone can falsely accuse anyone. There would need to be direct work with women’s centre and social services for priority to be given. If these services and courses such as freedom project are not engaged with, then priority should be relinquished. Same goes for antisocial behaviour.”

“Domestic abuse has nothing to do with affordable housing. Limited council housing could potentially be used by domestically abused people who can afford private housing. That’s not to say that they don’t need support or shelter whilst moving from A to B.”

“People on the list will have to wait longer.”

“They keep moving new abusers in their homes and needing to move again and again.”

Did Not Answer

“Don’t really understand – as no idea what in the domestic abuse act.”

- 7 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 8

Strongly Agree

"I know I agree on this one but I'm 51 years of age, none drinker or smoker or drug taker and need a walking stick. My mobility is getting worse, have not yet been assessed and haven't been moved from the bronze band in about a year. I bid on bungalows each Thursday only to be told that there's so many people before me. I feel as though that I'm getting nowhere fast, surely this is not council policy."

"I myself would not be good in a flat etc. A lot of people suffer with mental health as I myself do. You only need to end up with someone noisy or who may argue a lot and that brings you down."

"People are taking advantage of this system and it is wrong."

"I'm 32 and in desperate need of a bungalow due to my disability but because I'm on bronze and my age I never get a chance to bid on any."

"It shouldn't go on age, that's discrimination. It should go on needs."

"Why should you get a house quicker if you are a certain age? If they don't like the wait, private rent."

"Don't think you should designate based on age as it is discrimination."

"Prioritising on need rather than age seems painfully obvious and it's hard to believe it isn't already the case."

"Not only elderly people require such housing. There may be younger people who are in greater physical need and it should definitely go to these people first."

Agree

"As long as this doesn't adversely impact on older applicants or move into age discrimination."

"Elderly people should be prioritised in the bungalows not given to any other tenants (i.e. homeless, drug abusers)."

Neither Agree nor Disagree

"Bungalows need to be available to anyone over the age of 60, while all flats should be available to everyone, as most elderly people do not want to live in a flat. It is age discrimination, when designating an age limit on a property, except bungalows which are more suitable for the elderly and disabled."

"I neither agree on this or disagree as I seen a property and it said 50+ on it yet that property would have been ideal for me and my family with it having a ramp and with 2 small children under 2. Getting a pram over a big step is hard when a single parent."

"If this means you will put in a 25 yr old in before an elderly in need then definitely not but if they are still age appropriate and say a couple of yrs younger than the other person but need it more then yes I agree as long as the people put in them are still age appropriate then yes."

“If you want to do this, then you need to speed up your assessment process first.”

“There should be a fairer selection scheme.”

“Bungalows should be for the elderly and for people with disabilities starting at 50+.”

Disagree

“There is a chance that someone who is more aged could end up passing away before being rehoused.”

“Some people are only eligible for flats & maisonettes, therefore age should allow them a bit of comfort/priority in order to get a bungalow.”

“Bungalows should be given to older residents or those with disabilities.”

“Bungalows should be for the elderly – houses can be adapted.”

“I live in a small one bedroom ground floor flat, working full time and paying full rent etc. from my wages. Looking for a suitable slightly larger bungalow to move into. I can see this change making it even harder to transfer into a suitable bungalow if one should become available in my chosen area.”

“My flat rent is too high and I cannot pay rent and I was very depressed and upset.”

“I don't think it should matter of your age. I think it should matter on your circumstances like if you're in a 3 bedroom house and you need a 4 bedroom house then you should be put on the high band.”

“No fair.”

“Everyone is to be considered based on their needs.”

“You may end up not having enough 2 bed bungalows to get older couples out of 3 bed houses to release for families.”

“I think younger people should also be considered for bungalows.”

“Only in as much as the older population can find the prospect of having to move away from where they're comfortable and settled much more terrifying than perhaps younger people would.”

“If it works don't mess around with it.”

“I am in a large 2 bed house and wanting to downgrade into a bungalow. I am in my 50's and would prefer to do this rather than downgrade to a smaller 2 bed house and then as I age or end up where I am disabled have to move into a bungalow. While I am relatively able to move I have coped, I would much prefer this option.”

“I think this needs to be carefully monitored. There are reasons people moved to the community they moved to due to the age designation in the first instance.”

“Should be for OAP's.”

“A lot of us are already waiting for ongoing time to get a bungalow. A lot of us over people have medical needs also you shouldn't push us further back in the queue for a bungalow.”

Yes those that truly need one I agree but can't just forget about us that's over 60. Why can't they start on bronze or silver instead of platinum?"

"Think if properties are allocated to younger people it may result in ASB in areas where it doesn't currently exist."

"I currently own my own home and I am wanting to move into a bungalow. As soon as I am offered a bungalow I can sell my game and move as I am retiring and can't afford the cost of staying in my own home. If this amendment is passed, I would possibly never get a bungalow."

"I think that age is very important. I am at the moment 65 and working, I retire at 66 but if I cannot afford the rent on this private property I would have to consider carrying on working if I am able or not. So if my age is a help to getting council bungalow I want it to count."

"I am concerned that younger people who are housed among older residents, particularly in age-designated flats, may behave in ways that are unacceptable to their neighbours. I would approve of this only if the applicant is made fully aware of the conduct appropriate to the particular location and that they confirm their acceptance of these conditions."

"If it is for a bungalow I do not agree, I think that the bungalows should be for the elderly only."

"Yet again, older people to wait longer."

Strongly Disagree

"I strongly agree as it should go on current needs not age, this is probably why we're not getting a chance. I bid every wk if property is in my area. Again, it just seems to be a bit unfair."

"By age only, too many younger people getting bungalows."

"Bungalow should be allowed to disabled/60+."

"Once again – both deserve to have a home that reflects their needs. If you implement this amendment then there is a very strong chance that some people on the list will never reach the point of being rehoused to fit their needs because they will continually be dropping down the priority list. I ask what is the current % of housing stock allocated for these residents – it is also extremely low at 2%? More new homes need to be built to address the shortfall. The demographics and housing allocation in the Local Plan highlighted this in 2018 e.g. with an expected 30% increase in the over 60 population. We are now 4 years in and the world has seen further & greater change. So does the council now need to revisit its social, elderly and disabled housing stock numbers to keep up with the times? More assisted living, bungalows etc. need to be built and provided by DMBC."

"Letting bungalows to age 40+, one time a day you had to be 50 to 60 get a bungalow. I say bungalows should be 50+ not under that age. 2 bedroom flats 30+ 40+ depending on floor level of flat location access."

"I don't agree as there is younger people that would benefit with bungalows or smaller places because of health conditions."

"No because this will then lead to younger families being rehomed into designated retirement and residential areas. Older people command respect and deserve peace and quiet."

“If someone is 55+ and very fit with no health problems & someone at 40+ has health problems and can't manage stairs then I think assessing by age rather than health needs is not fair.”

“This is long overdue, however, when it comes to bungalows I think these applicants should still have a medical need for a bungalow, such as being on PIP.”

“Nothing wrong with it.”

“There might be an underlying reason why people need to move which isn't age related.”

“Older tenants often wait years to be moved into bungalows or never get the opportunity to move.”

“Ridiculous, pensioner properties should be left to pensioners. Maybe some of the others could find a job.”

“It is a recipe for disaster if young people are to be routinely accommodated in housing intended for older people. Nobody under 40 should be housed in such accommodation unless it is due to serious physical disability.”

“As earlier, if property is age related e.g. 60+ then 60+ only get tenancy. As said, my 60+ property in 60+ street had 3 fairly recent tenants in 40's and retired elderly have peace and tranquillity destroyed.”

“Older people need bungalows more than younger and should be given priority for them.”

“Age related assessment seems fairer as older people, often living alone would not like to be housed next to younger families or people with additional support needs.”

“I am already aware of younger people living in bungalows who are not ill or have disabilities whilst elderly people are stuck in big family houses and can only use the downstairs due to health problems.”

“I am approaching 59 years of age and in the bronze band. I have waited patiently for a 40+ & 50+ bungalow for a number of years.”

“You need to have more assessors, someone supervising them, time limit to each step.”

Did Not Answer

“As somebody 40+ disabled and living in fear of her child and my own safety why haven't I been considered for a bungalow?”

“The council should safeguard people that have moved into bungalows as being over 6-+ before moving in other tenants.”

- 8 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 9

Agree

“They are all in the same situation and otherwise could end up homeless.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Should be done by means and needs.”

Disagree

“Forces should have funding for personnel leaving service not the council.”

“I don't agree with granting straight platinum band as that's their decision to separate/divorce and if it's not caused by any abuse, then it should be made with all the consequences and thinking ahead where they will live etc. I would agree with a personalised decision made on the assessment but not to be granted as a whole.”

“No this shouldn't be made a priority as they are separated and the person in or previously in armed forces may have a new partner that would need help.”

“Not sure even why ex-service staff get priority – so definitely do not think it should include ex-partners.”

“Keep platinum for the most needy.”

“We all work regardless of what job.”

“Because if you put divorced mothers/fathers that are single should be prioritised as well.”

“Person with family should get priority.”

“There are many more vulnerable people needing it more.”

“This only helps people in higher band.”

“The armed forces are supposed to cater for their needs, not councils.”

“They should apply and be treated as anyone else.”

“Surely they'd be treated like any other person?”

“The time period (5yrs) seems excessively long – a reduction to 3yrs might be more appropriate in line with other priority housing considerations.”

“If they are homeless yes, but also every week a property should be offered/allocated to the longest person that's been waiting on the housing list also as some people been waiting years and never going to get a property. Which is still not acceptable.”

“I think if it was the actual person in the armed forces in need then yes but not divorced partner not to take priority over someone else.”

“All should be treated fairly and being a partner to armed forces should not take priority over others who have been waiting longer.”

“Why would it be different for armed forces families separating to any family separating.”

“Don’t quite understand why you would want to do this – service people know how long they are signed up for and know they will need to transition and whether rent or buy another house. As for ex(s)???”

“Why should they have priority over other people just because they were in the armed forces otherwise we should be the same for NHS staff and police.”

“Ex service personnel usually have better pensions than our old folk to manage on. Merit also on separated folk.”

“If they are separated it would be the same as any civvy separated person bidding to find a home.”

“Only priority to the person who has children.”

“Unless someone is currently leaving the armed forces the banding should be the same as anyone else. If someone has been stable for up to five years they should be given the same priority as anyone else.”

“Platinum seems like a bit of a stretch just because of the armed forces. Why not the same priority as other separated/divorced partners?”

Strongly Disagree

“Not really fair on everyone else.”

“What about widows and widowers.”

“Can go private till they bid like everyone else not one rule them one rule other. Who thought of amendments must be living in cuckoo land.”

“No priority should be given to those currently living with personnel. The same should go for their children.”

“Ex squaddies should not be auto top of list – same rules.”

“Again, priority should come down to circumstances and individuals affordability. Separated/divorced (ex) partners of any job description may well be in a new relationship where together they can afford private housing.”

“They are separated from the person, this will make people on the list already wait longer.”

“Not really because if they are leaving the army they aren’t exactly struggling for money and probably won’t need council help when they can afford private.”

“If they’re separated or divorced from force’s personnel then they’re no longer eligible for that support.”

“If they were in the armed forces they have money.”

“I don’t agree that separated or divorced partners of forces should be treated any differently to normal members of society. Unless there is children involved with the forces member.”

“Not sure why any ex services should be prioritised – never mind their ex. Surely they should only be prioritised if they have been medically discharged?”

“They chose the military.”

“Hmmm why?”

“Prioritise forces families, but not ex partners.”

Did Not Answer

“Each case should be evaluated independently. Friends of staff shouldn’t get to tell St Leger what to do.”

- 1 response redacted due to offensive language
- 3 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 10

Strongly Agree

“Need to make it clearer by stating all other in the wording as it’s not clear that this is all others that are not registered homeless.”

“I don’t think people should be dropped for refusing. People have reasons for refusing such as away from family support. Offer them what suits their needs otherwise your setting them up to fail. That’s wrong.”

“Why are we even giving them a choice? If they refuse it, take them off the list. If they’re desperate they’d take what they can get.”

“Yes definitely.”

“Seems fair.”

“Should be more chances.”

“Seems reasonable.”

Agree

“As long as fair notice is given on an applicant then I agree with this.”

“Because banding isn’t fair, I’ve been in Bronze for ages and it’s not fair.”

“Agree as long as each case is reviewed to understand why people are declining offers where they may have valid and strong reasons.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“As people are asked to state the area of choice when applying for a property, then they should only be offered a property in that area.”

“As I haven’t been offered any I don’t know how many times you can refuse before being penalised.”

“I don’t understand this.”

“1 offer for all.”

“Think if your bronze or below, you shouldn’t have a limit on your bids – it’s impossible to even get a council house for us anyway, always a million on the bids so why limit it. Might as well just give us a small chance to get one by letting us bid on as many as we are interested in.”

“St Leger houses are in disrepair with anti-social people given priority so each should be independently looked at.”

“I get that refusals slow the system but why should those who are most desperate (homeless) get less refusals than others?”

“I have been on bronze for years. I am 56 years old and still waiting.”

Disagree

“In this case what if someone had 4 children and bid on a 3 bedroom house and on view it was a small 3 bedroom property and they would not manage to live in it with it being small.”

“Can understand, but usually people are moved miles away from family that are able to help and support them.”

“Should be able to have as many offers as it takes.”

“Sometimes the property that is being offered really isn’t suitable for the person and could end up causing further distress and issues than actually being homeless. I think it should be 3 strikes and you’re out rule across all bands. The likelihood of 3 properties being unsuitable is highly unlikely and as such is given the applicant sufficient options.”

“The description on the properties to bid for is very limited and the pictures doesn’t match the description as well so it’s like blind bidding. This isn’t fair to the bidder so an error on the property can be an unwanted bid which could lead to an unwanted offer.”

“It should be 3 offers for all bands to make it fair. The properties offered could be in a bad state and those offered it could be in a position not be able to sort it out.”

“1 for all unless a very good reason why they turn down something they have bid on.”

“Shouldn’t have to accept a home that isn’t suitable.”

“If someone is offered a house in a location that’s not for them then that wouldn’t be fair. Some people have others to care for in the same village as them and have to be close by.”

“Some of the houses given are in poor condition i.e. need a lot of money spent on them before able to thoroughly enjoy living in them. Anyone in any band regardless of situation should be allowed to say no to a property that isn’t suitable, out of area or in a bad area

(drugs or antisocial behaviour) and not be made to go back to start or suspended for turning down a house not suitable.”

“They should be treated equally, with all bands having at least 2-3 offers. The reasoning for this is due to certain offers put forward for higher bands may be unsuitable in the immediate future and it’s to one party that it will be an issue. Example: One person is offered a house in an area. The house is sound but it’s found to have individuals who are antisocial in the neighbourhood, racism/sexism/homophobia. It isn’t fair that they lose their banding due to having this information and choosing to act upon it.”

“Would be fair if the council were to make sure all properties were offered in good condition, and fit to move into.”

“I disagree with it because the house they bid on may not suit the size of the family.”

“The properties aren’t always fit for purpose. I fear this will allow council properties to be in a state of disrepair and an individual has to accept it. Just because someone is homeless why should they be subjected to living in subpar accommodation.”

“One offer for any band is unreasonable given the semi-derelict condition of many houses with most tenants unable to take on the renovation of the council’s properties.”

“All should be given 3 opportunities.”

“All should have equal opportunities.”

“Everyone regardless of band should be granted the same amount of offers. Not all accommodation is suitable for everybody’s needs and sometimes this isn’t apparent until a viewing.”

“There are many people who don’t want to move into areas where there are already problems with anti-social behaviour as this could affect their mental health as it would mine.”

“1 offer for homeless isn’t great just because they’re homeless doesn’t mean they should only have one choice.”

“I’ve come across homeless people who prefer the streets than to be forced into certain accommodation. 1 offer seems tight for anyone. Choice encourages pride.”

“One for all.”

“If they bid for a property they should take it if successful – one offer for all.”

“It is not always right to do this. The person may end up living far away from any support network and feel they need to accept the offer.”

“One offer for all priorities.”

“What happens if a person is offered where they don’t want to live?”

“I don’t agree that is forcing people to take a property they don’t want, freedom of choice.”

“You are then restricting people choice of where they want to live just because of their affordability.”

“This should be case by case. We had an issue when we viewed 2 houses it would be completely unsuitable for us and you wouldn’t have known from pics. If the above stated had been in place, I wouldn’t have been able to get where we live now.”

“Homeless people should have the same rights as everyone else.”

“2 offers minimum to all bands.”

“I think all applicants should be allowed to refuse once and to take into consideration why they have refused.”

“If you don’t like the area, it’s not my problem.”

“Should offer 1 property across all bands, not enough houses for everyone to have so much choice.”

“The house offered may not be suitable for many reasons e.g. away from any much needed support network, schools etc. I think 3 is enough and suspend for 6 months if needed.”

“Unless someone is homeless and desperately in need surely it’s only moral to give them some option on where they live. Forcing people to live in places they do not want to will only create further issues e.g. mental health, social isolation.

Strongly Disagree

“This is simply not fair. I was offered a property that was advertised as a flat and it turned out to be nothing more than a small, damp and mouldy ‘self-contained bedsit’. It is unfair that I am penalised for refusing to live in a pretty disgusting property like that.”

“All priorities should be given one offer only unless there are specific exceptional reasons.”

“Sometimes properties are not advertised with all the details, and instead are advertised with ‘basic details only’. I believe that if a property is offered and it was only advertised with basic details, if the property was turned down for good reason, then the applicant shouldn’t receive a suspension. Please note that I believe that this should only apply to properties that are listed with ‘basic information only, however, all other properties that are advertised with the full information, amendment 10, as highlighted above, should be instated. Maybe make an amendment to include a few rights to refusal if the property is advertised with ‘basic information only’ and the applicant has a genuinely good reason to turn down the offer.”

“Most offers of housing are in poor run down areas in old run down houses that aren’t appealing to people as people would not feel safe and quite frankly wouldn’t be safe.”

“Because people have to feel comfortable in a home.”

“Moving or choosing a home is proven to be the biggest decision in anyone’s life therefore, prospective tenants should be allowed as many refusals as they want. The council could help massively by showing photos of the internal parts of each property to allow a better understanding of what one is bidding for, just as the private sector does.”

“Don’t agree especially for disabled people who are wheelchair users because from my own experience you don’t get offered the right properties for their needs. A lot of bungalows are not any good for wheelchair users especially a big electric powerchair from wheelchair services. Also we’re willing to give a 3 bedroom house up for a wheelchair friendly bungalow but not getting one bid enough for our needs. We live dangerously and are desperate for a bungalow but the ones that they keep offering are not suitable for someone who can only get around using wheelchair.”

"I disagree as I myself have been told by a housing officer to extend looking further afield for a bungalow. I personally have and need family members help. Not all of them drive. If I have a fall I need to someone to come as quick as they can to help. There is also certain areas you would not want to live in due to drugs, vandalism and anti-social behaviour."

"I don't know how to explain this but that's not fair. Some people in other bands need bigger houses because of their kids or any different circumstances."

"Due to personal experience area could be inappropriate."

"Sometimes the place is not good. Let them choose where they feel comfortable. Do not force people."

"These properties may not be suitable or in area the person needs for their support network or need."

"There are various reasons why someone may reject an offer and they should not be penalised if it doesn't suit their needs. After all, you are not providing their home for free. You or I wouldn't be willing to pay rent on a property that we didn't want to live in – would we? So why should you expect others to and to further suggest, that we do this by holding a virtual gun to their head, is flabbergasting. I suspect there are a number of permanently vacant properties that no one really wants – if this is the case, you already know the reasons why this is the case, so sell them and buy other properties that you know people will rent and accept."

"Safety reasons on why they can't take the property."

"There could be safety reasons as to why a property is unsuitable."

"Offers such as direct match where a valid reason has not been given for refusal is a bit harsh when the opportunity for them to see the property for themselves, unless they have actually bid on a property and been reached."

"There should be no limit for refusal of a property. If one person refuses a property it just goes to the next individual. It's not until an individual sees a property that they can fully assess whether it suits their needs. The individual knows their needs more than anyone and may have very valid grounds for refusing. No one and I mean no one should ever be suspended for six months for just refusing a property. People aren't children and they know what they need out of a property in order to achieve a happy life. To be stuck in the wrong property can be a disaster for an individual."

"We are not cattle, we are born and bred in our home towns. We raise our children here and should never be forced to move our families away from our friends / relatives / community / support systems. The fact that this is legal is abhorrent."

"Most advertisements give totally inadequate information about a property, most have only one external photo, some not even that, so only way to see if a property is suitable is to view it. If turn it down because it's not suitable, then get penalised by marked down as refusing a property. If adequate information was given in the first place and could see it wouldn't be suitable then wouldn't bid on such a property."

"There will be many different reasons why someone may refuse a property, listening to these reasons on an individual basis will create more accuracy in offering properties that meet the needs that are not assessed for. If passed, this amendment will create a situation where people in high priority need are forced to accept properties not truly suitable for them."

“It should be over 3 for all applicants, we lived in a private let and the landlord sold the property and we only had the choice of one house and had to take it even though not close to other family. This area is not nice and we cannot get anyone to exchange.”

“To keep communities together. What will happen if someone looking in a certain area will be penalised for a smaller number of offers despite their circumstances.”

“Depends where you are offering.”

“Everyone should be entitled to refuse a property. Specifically due to taking children into areas of high crime rates and violence etc. This wouldn't be in best interest.”

“It should be 3 offers for all bands.”

“If a person is refusing a property, I believe it is likely to be for good reason. I don't believe that people should be so severely penalised for this when it is significant decision to make and one with a long-term impact. Maybe instead of removing priority etc. Explore the reasoning behind the refusal and go from there. It could be a personal, social, financial or other type of issue that might with a little coaxing be easily remedied.”

“Unless there's a separate mechanism for refusing a property as unsuitable, there's a strong risk of people being pushed into unsuitable properties.”

“People should be given the opportunity to make their choices at least 3 offers for all band.”

“You cannot get a reasonable feeling for a property in one quick visit, the ones left in a mess do not always appeal.”

Did Not Answer

“Don't understand the question.”

- 3 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 11

Strongly Agree

“This is a good change as individuals with genuine accessibility needs are often lost in the system.”

“Why do we even give them a choice? If they refuse they get taken off the list.”

Agree

“As long as they have a valid reason for doing so and outweighs the offer of housing.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

"You say penalty but don't state what kind. It should be based on reason why they refuse as if you're wanting a house near your family, you're not gonna take the house that's offered to be too far away or unsuitable from the viewing."

"Just because they are on the Accessible Housing Register doesn't mean they should be forced to accept a property in a neighbourhood that is unsuitable for them. There are many many bad neighbourhoods out there."

"If they refuse houses in their chosen area for no reason then yes agree, but if there is issues such as damp, things broken or the house classed as unliveable then no I don't agree."

"I don't understand what this means."

"It depends why people are refusing the properties offered."

"I'm not sure with this. A penalty as in a fee? If so this seems unreasonable given the relative needs of applicants. Such housing may not be appropriate after viewing and they should not be penalised by this via a fee."

Disagree

"If you are disabled you might want to be near family or have certain needs for kitchens, bathrooms etc. Should have a couple of choices."

"Shouldn't have to accept a home that isn't suitable."

"Depends on circumstances."

"I disagree with amendment 11 as until viewing a property the person who is eligible for an accessible property will not know if the property is suitable for them and their needs, it may not have the adaptations they need."

"I don't think anyone should be suspended for any time as it's a big thing moving and if the applicant doesn't feel it's right for them they shouldn't be punished in that way because some places are in a bad state of repair."

"See previous answer."

"Depends on the penalty."

"Ask people why they refuse and why they aren't happy with the house. If they are in line with standard living codes so people live safely and in a good state to live in."

"There shouldn't be penalties."

"Don't understand that so not agreeing."

"Can't expect someone to live in areas they are unfamiliar with or have no connection to."

"Why should someone only be offered in areas where they may not want to live."

"Some properties may be very unsuitable and the applicant should not be given a penalty."

"When I see the house in real life, I want to make the decision then. Everyone should have their own right to refuse a house if they don't feel it's suited for them."

“It’s unfair on people who need to be rehoused who are desperate for a new home.”

“Again if more pictures and information on the houses were supplied where possible it would waste less time all round.”

“Minimum 2 offers.”

“Again it should all depend on why they have refused.”

Strongly Disagree

“This is simply not fair. I was offered a property that was advertised as a flat and it turned out to be nothing more than a small, damp and mouldy ‘self-contained bedsit’. It is unfair that I am penalised for refusing to live in a pretty disgusting property like this.”

“Could be offered one in an area they don’t want.”

“People’s needs don’t always match up directly with council’s medical needs. Such as family support or how close properties are to the shops etc. which can be at times more important than everything else. If they are suspended, an appropriate house could pass them by leaving them on the register for longer.”

“Nobody should be penalised for saying they can’t take a home they wouldn’t feel safe in or if the area isn’t ok for them if they’d have no support. A home is a huge thing in life it has to be suitable.”

“For the same reasons as above, grossly unfair.”

“Depends on needs, one size doesn’t fit all.”

“Depends on circumstances.”

“Giving out penalties for refusing unsuitable accommodation is just wrong whatever colour or creed it’s just wrong.”

“Sounds like you’re just trying to push people into properties/areas that may not be suitable for them.”

“I have covered this in the previous amendment proposed.”

“Amend should stay as it was not changed by SLH whom is only contactors to Doncaster Council.”

“No. Unless the house is suitable for their needs, and they again have already bid then no they should not lose. A lot of properties that are accessible still do not meet the needs of the disabled applicant, therefore they should not be given any prejudice when they refuse a property that is not adapted or ready. People with accessible needs should be given the right to refuse as a lot of AHR properties are not tailored to their needs.”

“As above...there should be no limit for refusal of a property. If one person refuses a property it just goes to the next individual. It’s not until an individual sees a property that they can fully assess whether it suits their needs. The individual knows their needs more than anyone and may have very valid grounds for refusing. No one and I mean no one should ever be suspended for six months for just refusing a property. People aren’t children and they know what they need out of a property in order to achieve a happy life. To be stuck in the wrong property can be a disaster for an individual.”

“From personal experience, I can say waiting for council accommodation whilst being sheltered in hotels with my children has been one of the most exhausting periods of my life in all regards. The threat of being forced to move away from my home town leads me to feel nothing but sub-human, and the added threat of being penalised for trying to stop this is abhorrent.”

“No one should be forced as a matter of policy to accept a property that isn’t suitable according to their assess needs. There needs to be a feedback mechanism to adjust offers to be more suitable.”

“Why people should be punished if they refuse to accept accommodation which is not good for them?”

“When you are on bidding list you have an idea on location, style etc. of home. When you on AHR it’s a random OT who decides where you need to live. The whole of AHR needs an audit currently not fit for purpose. You’re in a lottery, no idea on time you will wait. Should be a list so you can view.”

“Again causes more problems than it solves.”

“As a disabled lady who has been waiting almost 2 years to move from 1 bed to 2 bed (consultant’s recommendation), I dislike the thought that I may have to move away from my native area to avoid a penalty.”

“See above.”

“Same as amendment 10.”

“Why the right to refuse away or a threat with penalty. You may view a house and not realise the street is awful til you view it. If you don’t bid at all you get knocked off the list.”

“Not acceptable and completely unfair.”

“The house may not be suitable due to other reasons.”

“Sometimes a property just isn’t feasible for disabled people. The disabled person should be able to say no to a property.”

“I strongly doubt that it would be carried out fairly.”

“That’s not ‘helping’.”

“There are several issues involved in AHR housing and expecting a tenant to accept first option before issuing a penalty is forcing them to make a decision which could ultimately be unsuitable and therefore restricting their freedom of choice.”

“The houses that are described on the website are poorly described, in order to feel good in a given house, you need to see it. The penalties are not appropriate.”

“People who require accessible housing have very specific needs and very specific barriers. Perhaps further research around this is needed? I find it highly immoral to effectively remove someone’s independence and choice because they have a disability. Changing the way adaptable housing is dealt with entirely in Doncaster is needed.”

“People should not be given refusal penalty because they refuse to accept the property given to them. What about the direct match where the individual did not bid the property by herself. If the individual refused any offer it can be given to another person. For me I don’t like forcing people when it comes to making choice as I can only advice.”

Did Not Answer

“Don’t understand what it is.”

“Don’t understand the question.”

- 1 response redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 12

Strongly Agree

“Keep it within the council.”

“Yep don’t see why this would be a bad thing.”

Agree

“Should have more information and picks of house you want to rent to people and it should also come with a list of problems so people know what they are taking on if said problems have had to be fixed so many times.”

“Maybe if they are difficult to fill – these should be the properties that are offered to homeless etc. as a stop gap so they take a place in the queue.”

“People do not always have access to internet.”

“Doesn’t really give much info on what this is or will do or how, but it seems reasonable.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“See amendment 10.”

“Not sure how this would work.”

“Perhaps more work needs to be done to make such properties less ‘low demand’ and more desirable or accessible.”

“If it saves money and resources then it makes sense. Value for money.”

“How often does this happen to warrant doing this?”

“Don’t understand.”

“Make them more accessible for those that have been homeless – incentive to support moving in.”

“You are creating ghettos.”

“An explanation of what no demand is would be useful. Does low demand mean an area that no one wants to move to? Perhaps if an area is low demand, the area requires improvement.”

Disagree

“There are usually good reasons for low demand properties.”

“Not enough housing. Could be someone waiting on high priority banding who need that house first before being offered to others in lower banding.”

“Still will have the same problem. Who thought of this need think again. Fault bid for property given property but can't move in as SLH are doing repairs can take two or three weeks in turn their place can't be re let.”

“There's bids on all houses anyway.”

“I would have suggest if the interior of the houses advertising can be included so people can see what they are bidding to avoid refusal of the offer.”

Strongly Disagree

“Again for the reasons as above, this would result in ‘shoving people’ into tenancies they don't want, thus ruining lives. It's that serious.”

“Waste of money.”

Did Not Answer

“Yes more photos of the property and garden should attract more interest.”

“Hard to let house should go to anti-social tenants until they learn.”

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 response redacted for including identifiable/personal information |
|---|

Amendment 13

Strongly Agree

“This needs to be properly communicated in writing either by email or paper.”

“They're your properties. Why wouldn't you do this as standard?”

“Yes need to be clearer.”

“Sometimes think lettings team afraid to say no even if quietly believe an applicant should not be awarded a certain property e.g. applicant is not age qualified for a property where an age factor applies.”

“Clarity in housing is required. It’s complicated for most people and if someone is in a time of crisis they may struggle to understand a complex process.”

Agree

“This would be more useful for wheelchair users. We always get property offers that are not medically suitable for some in a wheelchair plus area are important to feel safe where you live when you’re vulnerable. It’s not nice some areas are very rough.”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Nuisance neighbours should be given stronger deterrents so not to reoffend.”

Disagree

“This will be abused and individuals will end up cherry picking what they believe will be the best applicant.”

“Again it’s unfair on people who need to be rehoused.”

Strongly Disagree

“People will struggle with rent as rent is too high for people to afford. People will end up homeless as it’s not their fault renting is going up to much. People with low income will suffer.”

“Every human has a right to live somewhere but medically ill people and disabled should be considered. Everyone has to live somewhere if not open caravan parking, it’s better than streets.”

“As a council you are letting properties to people and it is their right to have every opportunity to settle in a house they believe they can make a life for them and their children. If they believe it’s medically suitable then they should be given the chance. The same with references – as stated previously, the past is not always the future. This point is covered including support that could be provided in previous comments.”

“Application should be on it stating if disabled etc. but there a problem if they got to move because of threats and danger to life. Local lettings policy is down to the owners of the properties – Doncaster Council – not contractors to the council.”

“You need to be clear in all cases when properties are applied for, when they have been let, all who apply are left in limbo.”

Did Not Answer

“Look at a person application before offering it to anybody.”

- 3 responses redacted for including identifiable/personal information

Amendment 14

Strongly Agree

“Sensible approach.”

“You’re the owner, it’s entirely up to you what to do. Why wouldn’t this be standard procedure?”

Neither Agree nor Disagree

“Priority banding/homeless should always come above anyone regardless of situation. People choose to live in flood prone areas i.e. fishlake, Bentley and around areas which they know flood regularly, where as someone being made homeless via section 21 did not ask to be made homeless due to landlord selling up so should always come first in priority banding.”

“Not opposed in principle but if it’s in response to an emergency or extraordinary circumstances, then surely the answer is to use emergency/extraordinary provision, not existing housing stock which then further impacts the current lack of appropriate housing.”

“This is a difficult one. I sort of agree, but equally think larger inner city properties should be acquired for this purpose and used as emergency accommodation.”

“Not sure about this one as someone gets flooded who had a house and gets a house a week later and there are people on gold/silver/bronze been waiting years already for a property. That’s definitely not acceptable as the people waiting for yrs are always going to be prioritised by some else worse off if that’s the case. So to make this situation and one’s like it fair, one property every week should be allocated/offered to the longest waiting person/family matching their needs on the list no matter what band they are in to make it fair to people waiting years.”

“Allocation should carry on as normal and house the people who have been waiting to move into a property.”

“Anyone can say the family have deserted them.”

Disagree

“Those on the housing register before the emergency may also be affected by that emergency.”

“No, people need to be encouraged to pay for insurance.”

“There should be a team/people/a strategy in place for this without it having to affect everybody else who is desperately waiting for a house.”

“I think this could potentially be unfairly used, depending on what gets labelled as an ‘emergency’.

“Unfair.”

“People who are registered for housing are in need.”

“Majority of the people on the housing list are awaiting properties, also for needs that aren’t being met long term.”

“People still have housing needs no matter what emergency event etc.”

“This is only needed temporary so should be worded as temporary accommodation.”

“Everyone should be considered for rehousing, not just a selective few.”

“Suspect there is a hidden agenda to this that hasn’t been stated.”

“A family such as mine that has been waiting on a property for several months if not years will then lose the opportunity to get housed...this I don’t feel is fair.”

“Everyone applying for social housing is in desperate need for housing.”

“There should be procedures in place for this, will cause disappointment if been offered a property then taken away.”

Strongly Disagree

“That is completely unfair to the people on the housing list, we have been waiting years and to have it snatched away at the last minute through an emergency situation is not of their doing is completely unfair.”

“Because homeless families should always come first, after all they may have been waiting for a long time in a hostel – there should be a fast track for potential homeless cases rather than assume they have nowhere to stay – or perhaps insist that insurance is taken out to cover such events, particularly in council homes.”

“As stated previously, suspending should never be an option – you are only replacing one person’s life above another and the amendment is open to be abused – anything that is decided as an emergency can suspend the list. In life we are always faced with new challenges and emergencies, we rise to these and get creative but suspending the list is not the answer.”

“People are at risk of not having a property and putting them at risk.”

“People needing a property could be left at risk and vulnerable by suspending this and this could lead to further deaths.”

“Again it comes down to circumstance and affordability. Yes tragedies happen where some people become homeless or ill, but they could potentially have family to stay with or savings or be in a partnership where therefore they can afford private rent/hotels etc.”

“No, put them up in hotels and given the homes to people who need houses.”

“Special measures should be imposed from central government not local councils. If this survey is any indication, local council will try to find any means possible to throw out the rules governing these processes to do whatever they want. The council should always have to apply to suspend these processes.”

“Leaves people homeless through no fault of their own.”

“People who have been flooded or other emergency usually have insurance that will cover the cost of a private rental. Where this is not the case, this should be looked at case by case.”

“If you are sick you should call and tell the council about it. People who are healthy will waste time trying to get a home.”

“People of Doncaster should come first to Doncaster.”

“To a person who is homeless, unable to live independently, disabled and stuck in unsuitable housing, someone suffering antisocial behaviour or other such situations moving/finding accommodation is an absolute essential.”

- 2 responses redacted due to offensive language
- 1 response redacted for including identifiable/personal information

General Comments

“Treat single parents as a priority.”

“People that suffering from antisocial behaviour through no fault of their own should be prioritised on the housing list. People have the right to escape from the nightmare they are living in.”

“Have more houses up on the website.”

“Stop offering council accommodation to people who are constantly causing abuse and antisocial behaviour, and stop moving them to other areas, to cause distress there.”

“We are currently bidding on bungalows in our area but I think because we own our own home which we bought from council we think this would make things more difficult to get a bungalow even though we have medical condition that you know of. We have a 3 bed and was willing to sell back to you so we could have a bungalow and there would then be a 4 bed property for a needy family. I think people who are on the bid list and own their homes who need to downsize the council should consider those as well.”

“Happy the allocations process is being look at. Think this should happen more than every 15 years to keep up with changes in society.”

“Give more help/priority to young, single or teen mums who are in lower bands.”

“The rights of people who have been on the register for 2 years or more to be able to bid on properties in their area without seeing that 30 or 40 or even more people have bid on said properties and therefore you find yourself in a position where you will never be offered a property while living in private rented accommodation.”

“Nothing missed. More bungalows needed with wet rooms rather than baths as older people can’t always get in a bath.”

“Listen to the tenants a lot more. Have like individuals for certain areas or postcodes who get involved and go out to see the tenants in their particular area and who can assess a situation and say yes he or she or this family need to be moved or no they’re fine where they are, rather than just looking at paperwork and making an assessment on that. Direct face to face give better faster results than just paperwork.”

“I just find it very frustrating and hard work to even get shortlisted for council housing as we have been on the list for over 8 years now and been on medical priority gold for nearly a year. I have bid on properties when no one else has and still don’t get a look in. I know the council are doing their best and also know that it doesn’t matter if you’re the first or last to bid to decide whether you have been successful or not. Was also advised by a home choice officer to only bid in the areas you want as if you take one in an area you don’t really want, we will have to stay in it for a year and then will be changed to transferable not priority.”

“Mutual exchange should be easier and quicker and not defined by eligibility. If a single person in a 3 bed wants to swap with a couple in a 2 bed this should be allowed as the council lose nothing, yet the people exchanging would be happier and more settled.”

“Should be a timed limit for those on higher bands of 3 months to stop picking and choosing of best areas before their banding is reduced because if they have a genuine need to be moved they shouldn’t be allowed to wait. Transfer band should be regarded as the same as bronze and silver depending on needs.”

“Help genuine people like myself.”

“Need to look how tenants affect others and how to help support the people suffering because of bad tenants.”

“I believe that you a tenant should be moved up banding due to length on list. I have been on the housing list for 7 years and whilst I understand some people’s needs will be greater than mine, if I stay as I am I will never ever be able to get property.”

“Potentially increase the band lower people are on if they haven’t got close to having a house in the past 3+ years. Living in a house with damp and mould when there are young children there should have more priority than they currently receive.”

“Occupational therapy assessments should be done when medical records received not when offered a place.”

“People who own house and been a victim of domestic abuse should get quicker option to be able to move out of the house of course if necessary. It will give them safe place and time to deal with things.”

“Family, kids, should be priority.”

“When a tenant wishes to move you take the reasons into consideration and don’t just stick them back at the bottom of the pile.”

"I feel that banding should be explained to each applicant as I personally wasn't told what each banding meant and I'm someone who struggles to understand if not having it explained."

"Yer people like me get over looked."

"Housing applications should also take into consideration locations to local support offered either by the applicant's family and services from the council themselves. Also if families with needs are in an area they are more comfortable in because they are familiar of the area, it will reduce the likelihood of rehousing and families can help support them, which would help the council support those who have nobody."

"Remember that just because people work they could be in a bad place and shouldn't just be placed on the lowest band. Check more in depth their housing situation. Just because they have income doesn't mean they have savings and can afford to move to other private rent or rented properties through agents. Working families also struggle."

"Younger people should not be forced into flats just because they don't have children. They should be allowed to bid on 2 bedroom houses the same as they are allowed to bid on 2 bedroom flats."

"I think you should go back to how it used to be on a waiting list, this bidding is totally unfair. I've been waiting for a bungalow for nearly 4 years, I'll be in an OAP care home before I get anywhere near one."

"I am in silver band and think I should be placed in a higher banding."

"In regards to amendment 2, in my opinion there should be 2 'queues' main as it was always there and the one with lesser needs just progressing with simply time they applied for the accommodation."

"More homes need building. The run down areas need making safer and nicer so people are not afraid of moving to them."

"Some people have been bidding for more than 10 years and above because the council deemed them not a priority but some they bid for only less than a year because the council thought they were priority yet they are not. The council should also consider the years people have been bidding for. This whole system should be changed to first come first served at the same time council putting houses aside for people who genuinely in need. This bidding system does not work, some families put themselves in situations where they know the council will think they are a priority, yet they are not. There are families having genuine problems and wanting to be rehoused but they are overcome by those who know how to play the whole system. Stop the bidding system. Families are suffering because of this priority thing."

"I think people who are re-applying but already have a council property and are wanting to move for whatever reason other than just wanting to move e.g. far from family, problems with neighbours etc. they should be given opportunities to move into another property quicker than now, providing they have a good tenant record. They aren't taking an empty home they are also giving one up so the council lose nothing really as still have a home to provide to someone in need."

"We currently bid if bungalow is in our area. I am waiting to be assessed to move up band. I'm not in a council home, it's our own home and is a 4 bedroom property which if the price

was right we would sell back to council and the home would be ideal for a large family if we were offered a bungalow in Thorne.”

“You just put in Doncaster people anywhere, not the area they were born and brought up and have family because council put anyone from out the area in that area because it’s popular. No you should support people who have families and keep them together.”

“It is extremely difficult for prospective tenants to choose a property with the current system. It needs a radical overhaul for sure, but not for the reasons you are suggesting. Prospective tenants should have far more information about each property on offer on your website and be allowed a viewing without fear of penalties should they decide not to accept. I fear HomeChoice staff are reluctant to do any of this and expect people to accept properties that would result in their unhappiness which, in the case of bungalows, is for the rest of their lives.”

“Consider a higher banding to applicants depending on discretionary housing payments. They’re only temporary and when they stop it leaves people in a terrible position financially.”

“There are young people, some with needs/vulnerabilities that live in HMO and desperate to get on the housing ladder, yet the age limit limits them finding properties. Young and vulnerable people are just as in need as anyone 30+, 40+, 50+ etc. but their options are limited. The age limit (except on bungalows) is ridiculous and should be removed. For instance, a single person over 50 is no less in need than some aged 25?”

“People who are moving from one council house to another in the same village should not be prioritised over somebody who is moving from one village to another with valid reasons for doing so.”

“Yes I think properties advertised in an area should be offered to people who live in the area first and not to people who live in a different area.”

“To give lower bands a chance to get property even though they are not a priority. The waiting list for a house on a lower band is so long unless people are a priority.”

“Offer of emotional support throughout homeless situation, one on one support, help with jobs, debt help till they are rehoused. All families with children with disabilities regardless of nature to be given priority banding from start to finish to cut down on the emotional turmoil of moving areas could have on their children’s emotional health. To prioritise cases with children to stay in their local area to keep their links and cut down on the amount of children being out of school i.e. waiting for a place to come available in a new area etc.”

“Council to understand when someone is complaining and to do something about it.”

“When giving people these properties make sure they get inspections on the garden and house as some are a mess and not cared for when there is people like myself that would love a council property and would make sure it was looked after unlike some tenants.”

“Yes I think all this system is so unfair.”

“I feel that us working people who are on the council list, claiming universal credit as we are struggling to pay private rent and on band bronze should be given a chance to get a house so we can actually be able to afford our bills and not be in debt whilst working.”

“I think you should also help working people who are struggling to rent larger accommodation that they need and not leave them on bronze band.”

“I think people who want to transfer, priority should be higher as you would be getting a house back to let and the tenant would live somewhere more suitable for them and their family.”

“To prioritise empty buildings to get them back in the game, as such, ASAP? Oh, and the new pilot scheme of the repair men calling before they come, and if they don't get an answer the job is cancelled? Absolutely ridiculous idea. I've missed 2 calls because I refuse to take my phone to the toilet.”

“Build more homes. Especially 3/4 beds that are clearly in demand. Have more empathy when dealing with customers who work and are overcrowded. We do not fall into a desperate need but we matter too and to be told to look at other options isn't good enough, we are not in a financial position to do that.”

“I feel as though the rehousing process would be quicker and easier if there were more of a description and up to date photos of the property. I believe this would reduce refusals as people would be able to see what the looks like and would know where it's medically equipped for themselves.”

“When it's a matter of life or death due to medical grounds you should house them.”

“There should be more of an effort to let properties that have little interest on the 'first come, first serve' property scheme you had running a few years ago to enable applicants to apply for the properties to enable them to be housed sooner. It may mean they end up in a property that they normally wouldn't be entitled to (for example a single person in a 3 bedroom flat or a couple in a 2 bedroom house) but as long as their affordability etc. is properly assessed and there are no concerns then surely it is better than having a property empty for an extended period of time.”

“When been on the list after a good few years I think this should qualify to be in a higher band. Lest it takes many years to find something suitable.”

“Yeah plz look at how you categorise people within the bands.”

“I think that if somebody needs a 3 bedroom house should only get a 3 bedroom house with no dining room and I think if you need a 4 bedroom house you should only get given a 3 bedroom house with a separate dining room to be used as a 4 bedroom or a 4 bedroom house.”

“Passing from one department to another, and never told the same thing twice.”

“When a person/family fill out an application there should be a section to say why they are looking to downsize or relocate or move to a new area, the reason for the application. For example, we are looking to move to a bungalow as we are finding stairs difficult but we don't have a mobility issue as such just getting older and one of us has moved job location and find the commute to work harder so would like to get nearer. All this should be taken into account somehow and people that are in a family home that ask to downsize should be given priority.”

“It would help if one could get a medical assessment done in a reasonable time. I have been waiting four (4) months for mine and still no signs of one. When I phone they say there are people waiting longer than me. I have to struggle climbing stairs after an accident who do I blame if I fall.”

“People need to have a link with the area they are bidding for. Been on list 8 years due to wanting to be near family. Make private landlords charge same rent fees as council. Bring back old style waiting list.”

“Doncaster Council do not consider people with mental health conditions, health problems and danger of people in the area about the properties. They don't consider the fact that people can't move out the area that they are in because of their mental health and because of the danger of other people or that they can't stay in the area they are in because of the same reasons.”

“There should be more understanding and support for single applicants with no dependents but have care needs being fulfilled by the local area and cannot leave to take up emergency accommodation due to this. Also having the safety of people in mind rather than just the safety of 'simple' illnesses/disabilities.”

“I think that tenants with children should not be housed in flats that do not have a lift.”

“People who currently live in private housing and wish to move to council housing to make it more affordable to live need more help I think. We are currently really struggling to make ends meet with the rent and are more than likely going to end up behind with the rent as we're not a priority to the council.”

“People who have private rented should still be awarded the band they deserve.”

“People that have been bidding for years should also be given priority and not left in an overcrowded household. Also shouldn't matter whether you have local connections to any area.”

“Think you need a serious reconsideration of what you refer to as 'reasonable offers' and what your viewing staff call 'lettable standard'. The serious letting agencies would consider these statement to be laughable. Some of your properties are clearly not lettable standard.”

“I think we all should only be able to bid on 1 property per week, instead of 3. This way with less bids, when looking at the queue position, it would then be higher up the queue, which I think would be encouraging.”

“I do not agree that because you do not yet have children you can't have a house. Myself and husband to be are more than willing to pay rent on a 2/3 bed house and have been refused.”

“I think that DMBC should keep up with their responsibilities to new and existing tenants already living in properties i.e. don't move known drug dealers or individuals known for antisocial behaviour into properties wrecking communities in the process. Tenants are expected to keep their homes and gardens maintained to a good standard yet DMBC don't seem to practice what they preach, carrying out very poor grounds maintenance, not responding to tenants concerns re issues on their estates. Leaving estates dirty and littered etc. etc. etc... I could go on.”

“No, but this questionnaire is far too long for some people to be bothered actually completing.”

“I think that when people bid on a property their position number should not change.”

“I think you should make it clearer on your website what band can apply for what property. Also, the amount of properties advertised is unreal. There are constantly new developments appearing around Doncaster and all the affordable housing you are offering this week are 2

houses only. 2. For this week and for a bronze band anyway. I can't wrap my head around how it is possible."

"Give more houses. Quicker change band cards."

"Start giving more priority to single mums with families who need to get closer to their family."

"People with mental health issues living in a family home e.g. 3 bed house for 1 person, should be made platinum for 2 bed house or flat as should have right to have a garden as well like any other person or family were necessary."

"Definitely need to stop the tick box system. More council estates should be built in over-subscribed areas, especially where private build estates are being allowed to be built. It really is a slap in the face when councils are knocking down perfectly good buildings (schools for example), only to rebuild the exact same thing costing millions. House shares are disgusting. Renting out 1 x room for £400+ per month. Right to buy needs to stop as the council do not create more housing to balance this out."

"Unfortunately, I have been on council listing for some time, and still trying to bid for properties. People who have been on list shorter and on the same band are being rehomed first which I believe unfair. So first come first basis for people who applied first should have priority over the bidding in their band."

"Make more consideration for medical priority applicants, for example, a full size bath so can use the bath list that has been supplied. Not be stuck in a 1st floor flat and unable to go out without assistance as need a wheelchair to go out, so cannot go out unaided."

"There are many people with health problems who need to move ASAP yet you have next to no understanding of how their health problems affect them."

"Is it possible to change how a home is passed down due to death? My understanding is it can be passed down once so that would mean if it's a family home and the father has died it's passed to their wife/partner but when they die and there is still sons and daughters living there, they would become homeless. This doesn't seem fair if it's always been their home. Also, with the bidding for a home instead of being on a waiting list, doesn't this make it a bit unfair. Someone who's been waiting for a home for a while could be outbid by someone who's only been waiting a short time. I may have this wrong as I'm just repeating what I was told by someone waiting for a home. There seems to be quite a few privately owned empty houses about too, can the council not ask the owners to let the house via the council which may help with a shortage of homes. I don't understand why you would buy a house and then not maintain or let it. It seems such a waste."

"I think they should do interviews with families to make sure priority is needed and more rights given to mental disorders."

"I think people from prison should also be given priority, especially ones with children. Will help."

"I think there should be some rule on area priorities, maybe making bands higher for people in a certain area if they have school or work in that area and if moving from that area would make them lose their job."

"If someone is platinum banding and they bid on a house suitable for them in their area, and are situated and have children in school with the area (certain distance) they should be priority for the house over someone who lives out of area."

“Yes I think you should do more to make the houses liveable. Check for mould, clean the houses properly. And most of all give people mixer taps for the houses and bathrooms. They are safer, they might cost more but they are safer for kids and elderly people who could easily burn with normal taps.”

“Increased availability for shared ownership.”

“Ah reg it’s a guessing game how long you wait when you will be nominated by OT. I strongly believe current system is not fit for purpose should be reviewed ASAP.”

“The old way was better, you went on a waiting list and when you got to the top you was offered the next property available.”

“In my opinion, people such as myself who are in private accommodation should also be given the opportunity to be housed in council property before we are given an eviction notice and made homeless. We should not have to wait until the bailiffs arrive to throw us out to be housed.”

“Do not assume that couples only need 1 bedroom properties.”

“Be more fair just because someone works doesn’t mean they should be put on a waiting list for 10 years.”

“You don’t support disabled people enough.”

“Priority banding given to families who are served with eviction court paperwork prior to eviction. Eviction is inevitable.”

“Is the council addressing the housing needs of the carers with on-going long-term serious mental health, who live with them? Is there provision to adapt their council house to better suit their needs, to sustain that person living at home? More should be done to help carers and deal with their needs. Mental health should be viewed as equal to physical health.”

“End short term rentals. Carpeting, flooring and painting for larger properties is expensive. With a short term let, families spend so much only to have to move on. Maybe provide basic white walls and carpet in the event of a short term rental so the family isn’t thousands of pounds out of pocket just to make a home liveable. I think all homes should be secure but with an incentive to bid once you are under occupied.”

“Housing could be offered to people who have a local connection to the area i.e. family/friends, schools, work or was made homeless in that area over someone with no connections. Stop filling 3 bedroom houses with single mums/dads with one or two children so there is more homes available for larger families. Direct match should be used more often.”

“Relook at temporary accommodation for homeless cases who are placed in accommodation with no cooking facilities are unable to get a meal apart from takeaways. Especially people with children and also people with mental and physical disabilities.”

“Better communication from yourselves when answering customer emails instead of using a generic message reply. Needs to be more personal and answered properly and fully.”

“To consider applicants who have been on the housing register for many years. When you are in bronze band you get nowhere near the top of the list on bidding despite being on the register for years. It used to be a waiting list but now there are people who register, abuse the system by pretending to be potentially homeless and get offered a property straight

away. This is not fair on those people who genuinely have a need but are not classed as a priority. Also to consider that private renting costs are going up steeply and it's becoming unaffordable for most households. My rent is only £200 less than my monthly wage and this is not sustainable."

"Most people that are on the transfer list for the same area are often the troublemakers and are clogging up the system. The mutual exchange register is also not really fit for purpose as most people are expecting to move into a decorated property. Also there are certain individuals who are abusing the allocations policy by offering cash incentives of up to a thousand pounds to move into a transferred property. This is not acceptable."

"Medical priority needs sorting out. We need a smaller place but could do with a bungalow because of my disabled daughters needs and we've had nothing sorted out and we're missing out on being able to bid on bungalows that would be ideal for us. It's been months and nothing has been sorted for us. We're in a 3 bed house and a large garden that is too much for us but we cannot get moved because no one is sorting our medical out."

"I'm thinking of cancelling my application to downsize. After waiting 4 years with my possessions packed up, I bid on a perfect bungalow. Got position one then was told I'd finished 6th position. Found out my medical priorities form had not been added to my application. Sent in another letter from my doctor. Just found out that has not been added to my application/account either and it's been with home choice since beginning May 2022. I've basically wasted years bidding and not taken seriously for a two bed bungalow because my account isn't up to date. Don't even get me started on the rip off bedroom tax. Even when/if I get a two bed bungalow, I'm still expected to pay bedroom tax from the benefit I was awarded to cope with my disability. Disgusting."

"I think St Leger Homes needs to also take into consideration how long people have been actively bidding on properties. I have been bidding on properties since 2015 as we are classed as overcrowded & need an extra bedroom, we want to stay in the area we are currently living as this is where I grew up and my family is here, but not getting anywhere...it's frustrating."

"I have a family of 4 living in a 2 bedroom house and need bigger for my family."

"I have been bidding for a property for over 20 years and I'm never in the top 70 of people. I believe for long term people priority should be given. It is so frustrating that because I work full time and we are private renters, we aren't deemed priority. I have an adopted child who only wish is to live in our home with grass but we can't afford to move as house rent is stupid prices and we aren't classed as a priority to the council. Time to start looking after people better."

"I'm in an increasingly vulnerable situation and find it difficult to contact anyone. I am desperate and mental health is declining rapidly but there's not really an easy way to report this. Maybe for those that are in situations of domestic abuse, a GP or professional involved could have an email to record events and growing concerns to a direct person. Then that person can flag such correspondence on the application."

"I live in a small one bedroom ground floor flat, working full time and paying full rent etc. from my wages. Looking for a suitable slightly larger bungalow to move into. I can see the possible amendment 8 change making it even harder to transfer into a suitable bungalow if one should become available in my chosen area."

“Yes you need to make the process as a whole much easier and my own instance is that things get missed. I for one took nearly a year before I was allowed onto the register of properties and because I’m a single male, I get bumped to the bottom of the pile despite having mental health issues and sight issues and my current living situation becoming slowly and steadily less and less unsuitable.”

“Give people a chance to move up the bands quicker. I have been on bronze for absolutely ages and it currently feels like I’ll never get a house. It’s as if it’s looked at that just because I have a private rented house, I’m not in need of a council house. When in fact as a single mother of two, I struggle to pay for my current rent and I know council houses are that bit cheaper.”

“It would appear that the driving force for these proposed amendments is because the list is longer than what is available. Growing demand means that there is a woeful shortage of housing stock to choose from and the list is ever growing. More housing is needed in the areas desired. Sell those homes that nobody really wants and buy new ones in areas where they do want to live. Buy larger houses and make them multiple occupancy especially for the newly homeless – saving money on temporary accommodation at hotels etc. Build small blocks of flats and bungalows for a varied choice. Transform some of the vacant shop units and pubs into housing in the town centre and sub town centres. Put out a wide and broad call to Doncaster residents – do they have a spare room to rent? In the current climate this could be a real advantage to both the home owner and the homeless. Helping each other, reducing loneliness and assistance with fuel costs etc.”

“People with mental health issues. Because my house is 3 bed with smaller backroom but tiny 1.5x1.5 kitchen so my fridge is in this room and we’ve had several inspection which say we are overcrowded. But because that room which I cannot sleep downstairs or my children due to mental health issues it gets used against me.”

“I have been on the register since 2017 as a bronze, I pay my rent at my property and have never missed it which is sometimes double the amount of council rent. I bid every week without fail and haven’t come close to getting a house, I think the system is flawed and unfair and I hope these changes allow a chance to everyone to a property. I’m a single mum with 2 kids and I am struggling. Not classed as a priority.”

“An opportunity for a primary carer to be able to relocate to the estate where the person they care for lives but to be able to choose on that estate as property becomes available. A home that is at least like for like and feels like a home you could live in and be happy there...not just have to take any that’s available no matter what condition they are in, as it’s important to us to feel right in the property we choose. It has previously been said that 1.7 miles is not too far away to travel but when you have no transport and may need to go more than once a day, this can be draining and consume time.”

“Homeless/sofa surfing to be classed as homeless as I’m myself sofa surfing last 2 years and spent nights in car and on streets to be at least in gold band and be treated equally for a 1 or 2 bed property. More prioritised round areas where there’s biological/immediate family living not just because they want area but have a connection biologically to area or lived there previously in last 10 years for at least 5 years or more.”

“St Leger needs to have better level of tenants. Antisocial people should be kicked out until they learn then house them. Your staff need to learn not to be told by their friends what to do in St Leger properties.”

"I have been homeless for almost 15 years and soon as I ask for help to get accommodation, I am pushed from pillar to post needing all this information and when I have supplied all of my information I gave you too much. All I am asking for is to be treated like a human being and not something people can step over and ignore."

"People who through no fault of their own find themselves having to sell their family home due to separation to be told by the council that they are effectively making themselves homeless as I have just found out. I will now have to sofa surf if I am lucky as I can't afford the extortionate rents that private landlords are asking for living on my own."

"I think you should look at the neighbourhood before you allocate an empty house to a family. Such as if most houses don't have children & pets. Then why put a family in the middle with 3 or 4 children and dogs."

"Younger adults should be thought more of, we just want to build a normal stable life not in a terrible flat or caravan."

"See answer to proposed amendment 8."

"People who have been on the council list for a certain amount of years should be seen partly priority. Especially people on no income or on benefits due to medical reasons or due to children under a certain age."

"To allow people who are working to be able to get housing so they're not forced to private rent and lose a lot of their wages on this. Totally unfair that the only way you get a council property is by being a single mum or being on some sort of benefits."

"You need to take into account some people in general band was forced to take houses in areas they did not want to live due to old letting policies and you treat them unfairly on new letting policy as they have to put up with bad areas that they would not have chosen if given a choice."

"Think of people who are in bronze and will never ever get a house while bidding and cannot afford private renting even if their home/private is in poor condition."

"I am struggling with private rental. It's just gone up another £100. Everything else has gone up. I will be soon homeless and starving."

"The band should be based on all applicants' needs, not just the main applicant. Me and my husband are in bronze band, the children's needs haven't been taken into consideration at all. I've been bidding for years, offered one property that wasn't suitable so I was moved to bronze band. I was in platinum."

"I think there should be more allowance for people living in bad houses i.e. damp. There should be somewhere you can tick to say your house is not liveable and should be made more a priority."

"Help with transfer if conditions have changed on the property."

"I personally think that private sector tenants should be offered a higher banding system. I have been on bronze for the whole time I have always bid on properties and been rejected even though I am overcrowded and struggling with financial problems thanks."

"Seems to cover most eventualities."

"The survey is very long – would it not be better to simplify?"

“Get people in Mexborough scared safe.”

“We need more 2 bedroomed bungalows.”

“People over 60 homeowners who have been on council list over 8 years can’t sell their homes as they can’t get off the bottom band to get a bungalow. Unfair for those with mental health issues, arthritis and other underlying problems.”

“Areas with anti-social behaviour needs improving.”

“You need a policy on how long someone should wait for an OH assessment for an adapted bungalow. I myself have now been waiting for 3 years and keep getting passed around. There needs to be a limit of time waited.”

“The medical assessment team are very slow. I have been waiting since March to be assessed as I am in the bronze category. The phone number given you cannot get through. This definitely needs looking at.”

“There was little or nothing wrong with the process prior to 2018. As the saying goes if it ain’t broke then don’t fix it.”

“To ensure that applicants commit to accept or reject an offer within a defined time so that, if they do not take up the offer, the property can be offered to another applicant immediately.”

“Be more in contact with homeless people in hotels. Make sure that disabled people are put in temp accommodation to meet their needs e.g. food is available, accessible rooms, support from the key worker, not just left. Offer some financial help for vulnerable people to help with cost of living whilst in temp accommodation where no food is available.”

“I don’t understand bidding it doesn’t make sense. You might as well go back to a register as when you bid you’re not actually bidding as in winning a property. All you’re doing is showing an interest then it goes on how long you been on register.”

“Build more safe and suitable senior bungalows. Build suitable accommodation for single young people. Buy the large properties to turn into homes. Help the homeowners to downsize.”

“I think priority should be given to rehouse a tenant or family if they are suffering from harassment or threats of violence where they currently live. Or at least deal with the perpetrators and evict them. Also, if tenants are not looking after their homes and gardens they should be made to do so.

“Prioritise people who have lived in the area for more than 2 yrs.”

“Should really go back to the old method of being on a list with no silly band once you got to the top of the list you be rehoused etc. Kick people out that let their kids run feral and parents don’t do owt, just a thought.”

“Is there a stipulation for clients awaiting housing to regularly provide an update of their housing needs, and/or whether their circumstances have changed and may be willing to ‘uptake’ some other available suitable accommodation? What is the regularity timescale?”

“Should do something or prioritise for those stuck in small 1 bed flats with children with no storage space to put anything. It’s not always about the homeless and everything else. I’ve had health visitors write me a letter, I’ve even had social trying to help to see if she can get us out of here and nope no one can do anything. Just like I’ve been bidding for over a year

or 2 now and in all that time never once received a phone call on anything I've bid on, it's beyond a joke."

"Should go back to how you used to do housing. Add you to a list, move up that list, and get the chance to see two properties. If you refuse both then you move to the bottom of the list."

"People who have the last groups, a very long wait for houses, sometimes for 3 years. Maybe it is also worth paying attention to these people, they are also in need, sometimes they are far from work, or they do not have a car and this makes it difficult to get to work."

"Updates yearly as circumstances change."

"A house that is let should be moved into within a week of the let agreed."

"I think sometimes people's circumstances don't always fall into set criteria and may need some discretionary allowance. Also, far too many people playing the system. I suggest that staff from st leger homes join the Facebook groups for mutual exchange and see the comments. You all do a great job!"

"I believe that as a person with difficulty walking and have mobility problems, I should not be restricted on bungalows due to my age. I have the same difficulties as people at 50-60 though because I'm young I struggle to get a place. Why not amend that policy."

"I think special needs of families for more bedrooms need to be looked into more on a case by case basis and the allocation of things like garages and storage spaces also whether people are running businesses from council property need to be looked into more."

"Doncaster needs many more bungalows to free up family homes."

"Yes, people who wish to move in order to build a life due to divorce etc. should be part of it. It's not always right for someone to remain where they are. It causes stress, depression and this is not considered in the applications."

"I believe as a whole we should be aiming to re let properties ASAP and to encourage those with large family houses and not utilising the floor to move to smaller accommodation. I would like to see more 4 bed houses become available and the waiting times for council tenants to be drastically reduced. I believe we have now been waiting for near on six years and I am assuming people have been waiting longer. A better vetting service would also be cost effective i.e. putting tenants in properties that can afford them and will look after them."

"To give younger people like myself a chance on the council list as I have been asked to leave a while back by family and I still haven't had any opportunities from the council and it is coming to a point of me being homeless and I am a working person in the health care sector."

"I want to have my own house."

"Your communication with prospective tenants is very poor, the need to give notice that a bid was not successful, is equally important."

"Priority for disable – different bands for children. Single parent/guardian priority."

"I personally feel not enough investigation is carried out on applicants for housing. To make absolutely sure there is a genuine case to be housed or re-housed in especially marriage splits. Or house owners wanting bungalows when they put their owned property in their children's names etc."

“I feel that clarity is required on adaptations. There appears to be a lack of adapted homes available. Unless someone owns their own home they’re stuck. The likelihood of a private rental being available with adaptations seems slim to none and the general impression given is that no new houses are being or will be adapted. In fact it’s not uncommon for people on the adaptations list to be told that they are basically waiting for someone to die or go into care to get a property. This seems like an unsustainable system. People who make poor choices that result in them requesting housing should generally be considered a much lower priority e.g. not paying the rent resulting in eviction. Doncaster council really does need to invest in building specific local authority owned homes. The ‘affordable’ housing included in current developments really is just a fallacy. This housing isn’t affordable to most people.”

“The length of time a person has been waiting for a larger property should be considered as well as the banding, people in silver with desperate need for a 4 bed property are waiting for over 4 years which is just disgusting. People with 2 or less children should not be a priority on 3 bed parlour houses either. The whole bidding system is a waste of time. Bring back waiting lists. I would have been rehoused 3 times over by now under that system. Instead over 13 years of bidding, 10 of those as overcrowded and not been offered a single property, absolutely disgraceful.”

- 6 responses redacted due to offensive language
- 44 response redacted for including identifiable/personal information