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Executive Summary

Introduction and background to the proposals and consultation

1. The council conducted consultation about proposals to licence most privately rented properties in Waltham Forest to effectively regulate their condition, management and occupation and to help tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) associated with private rented properties.

2. The council proposed to introduce two private rented property licensing schemes:
   - A selective licensing scheme across all wards in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury where the proportion of private sector housing is below the national average and therefore they do not meet the criteria for inclusion as set out in current Government guidance) from 1 April 2020 after its current scheme comes to an end on 31 March 2020: Under this scheme, most privately rented homes that are rented to single family households or to no more than two unrelated people would require a Selective Licence.
   - A borough-wide ‘additional licensing’ scheme: The Additional Licensing scheme would cover ALL eligible Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) that are not within the scope of Mandatory HMO Licensing where tenants share some basic facilities or amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This is proposed to apply across all of Waltham Forest and will ensure that all HMOs are licensed.


4. This report summarises the key results from all the consultation activity. The council commissioned Public Perspectives Ltd, an independent research and consultation organisation specialising in working with Local Authorities, to help design and deliver the consultation and produce an independent report on the consultation results.

Consultation Methods and response

5. The consultation has been designed in consideration of the practical and legal requirements as detailed in Section 80 (9) of the Housing Act 2004 and as per guidance provided by ‘Selective licensing in the private rented sector: A Guide for local authorities, 2015, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government’. The consultation used the following methods:
   - Open access consultation questionnaire: A total of 1,024 responses were received, including from 600 landlords and 22 letting/managing agents, 126 private rented tenants, 290 other residents, as well as local businesses and organisations responded.

---
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to the consultation questionnaire\(^2\). The consultation was hosted on the council’s website.

- **Face-to-face survey of residents, including tenants:** A demographically representative face-to-face survey of 1,395 residents, including private rented tenants living in Waltham Forest was conducted during the consultation to increase the reach of the consultation and ensure this group of people was adequately represented. This included a ‘booster’ sample of 395 private rented tenants to ensure that a reliable picture of the views of this group were captured (overall 723 respondents to the face-to-face survey were private rented tenants). The survey replicated the questions used in the consultation questionnaire.

- **Landlord forum events:** Two 90-minute events were held with landlords on the 6\(^{th}\) February 2019, involving 70 landlords, agents and landlord representative bodies. These events began with a presentation from the council about the proposals, followed by Q&A and facilitated discussion.

- **Landlord discussion events:** Two further events using a similar format were held on Tuesday 19\(^{th}\) March at 2pm-4pm and again at 6pm-8pm. In total, 141 landlords, agents and landlord representative bodies attended (most of whom were different to those that attended the event on the 6\(^{th}\) February).

- **Resident/tenant discussion events:** Two events with residents and tenants were advertised and promoted to take place on Tuesday 26\(^{th}\) March and Thursday 28\(^{th}\) March, 6pm-8pm. 8 participants attended, all of whom were both residents and also landlords.

- **Stakeholders:** Over 500 stakeholders including local councillors and MPs, neighbouring and nearby London boroughs (including Enfield, Hackney, Haringay, Newham and Tower Hamlets), public sector and community/voluntary organisations, social housing providers, local letting agents, and tenant and landlord representative bodies were directly contacted and invited to respond to the consultation. This included an initial e-mail or letter, and follow-up letters/e-mails/calls to key stakeholders to remind them to participate. In total, 21 such stakeholders responded, including the Greater London Authority, London Fire Brigade, the local London Assembly member, neighbouring or nearby London Boroughs of Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Newham and Tower Hamlets, and landlord representative bodies.

6. The consultation was promoted extensively through the council’s communications channels and local and regional media to interested parties, both within Waltham Forest and neighbouring boroughs.

---

\(^2\) These figures add up to over 1,024 because respondents could select multiple categories, for example they could be both a landlord and a local resident.
Key findings

Summary
Most tenants and residents support the Private Rented Property Licensing proposals.

Most tenants and residents state there would be a negative impact if the current scheme was stopped and a new scheme not re-introduced.

Most landlords/agents do not support the proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing, although most do support the proposal to introduce an Additional Licensing scheme for houses in multiple occupation.

If the schemes are introduced, most tenants, residents and landlords/agents support the proposed approach to fees and discounts and state that the proposed licence conditions are clear and understandable, albeit with a number of suggestions to modify the proposed fee structure and licence conditions.

Proposed licencing schemes
7. Overall, 47% of respondents agree with the council’s proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards) to regulate privately rented property conditions and management and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 31% disagree. 54% of tenants/residents agree and 19% disagree. This compares with 28% of landlords/agents that agree and 61% that disagree with the proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing.
Figure 1: Agree or disagree with proposed Selective Licensing scheme

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you agree or disagree with the council’s proposal to introduce Selective Licensing in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards) to regulate privately rented property conditions and management and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

8. Overall, 57% of respondents agree with the council’s proposal to introduce Additional Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in all of Waltham Forest to regulate property conditions and management in HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 23% disagree. 59% of tenants/residents agree and 18% disagree. This compares with 51% of landlords/agents that agree and 38% that disagree with the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing.
9. Stakeholders including the Greater London Authority, London Assembly, London Fire Brigade and neighbouring and other London boroughs including Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Newham and Tower Hamlets support both the Selective and Additional Licensing proposals. Landlord representative bodies either suggested changes to the proposals or opposed them, while some local housing charities requested exemption from the schemes.

Impact of the current licence scheme
10. 93% of landlords/agents that responded to the consultation questionnaire said they were previously aware of the current scheme. This compares with 39% of tenants and residents that were aware. Overall, 32% of respondents said that property conditions in privately rented housing have got better since the current scheme has been in place, 59% said it has stayed the same and 9% said it has got worse. 35% of tenants and residents said that property conditions have got better, compared with 21% of landlords/agents.

11. Overall, 28% of respondents said that anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties has got better since the current scheme has been in place, 58% said it has stayed the same and 15% said it has got worse. 31% of tenants and residents said that anti-social behaviour has got better, compared with 13% of landlords/agents.

12. Overall, 51% of respondents said there would be a negative impact on the condition and management of privately rented properties in Waltham Forest, if the current scheme
stopped, and 11% said there would be a positive impact. 68% of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact, compared with 24% of landlords/agents.

13. Overall, 51% of respondents said there would be a negative impact on anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties in Waltham Forest, if the current scheme stopped, and 10% said there would be a positive impact. 64% of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact, compared with 19% of landlords/agents.

**Private rented property conditions, management and anti-social behaviour**

14. Tenants/residents are more likely than landlords/agents to cite problems with private rented property conditions and management, the condition and management of houses in multiple occupation and especially anti-social behaviour such as messy front gardens, fly-tipping and littering. For example, on average, across all potential problem issues, 43% of respondents overall said there are problems, including 45% of tenants/residents and 34% of landlords/agents.

**Fees and discounts**

15. Most tenants/residents and landlords/agents agree with the proposed approach to licence fees and discounts. Overall, 75% agree that landlords should receive an early bird discount and 7% disagree. 71% of tenants/residents agree and 7% disagree. This compares to 86% of landlords/agents that agree and 8% that disagree.

16. Overall, 66% agree that landlords should receive an energy rating related discount and 12% disagree. 68% of tenants/residents agree and 8% disagree. This compares to 63% of landlords/agents that agree and 20% that disagree.

17. Overall, 58% agree that landlords should receive a discount where they let multiple flats within the same block and 19% disagree. 61% of tenants/residents agree and 14% disagree. This compares to 52% of landlords/agents that agree and 27% that disagree. Some tenants, residents and landlords said that this discount should not be applied as it would only benefit portfolio/larger landlords.

18. Consultation respondents and stakeholders suggested several other discounts and fee structures, such as providing a discount to new landlords throughout the life of the scheme, discounts to landlords that have previously held a licence with no issues, allowing licences to be extended into new schemes if under five years old and higher fees to bad landlords. Tenants and residents were keen that landlords do not pass fees on to tenants.

19. Consultation respondents, especially those at the landlord events, asked for transparency and regular reporting about how licence fees are calculated, how the revenue generated is spent and the impact of licensing activity.

**Licence conditions**

20. Most respondents said the licence conditions are clear and understandable, although there is room for further clarity and refinement as outlined in the main report. Overall, 81% of respondents said the Selective Licence conditions are clear and understandable. 87% of tenants/residents said they are clear and understandable (although this figure excludes high numbers of don’t know responses), compared with 68% of landlords/agents.

21. Overall, 83% of respondents said the Additional Licence conditions are clear and understandable. 89% of tenants/residents said they are clear and understandable (although
this figure excludes high numbers of don’t know responses), compared with 68% of landlords/agents.

**Access to tenant and landlord services**

22. Most respondents support proposals to offer licence holders discounts to council services and/or provide access to support services. Overall, 67% of respondents agree with the proposal to offer licence holders discounts to council services and/or to provide access to support services that could benefit landlords or tenants. 66% of tenants/residents agree and 67% of landlords/agents agree.

23. The services and support suggested include information, advice and guidance for both landlords and tenants, as well as access to specific services such as pest control, bulky waste collections and maintenance and repair services.
Main report

Section 1: Introduction

Introduction and background to the proposals and consultation

1.1. The council conducted consultation about proposals to licence most privately rented properties in Waltham Forest to effectively regulate their condition, management and occupation and to help tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) associated with private rented properties.

1.2. Under a property licensing scheme, licensable addresses must hold a property licence to be legally let to private tenants. Under Government legislation, many Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) that do not fall within an exempted category are required to hold a property licence. This ‘Mandatory HMO Licensing’ applies to houses that accommodate 5 or more tenants forming 2 or more households. In addition, all converted flats and some purpose-built flats that are occupied by 5 or more tenants forming 2 or more households also require a Mandatory HMO Licence. Local authorities can also require that other privately rented properties are licensed by designating ‘Selective Licensing’ and/or ‘Additional Licensing’ schemes that cover all or part of their area. Like Mandatory Licensing, above, under Part 2 of the Housing Act 2004, Additional Licensing applies only to certain HMOs. Selective Licensing, under Part 3, applies to other residential accommodation, which are rented to single family households. Waltham Forest already has a Selective Licence scheme in place. This borough-wide scheme began on 1 April 2015 and is due to expire on 31 March 2020.

1.3. The council proposed to introduce two private rented property licensing schemes:

- **A selective licensing scheme** across all wards in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury where the proportion of private sector housing is below the national average and therefore they do not meet the criteria for inclusion as set out in current Government guidance) from 1 April 2020 after its current scheme comes to an end on 31 March 2020: Under this scheme, most privately rented homes that are rented to single family households or to no more than two unrelated people would require a Selective Licence.

- **A borough-wide ‘additional licensing’ scheme**: The Additional Licensing scheme would cover ALL eligible HMOs that are not within the scope of Mandatory HMO Licensing where tenants share some basic facilities or amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This is proposed to apply across all of Waltham Forest and will ensure that all eligible HMOs are licensed.

1.4. The consultation opened on the 4th February 2019 and closed on the 29th April 2019 – a 12-week period.

1.5. This report summarises the key results from all the consultation activity. The council commissioned Public Perspectives Ltd, an independent research and consultation organisation specialising in working with Local Authorities, to help design and deliver the consultation and produce an independent report on the consultation results. This report,

---
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along with other evidence about the impact of the proposals, will be considered by Waltham Forest Council’s Cabinet (which is the council’s decision-making committee in respect of these proposals) in July 2019. The report and documentation will be published on the council’s website ahead of the meeting. The decision taken will also be published and available on the council’s website. Depending on the council’s decision, an application will be made to the Secretary of State for permission to implement a private sector property Selective Licensing scheme once the existing scheme finishes in March 2020. The borough-wide Additional Licensing scheme for HMOs will be implemented in line with the timetable that will be set out in the report to Cabinet, if a decision to adopt such a scheme is made.

Consultation Methods and response

1.6. The consultation has been designed in consideration of the practical and legal requirements as detailed in Section 80 (9) of the Housing Act 2004 and as per guidance provided by ‘Selective licensing in the private rented sector: A Guide for local authorities, 2015, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government’. The consultation used the following methods:

- **Open access consultation questionnaire:** A total of 1,024 responses were received, including from 600 landlords and 22 letting/managing agents (45% live within the borough and 97% let properties in the borough), 126 private rented tenants, 290 other residents, as well as local businesses and organisations responded to the consultation questionnaire. The consultation was hosted on the council’s website (the page hosting the consultation received over 5,200 unique views throughout the consultation). The consultation questionnaire is included at Appendix 2.

- **Face-to-face survey of residents including tenants:** A demographically representative face-to-face survey of 1,395 residents, including private rented tenants living in Waltham Forest was conducted during the consultation to increase the reach of the consultation and ensure this group of people was adequately represented. This included a ‘booster’ sample of 395 private rented tenants to ensure that a reliable picture of the views of this group were captured (overall 723 respondents to the face-to-face survey were private rented tenants). The survey replicated the questions used in the consultation questionnaire. The demographic profile of respondents to both the online consultation questionnaire and face-to-face survey are included at Appendix 1.

- **Landlord forum events:** Two 90-minute events were held with landlords on the 6th February 2019 at 6pm and 7.30pm involving 70 landlords, agents and landlord representative bodies. These events began with a presentation from the council about the proposals, followed by Q&A and facilitated discussion.

- **Landlord discussion events:** Two further events using a similar format were held on Tuesday 19th March at 2pm-4pm and again at 6pm-8pm. In total, 141 landlords, agents and landlord representative bodies attended (most of whom were different to those that attended the event on the 6th February).

- **Resident/tenant discussion events:** Two events with residents and tenants were advertised and promoted to take place on Tuesday 26th March and Thursday 28th March, 6pm-8pm. 8 participants attended, all of whom were both residents and also landlords.

---

4. These figures add up to over 1,024 because respondents could select multiple categories, for example they could be both a landlord and a local resident.

5. Demographic quotas were set by gender, age, ethnicity, geography and housing tenure to ensure the survey was representative. The survey took place during March 2019 i.e. during the middle of the consultation.

6. This survey helped increase the reach of the consultation. For example, at the time of being interviewed, 68% of respondents were not aware of the consultation and only 2% had taken part.
• **Stakeholders:** Over 500 stakeholders including local councillors and MPs, neighbouring and nearby London boroughs, public sector and community/voluntary organisations, social housing providers, local letting agents, and tenant and landlord representative bodies were directly contacted and invited to respond to the consultation. This included an initial e-mail or letter, and follow-up letters/e-mails/calls to key stakeholders to remind them to participate. In total, 21 such stakeholders responded, including the Greater London Authority, London Fire Brigade, the local London Assembly member, neighbouring and nearby London Boroughs of Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Newham and Tower Hamlets and landlord representative bodies.

• A dedicated phone and e-mail address were available to residents and organisations to ask questions about the proposals and consultation or receive help to respond to the consultation. Four e-mails and three phone calls were received, and their points are included within this report where relevant.

1.7. The consultation was promoted through the council’s communications channels and local and regional media:

**Targeted at residents, tenants, stakeholders and businesses/organisations within Waltham Forest**

• Articles in Waltham Forest News on the 4th February, 18th February, 4th March and 8th April 2019.
• Multiple e-mails to 11,343 landlords on the council’s database that opted in to receive regular communications, plus an individual additional e-mail to 2,565 landlords that had not opted in.
• E-mails to over 7,091 residents on the council’s database.
• 16 twitter posts, receiving a total of 481 clicks, 43 re-tweets/shares, 31 likes and 6 comments.
• Next door social media platform promotion at a local level, which went live on the 21st March 2019.
• Posters for libraries/children centres/community centres distributed on the 19th March 2019.
• Leaflet inserted in Council Tax and Business rates and distributed in March 2019 to households and businesses.
• A5 leaflet within primary school book bags in Walthamstow area before Easter school holidays 2019 (i.e. end of March/start of April 2019).
• A5 leaflet to all children centres available at the end of March 2019.
• Outreach session held at Walthamstow children’s centre on the 4th April 2019.
• Information in ForestHub news section throughout consultation.
• Automated contact centre message set-up in March 2019.

**Targeted at stakeholders, businesses/organisations and interested parties in neighbouring boroughs and beyond**

• Adverts in publications in neighbouring boroughs - Hackney Today (25th February), Redbridge Life (4th March), Newham Mag (15th March), Our Enfield (1st April), Haringey People (6th April).
• Press releases to local, regional, national and industry media outlets on the 27th February 2019 and the 28th March 2019.
• London Property Licensing website and social media promotional package, which went live at the end of March 2019.
• East London and West Essex Guardian Series advert and online banner run on 13th, 14th, 20th, 21st, 27th and 28th March and 3rd, 4th, 10th, 11th, 17th, 18th, 24th and 25th April.
• Archant Group advert and online banner run (targeting neighbouring and other London boroughs) on 13th, 14th, 20th, 21st, 27th and 28th March and 3rd, 4th, 10th, 11th, 17th and 18th April.
• Rightmove banner on searches for lettings/sales in Waltham Forest from 19th March 2019.

Reporting

1.8. The rest of this report presents the results of the consultation. It follows the structure of the consultation questionnaire:

• Section 2: Awareness, impact and importance of the current Selective Licensing scheme
• Section 3: Private rented property conditions, management and anti-social behaviour
• Section 4: Proposed new licensing schemes
• Section 5: Proposed fees, charges and discounts
• Section 6: Licence conditions
• Section 7: Access to landlord and tenant services

1.9. The report presents the results of the consultation questionnaire and face-to-face survey overall and by different types of respondents and demographics, especially landlords/agents and tenants/residents.

1.10. ‘Don’t know’ responses have been removed for most questions, to present the results of respondents that felt able to provide an opinion.

1.11. The open-ended comments have been reviewed and summarised.

1.12. The responses from key stakeholders have been reviewed and summarised.  

1.13. Key findings from the landlord and resident/tenant events, and other aspects of the consultation, are integrated alongside the consultation questionnaire and survey findings.

7 Full copies of stakeholder responses are available on request.
Section 2: Awareness, impact and importance of the current Private Rented Property Licensing scheme

Awareness of current Private Rented Property Licensing scheme

Most landlords are aware of the current scheme, while most tenants and residents are not.

2.1. Overall, 54% of respondents are aware of the current Private Rented Property Licensing scheme.

2.2. 93% of landlords/agents that responded to the consultation questionnaire said they were previously aware of the current scheme. This compares with 39% of tenants and residents that were aware. Private rented tenants in Waltham Forest are less aware (31% aware) than other residents in Waltham Forest (48%).

Figure 2.1: Awareness of current Selective Licensing scheme

![Graph showing awareness of current Selective Licensing scheme](image)

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Tenants/Residents are those that live in Waltham Forest and are not landlords/agents. This is the case for this group for all graphs unless otherwise stated. Figures may not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

Question asked: Were you aware of the borough’s privately rented property Selective Licensing scheme before you took part in this consultation?
**Change over time**

Tenants and residents are more likely to say that property conditions got better than worse over the past three years

2.3. Overall, 32% of respondents said that property conditions in privately rented housing have got better since the introduction of the current scheme, 59% said it has stayed the same and 9% said it has got worse over the past three years (since the introduction of the current licensing scheme).

2.4. 35% of tenants and residents said that property conditions have got better, compared with 21% of landlords/agents.

2.5. Respondents that are aware of the scheme are more likely to say that conditions have got better than other respondents. For example, 39% of respondents that are aware of the scheme said that property conditions have got better, compared with 20% that were not aware of the scheme.

**Figure 2.2: Change over time – property conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Got worse</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Got better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (1651)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants/Residents (1243)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlords/agents (358)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you think property conditions in privately rented housing have got better, stayed the same or got worse in Waltham Forest over the past 3 years?
Tenants and residents are more likely to say that anti-social behaviour got better than worse over the past three years

2.6. Overall, 28% of respondents said that anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties has got better, 58% said it has stayed the same and 15% said it has got worse over the past three years (since the introduction of the current licensing scheme).

2.7. 31% of tenants and residents said that anti-social behaviour has got better, compared with 13% of landlords/agents.

2.8. Respondents that are aware of the scheme are more likely to say that conditions have got better than other respondents. For example, 31% of respondents that are aware of the scheme said that property conditions have got better, compared with 21% that were not aware of the scheme.

Figure 2.3: Change over time – anti-social behaviour

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’. Question asked: Do you think anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties has got better, stayed the same or got worse in Waltham Forest over the past 3 years?
Impact if current licensing scheme stopped

Over two-thirds of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact on the condition and management of privately rented properties if the current scheme stopped and was not continued

2.9. Overall, 55% of respondents said there would be a negative impact on the condition and management of privately rented properties in Waltham Forest, if the current scheme stopped and was not continued, and 11% said there would be a positive impact.

2.10. 68% of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact, compared with 24% of landlords/agents.

Figure 2.4: Impact on property conditions, if current licensing scheme stopped

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: If the current licensing scheme stopped and was NOT continued, what impact do you think this would have on the condition and management of privately rented properties in Waltham Forest?
Nearly two-thirds of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact on anti-social behaviour if the current scheme stopped and was not continued

2.11. Overall, 51% of respondents said there would be a negative impact on anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties in Waltham Forest, if the current scheme stopped and was not continued, and 10% said there would be a positive impact.

2.12. 64% of tenants and residents said there would be a negative impact, compared with 19% of landlords/agents.

Figure 2.5: Impact on anti-social behaviour, if scheme stopped

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: And if the current licensing scheme stopped and was NOT continued, what impact do you think this would have on anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties in Waltham Forest?
Section 3: Private rented property conditions, management and anti-social behaviour

Perceptions of property conditions and management

Tenants/residents are more likely than landlords/agents to cite problems with private rented property conditions and management, with a notable minority citing such problems

3.1. Consultation respondents said the following about private rented property conditions and management:

- **Poor conditions in private rented properties**: Overall, 39% said poor conditions in private rented properties are a problem, while 46% said they are a fairly small problem or not a problem at all. 42% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 44% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 25% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 53% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Badly managed private rented properties**: Overall, 38% said badly managed private rented properties are a problem, while 46% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 40% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 45% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 25% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 53% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Unsafe private rented properties**: Overall, 35% said unsafe private rented properties are a problem, while 48% said they are not a problem. 38% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 47% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 23% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 60% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem.

- **Planning issues**: Overall, 38% said planning issues are a problem, while 43% said they are not a problem. 40% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 42% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 29% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 49% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Overcrowded properties**: Overall, 47% said overcrowded private rented properties are a problem, while 36% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 49% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 36% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 40% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 42% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.
Figure 3.1: Perceptions of property conditions and management

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: How much of a problem do you think each of the following are in Waltham Forest?
Perceptions of anti-social behaviour associated with private rented properties
Tenants/residents are more likely than landlords/agents to say that anti-social behaviour, messy front gardens, fly-tipping and littering are problems, with in most cases over half citing these as problems

3.2. Consultation respondents said the following about anti-social behaviour associated with private rented properties:

- **Anti-social behaviour:** Overall, 37% said anti-social behaviour associated with private rented properties is a problem, while 42% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 42% of tenants/residents said it is a problem and 40% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 21% of landlords/agents that said it is a problem and 54% that said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Messy front gardens:** Overall, 46% said messy front gardens are a problem, while 35% said they are not a problem. 50% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 32% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 32% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 44% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Fly-tipping:** Overall, 53% said fly-tipping is a problem, while 26% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 54% of tenants/residents said it is a problem and 25% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 46% of landlords/agents that said it is a problem and 33% that said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Littering:** Overall, 53% said littering is a problem, while 28% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 54% of tenants/residents said it is a problem and 27% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 50% of landlords/agents that said it is a problem and 32% that said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

![Figure 3.2: Perceptions of anti-social behaviour](image)

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’. Question asked: How much of a problem do you think each of the following are in Waltham Forest?
Perceptions of houses in multiple occupation

Tenants/residents are more likely than landlords/agents to say that the condition and management of houses in multiple occupation [HMOs] are a problem, with a notable minority citing such problems

3.3. Consultation respondents said the following about houses in multiple occupation (HMOs):

- **Safety hazards in HMOs**: Overall, 42% said safety hazards in HMOs are a problem, while 39% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 42% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 38% said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 37% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 46% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Poor condition of HMOs**: Overall, 42% said the poor condition of HMOs is a problem, while 42% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 41% of tenants/residents said it is a problem and 43% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. This compares to 40% of landlords/agents that said it is a problem and 43% that said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

- **Poorly managed HMOs**: Overall, 44% said poorly managed HMOs are a problem, while 40% said it is a fairly small problem/not a problem at all. 43% of tenants/residents said they are a problem and 40% said they are not a problem. This compares to 40% of landlords/agents that said they are a problem and 43% that said they are a fairly small problem/not a problem at all.

Figure 3.3: Perceptions of houses in multiple occupation

![Chart showing perceptions of houses in multiple occupation](chart)

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: How much of a problem do you think each of the following are in Waltham Forest?
Section 4: The proposed new schemes

Selective Licensing
Most tenants/residents agree with the proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing and they are more likely to agree than landlord/agents

4.1. Overall, 47% of respondents agree with the council’s proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards) to regulate privately rented property conditions and management and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 31% disagree.

4.2. 54% of tenants/residents agree and 19% disagree. This compares with 28% of landlords/agents that agree and 61% that disagree with the proposal to re-introduce Selective Licensing.

Figure 4.1: Agree or disagree with proposed Selective Licensing scheme

Stakeholder views

4.3. Stakeholders made the following comments/responses:

- The Greater London Authority supports the proposal to continue to regulate property conditions through use of licensing.
- Jennette Arnold, London Assembly Member for Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest, strongly agrees with the proposal, although she argues that the scheme should be introduced to all of the borough: “I strongly believe that Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards should be included in the Selective Licensing Scheme also. I do, however,
understand that they may not meet the criteria set out in legislation. However, out of fairness and a desire not to leave tenants in those two wards as second-class renters, Waltham Forest should push the Government to allow these two wards to be included.”

- Enfield Council supports the introduction of the proposed Selective Licensing scheme, which they believe will continue to improve the conditions of private rented properties by resolving issues such as poor property conditions, poor property management and anti-social behaviour.

- Hackney Council supports the introduction of the proposed Selective Licensing scheme, which is consistent with the recent introduction of a similar scheme in three wards in Hackney. It believes Waltham Forest’s proposed scheme will have a positive impact on neighbouring boroughs and is supportive of neighbouring boroughs introducing property licensing schemes so that bad landlords are less able to move to unlicensed neighbouring boroughs.

- Haringey Council strongly agrees with the proposal to reintroduce a Selective Licensing scheme, covering the proposed 18 wards.

- Newham Council supports the proposal to reintroduce a Selective Licensing scheme to continue running an “effective and properly-enforced property licencing scheme which is helping to improve property standards in the borough and tackle anti-social behaviour sometimes associated with the private rented sector” and to deal with persistent problems.

- Tower Hamlets Council fully supports the proposals to introduce Selective Licensing across all wards in Waltham Forest except Hatch Lane and Endlebury from 1 April 2020. It states that it is beginning to see the benefits of its own Selective Licensing scheme two and a half years after its introduction and it appreciates that it can take time to address the years of systemic under-regulation of the private rented sector. It states that it believes that the work done so far through the current scheme would be in danger of being reversed if Waltham Forest Council is unable to continue the scheme.

- Waltham Forest Housing Association strongly agrees with the proposal to introduce Selective Licensing in 18 of the 20 wards in the borough.

- The London Fire Brigade supports the proposal.

- The Housing and Community Association have asked to be exempted from the proposed scheme due to its charitable status.

- The Walthamstow and Chingford Almshouse Association asked the council to exempt them from the scheme, or at the very least drastically reduce the level of fees that Almshouse charities incur as a consequence of the proposed Selective Licensing scheme. As they said: “By charging fees to Almshouse charities, funds are not only diverted away from their charitable purpose – providing and maintaining housing for people in need, but actively conflict with the council’s housing strategy, which is to; a. Build more homes b. Make the most of the homes we have c. Create successful communities. The legislation allows the council the discretion to decide who to charge fees to, and we urge Waltham Forest to follow the example of Croydon Borough Council, Hastings Borough Council and Peterborough City Council in exempting or hugely reducing fees charged to Almshouse charities.”

- The Residential Landlords Association (RLA) is opposed to the schemes (both Selective and Additional Licensing schemes) because they believe that:
  - The schemes will not raise standards.
  - Sufficient powers are already in place to deal with poor conditions and anti-social behaviour.
  - The schemes will place pressure on non-licensed areas.
− They prefer a system of self-regulation or, if a scheme is to be introduced, that the option of co-regulation with the RLA could be considered.

• The National Approved Letting Scheme (NALS) states that the Selective Licensing scheme should be targeted at a smaller geographical area, focusing on the wards where there are the worst property conditions.

• The National Landlord’s Association (NLA) stated the following concerns about the proposals (related to both Selective and Additional Licensing):
  − Landlords have very limited authority when dealing with matters related to antisocial behaviour, especially if it happens outside the curtilage of the property.
  − The council has failed to provide evidence of a direct link between recorded housing crime and the private rented sector.
  − The scheme has not explained what additional resources will be provided by the council – research has shown the successful schemes have a joint council approach. There is no evidence this is being done here.
  − The council has failed to say how it will prevent malicious claims of antisocial behaviour being made, which could result in tenants losing their tenancies. Can this be provided?
  − What is the reporting metrics this needs to be published before, so the scheme can be judged success or failure? We would like sight of the measuring process and how it was decided.
  − The document says that Waltham Forest Council will use all its legal powers. However, if it were to use the powers it already has, this would solve the issues and it would not then require the renewal of selective licensing on such a wide scale.
  − The council has not published its strategy for dealing with chaotic and antisocial tenants. This should run in conjunction with the current proposal.
  − The council has failed to say how the proposal will tackle rent-to-rent and subletting, or even Airbnb.

• The UK Apartment Association (UKAA) believe there should be exemptions from Selective Licensing i.e. Purpose-Built Student Accommodation and Build to Rent developments due to the fact that they are owned by professional landlords who appoint accredited operators to manage their buildings. Precedent has been made in this regard by Newham Council, with the exemption of the E20 district, the historic ‘athletes’ village.

**Landlord/agent views**

4.4. Landlords/agents made the following points, mainly against the proposals, at the landlord/agent events (these points relate to both Selective Licensing and Additional Licensing proposals unless specified):

• The proposed licensing schemes place a financial and administrative burden on landlords, making it less feasible to let properties in the borough.

• The schemes are an additional ‘tax’ on good landlords and a money raising activity by the council.

• The scheme has not delivered a positive impact since its introduction in 2015, as shown by a small number of enforcement actions.

• Bad landlords will fail to sign-up voluntarily and will continue to fall under the radar, unless inspection and enforcement activity increases and is more effective than in the past years since the current scheme has been in place.

• The link between licensing and anti-social behaviour is tenuous and not proven.
• Similarly, the proposals do not deal with the causes of anti-social behaviour.

**The scope of the proposed selective licensing scheme**

4.5. Overall, 28% of respondents said it is appropriate to include 18 of the 20 wards in Waltham Forest in a Selective Licensing scheme, while 2% said less wards should be included and 8% said more wards should be included (these respondents come from across all parts of Waltham Forest, not just in the wards that are not proposed for inclusion in the scheme).

4.6. Most of those that agree with the introduction of a Selective Licensing scheme, agree with the proposal to include 18 of the 20 wards - 67% of those that agree with the proposal said it is appropriate to include 18 of the 20 wards, 1% said less wards and 17% of those that agree with the proposal said it should include more wards.

4.7. 7% of tenants/residents said more wards should be included. 11% of landlords/agents said more wards should be included, and 5% said less wards should be included.

**Figure 4.2: Geographical coverage of Selective Licensing scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (2415)</th>
<th>Tenants/Residents (1761)</th>
<th>Landlords/agents (616)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it is appropriate to cover the 18 wards and not include Hatch Lane or Endlebury wards</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, less wards should be included</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, more wards should be included</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that there should be a Selective Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents.
Question asked: Do you think the proposal to include 18 of the 20 Wards in the borough is appropriate?

4.8. 101 respondents that said more or less wards should be included, provided comments. The main comments were:

• All of those that said more wards should be included, said that the scheme should cover the whole of the borough to ensure it is equal and applied fairly and also to avoid bad landlords moving into the two excluded wards. As one respondent said:

  “I believe that such a licensing scheme is in place in a given borough with the express aim of identifying local landlords in order to be able to hold ‘rogue’ landlords to account for the conditions of their rental properties and the impact of that and their tenants’ behaviours on the local community. On that basis for such a scheme to be in place it must apply to all privately rented properties in that given borough with no exceptions for one ward or another and that way in theory there’s a fair distribution of the costs of such a scheme between all landlords in the same borough.” *Landlord and Resident*

• Most of those that said less wards should be included said that the scheme should not be introduced at all to any wards. A small number (approximately 5 comments) said that the scheme should only target the wards with the greatest problems around property conditions and/anti-social behaviour.
Alternatives to selective licensing

4.9. Overall, 22% of all respondents said the council should consider alternatives to a Selective Licensing scheme to regulate private rented property conditions and management effectively and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 12% of tenants/residents said the council should consider alternatives, compared with 54% of landlords/agents.

4.10. Respondents that do not agree with the proposal to introduce a Selective Licensing scheme are more likely than other respondents to state that the council should consider alternatives. For example, 48% of those that disagreed with the proposal said the council should consider alternatives.

4.11. 201 respondents that said the council should consider alternatives provided comments. Approximately a tenth of these comments simply reiterated that they did not support the introduction of Selective Licensing. The main comments were (please note that all of these points were also made by participants at the landlord events):

- The council should make best use of existing legislation around both property conditions/management and anti-social behaviour (approximately 30% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

  “There are already sufficient powers in place to deal with bad landlords and anti-social behaviour. The council and police should use these better, fining both landlords and tenants if they don’t comply and taking action against them.” Landlord and Resident

- The council should target bad landlords, many of whom may try to avoid applying for a licence. They said that complaints from residents, tenants, estate agents and partner organisations should allow the council to target these bad landlords (approximately 25% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

  “The scheme unfairly targets the good landlords. The bad ones do their utmost to avoid paying. The council should focus on targeting these rogue landlords by making it easier for tenants and residents to make complaints and follow-up on these.” Landlord and Resident

- The scheme should be properly enforced, through regular inspections amongst other things, to ensure it is most effective (approximately 15% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

  “The council should focus more on enforcing the scheme. After we applied, we never received any visits or anything from the council. It makes it feel like it is just a money-making scheme.” Landlord

- The scheme should prioritise HMOs and/or be extended to social housing landlords where anti-social behaviour was considered more of a problem (approximately 10% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

  “The real problems are with the HMOs and social landlords. The latter are not included in the scheme and the former should be prioritised. Not all landlords and private rented tenants are bad.” Resident
• The scheme should be replaced by a voluntary accreditation scheme (approximately 5% of comments to this question) (the National Landlords Association and Residential Landlords Association make a similar point). As one respondent said:

“I’d like to see landlords that join a voluntary accreditation scheme and/or are members of recognised bodies such as the Residential Landlords Association and receive training from them, be exempt. This will allow the scheme to focus on bad landlords and the good landlords can be incentivised to show that they adhere to high standards. In other words more carrot than stick. And besides the ‘stick’ already exists in the form of the legislation.” *Landlord*

• The council should engage more with landlords and provide more help and support to landlords to identify bad landlords, deal with bad tenants and help good landlords comply with the scheme (approximately 2-3% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

“This all feels like it is unfairly targeting landlords and placing the onus solely on us. I’d like to see a more supportive approach adopted, whereby the council helps landlords to comply and works in partnership with us to deal with bad tenants and identify bad landlords.” *Landlord*
Additional Licensing

Most tenants/residents and landlords/agents agree with the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing

4.12. Overall, 57% of respondents agree with the council’s proposal to introduce Additional Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in all of Waltham Forest to regulate property conditions and management of HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 23% disagree.

4.13. 59% of tenants/residents agree and 18% disagree. This compares with 51% of landlords/agents that agree and 38% that disagree with the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing.

Figure 4.3: Agree or disagree with proposed Additional Licensing scheme

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you agree or disagree with the council’s proposal to introduce Additional Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in all of Waltham Forest to regulate property conditions and management in HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

Stakeholder views

4.14. Stakeholders made the following comments/responses:

- The Greater London Authority supports the proposal to regulate property conditions through Additional Licensing.
- Jennette Arnold, London Assembly Member for Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest, strongly agrees with the proposal.
- Enfield Council supports the proposed introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme.
- Hackney Council supports the proposed introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme, which is consistent with its recent introduction of such a scheme.
- Haringey Council supports the proposed introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme.
• Newham Council supports the proposed introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme.
• Tower Hamlets Councils supports the proposed introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme for eligible HMOs not within the scope of Mandatory Licensing. It states that this would align Waltham Forest with the Additional Licensing scheme in Tower Hamlets, making the picture for HMO landlords and tenants more consistent across the East London sub-region.
• Waltham Forest Housing Association strongly agrees with the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing across the borough.
• The London Fire Brigade support the proposal.
• National Approved Letting Scheme (NALS) states there should be a single scheme to make it easier to manage, rather than both a Selective and Additional Licensing scheme. NALS welcomes the decision to restrict the additional licensing scheme to situations where tenants share kitchen and/or bathroom facilities. Whilst not stated explicitly, NALS understand this would exclude all converted blocks of flats (as defined in section 257 Housing Act 2004) from the remit of the scheme as these properties by definition contain no shared facilities. As such, NALS understand section 257 HMOs would only require licensing if they fall within the geographical coverage of a selective licensing scheme.

Landlord/agent views

4.15. Landlords/agents at the landlord events, in addition to the points raised earlier under the Selective Licensing section, which also apply to Additional Licensing, said that the definition about a single household/family should be clarified and modernised to reflect modern relationships. As these respondents said:

“It seems really unfair to say that close friends that have known each other for years and may have been living together for years should be treated as different households. Friends moving in together is common and the way many of us got started. It brings new and younger people into the borough, which is a good thing. These people often live as one household, like a family, even though they may not be related, and it definitely isn’t right that in these instances the property should be treated as an HMO.” Landlord

“What about same sex couples that aren’t married? How can we prove that one relationship is genuine, and another isn’t? How can we prove that people are related or not? It seems difficult and unfair to say that people that know each other well, whether they’re related or not or in a relationship or not, are living as a single household or not.” Landlord

The scope of the proposed additional licensing scheme

4.16. Overall, 45% of respondents said it is appropriate for the Additional Licensing scheme to cover all of Waltham Forest, while 1% said less wards should be included.

4.17. Most of those that agree with the introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme, agree with the proposal for it to cover all of Waltham Forest - 84% of those that agree with the proposal said it is appropriate to cover all of Waltham Forest and 1% said less wards should be included.

4.18. 1% of tenants/residents said less wards should be included and 3% of landlords/agents said less wards should be included.
Figure 4.4: Geographical coverage of Additional Licensing scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (2411)</th>
<th>Tenants/Residents (1761)</th>
<th>Landlords/agents (614)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it is appropriate to cover all of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, less wards should be included</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that there should be an Additional Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents.

Question asked: Do you think the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing across the whole of Waltham Forest is appropriate?

4.19. 56 respondents that said less wards should be included, provided comments. On investigation most of these comments said that the scheme should not be applied across any of Waltham Forest. A small number (approximately 5 comments) said the scheme should only be targeted at areas with a high proportion of HMOs and/or anti-social behaviour.

Alternatives to additional licensing

4.20. Overall, 17% of all respondents said the council should consider alternatives to an Additional Licensing scheme to regulate property conditions and management effectively in HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour. 10% of tenants/residents said the council should consider alternatives, compared with 38% of landlords/agents.

4.21. Respondents that do not agree with the proposal to introduce an Additional Licensing scheme are more likely than other respondents to state that the council should consider alternatives. For example, 34% of those that disagreed with the proposal said the council should consider alternatives.

4.22. 141 respondents that said the council should consider alternatives, provided comments. Approximately a tenth of these comments simply reiterated that they did not support the introduction of Additional Licensing. The main comments were similar in nature and volume to those about Selective Licensing:

- The council should make best use of existing legislation around both property conditions/management and anti-social behaviour (approximately 30% of comments to this question).
- The council should target bad landlords and not charge good landlords (approximately 20% of comments to this question).
- The scheme should target the residents and tenants causing anti-social behaviour, rather than the landlords. Some of these respondents said this could include increasing Council tax for HMOs to essentially tax HMO residents and use the income to enforce against anti-social behaviour (approximately 10% of comments to this question).
- Reduce the number of privately rented HMOs in the borough (or place these under social housing control) (approximately 5% of comments to this question).
Section 5: Proposed fees, charges and discounts

Approach to licence fees
Most tenants/residents and landlords/agents agree with the proposed approach to licence fees

Those that disagree tend to be a mixture of either being against licensing or supportive of licensing but against providing discounts to landlords

5.1 Consultation respondents said the following about the proposed licence fees and discounts:

- **Early bird discount**: Overall, 75% agree that landlords should receive an early bird discount and 7% disagree. 71% of tenants/residents agree and 7% disagree (about half of these do not believe that landlords should receive any discount). This compares to 86% of landlords/agents that agree and 8% that disagree (almost all of these do not believe that licensing should be introduced).

- **Energy rating related discount**: Overall, 66% agree that landlords should receive an energy rating related discount and 12% disagree. 68% of tenants/residents agree and 8% disagree. This compares to 63% of landlords/agents that agree and 20% that disagree.

- **Multiple lets within same block discount**: Overall, 58% agree that landlords should receive a discount where they let multiple flats within the same block and 19% disagree. 61% of tenants/residents agree and 14% disagree. This compares to 52% of landlords/agents that agree and 27% that disagree.

Figure 5.1: Approach to licence fees

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you agree or disagree with the following proposed approaches to licence fees?
5.2. 199 respondents that said they disagree with any of the approaches to fees and discounts, provided comments. The main comments were:

- Disagree with discounts for multiple properties in the same block because it benefits larger landlords over smaller landlords (approximately 25% of comments to this question).
- Do not support the introduction of licensing and consequently against any fees (approximately 20% of comments to this question).
- Supportive of introducing licensing and believe landlords should pay the full licence fee to generate maximum revenue and support enforcement (approximately 15% of comments to this question).
- The principle of an energy efficiency related discount is positive, but some landlords may not be able to afford to increase the energy efficiency of their property, especially older properties (approximately 10% of comments to this question).
- The early bird discount should be provided to new landlords throughout the life of the scheme, not just at the start of the scheme itself (approximately 2-3% of comments to this question) (this point was also raised by a small number of participants at the landlord events).
- Against charging fees because landlords will pass the cost on to their tenants (approximately 2-3% of comments to this question).
- Landlords that already have a licence should receive a discount for any new licences because there should be less administration (approximately 2-3% of comments to this question).

Other approaches to fees

5.3. 392 respondents provided comments to the question ‘What, if any, other approaches to fees or discounts do you think the council should consider?’ Approximately, 10% of these comments simply reiterated opposition to licensing and consequently opposition to fees. The main comments were:

- The council should provide discounts to landlords that have a positive record. This could be determined by length of having a licence without any issues and/or being a member of an industry body and/or using a reputable letting agent (approximately 25% of comments to this question). The National Landlords Association and National Approved Letting Scheme (NALS) also makes a similar point, asking for discounts to be applied for accredited members. As one respondent said:

  “Landlords that have shown themselves to be compliant and to maintain high standards should receive a discount. One way to do this could be to check their licensing record and also if they’re members of bodies like the Residential Landlord Association. This will help encourage good landlords.” *Landlord and Resident*

- Related to the above, bad landlords should receive higher fees. This could be applied to landlords that register late or landlords that receive enforcement action (approximately 20% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

  “Higher fees for landlords that fail to register or break the licensing conditions and receive enforcement action. Essentially the fee should be related to the property condition and the landlord and their tenants’ behaviour.” *Landlord*
Tenants/residents said that landlords should be stopped from passing on the fee to their tenants (approximately 15% of comments to this question). Landlords said the fee should not be too high because otherwise they would be forced to pass the fee on to their tenants (approximately 5% of comments to this question). As one respondent said:

“The fee should be high enough to generate the funds to manage the scheme, but not so high that it discourages good landlords or forces them to pass on the cost to their tenants. That has already happened with the current scheme. So there should be something built in that stops landlords from doing that.” Tenant

Tenants and residents that are supportive of the scheme said there should not be any discounts provided to landlords (approximately 5% of comments to this question):

“Landlords already make lots of money. They don’t need discounts and the council, and therefore residents, would benefit from more money to pay for the scheme and target bad landlords.” Tenant

The fees should be charged pro-rata and those that have recently paid for a licence under the current scheme should have their licence rolled over into any new scheme: (approximately 2-3% of comments to this question) (this comment was also made by some participants at the landlord events):

“I’ve been charged full price for a licence that I’ve been told will last one year instead of five, when the current scheme ends in 2020. This feels very unfair. The cost should surely be pro-rata. Or at least they should make sure that my current licence extends into any new scheme, so I get the full benefit of five years, which I’ve paid for.” Landlord and Resident
**Approach to payment**

Most tenants/residents and landlords/agents agree with the proposed approach to require payment of the licence fee at the point the licence application is decided rather than split it into two

5.4. Overall, 59% of respondents agree with the proposed approach to require payment of the licence fee at the point the licence application is decided. 23% disagree.

5.5. 66% of tenants/residents agree and 18% disagree. This compares with 53% of landlords/agents that agree and 26% that disagree.

5.6. Those that disagree with the proposed schemes are more likely than other respondents to disagree with the payment approach. For example, 39% of those that disagree with the proposal to re-introduce a Selective Licensing scheme also disagree with splitting the payment into two. Similarly, 48% of those that disagree with the proposal to introduce an Additional Licensing scheme also disagree with splitting the payment into two.

**Figure 5.2: Approach to payment**

![Approach to payment chart]

- **Note:** Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.
- **Question asked:** Do you agree or disagree with the above approach to require payment of the licence fee at the point the licence application is decided?

5.7. The Residential Landlords Association (RLA) state that the council needs to set out and display publicly their licensing processing time, and if tacit consent will apply if the processing of the application goes beyond the advertised processing timescale, as per recent case law.
5.8. Consultation respondents said the following about the proposed licence fee levels or related discounts:

- **£450 for a Selective Licence in early bird period:** Overall, 38% said the fee was about right, 22% too high and 6% too low. 32% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 44% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 18% too high and 8% too low, with 30% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 24% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 35% too high and 41% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **£700 for a Selective Licence after the early bird period ends:** Overall, 30% said the fee was about right, 32% too high and 5% too low. 33% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 36% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 28% too high and 7% too low, with 30% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 13% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 44% too high and 42% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **£450 for a Selective Licence for properties with an EPC of C or more:** Overall, 35% said the fee was about right, 24% too high and 7% too low. 34% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 41% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 21% too high and 7% too low, with 30% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 22% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 33% too high, 2% too low and 43% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **£750 for an Additional Licence in early bird period:** Overall, 27% said the fee was about right, 30% too high and 6% too low. 37% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 32% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 26% too high and 7% too low, with 36% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 15% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 40% too high, 2% too low and 42% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **£1000 for an Additional Licence after the early bird period ends:** Overall, 25% said the fee was about right, 31% too high and 5% too low. 38% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 28% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 27% too high and 7% too low, with 38% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 13% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 41% too high, 2% too low and 42% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **£750 for an Additional Licence for properties with an EPC of C or more:** Overall, 27% said the fee was about right, 31% too high and 6% too low. 37% said the council should not be charging the fee at all. 31% of tenants/residents said the fee is about right, 27% too high and 7% too low, with 36% stating the fee should not be charged. This compares with 14% of landlords that said the fee was about right, 41% too high, 2% too low and 43% stating the fee should not be charged.

- **A discount of £100 for each property licensed under a single landlord in a block of flats after the first property is charged at the full rate (applies to both Selective and Additional Licences):** Overall, 39% said the discount was about right, 18% too high and 10% too low. 33% said the council should not be offering this discount at all. 45% of tenants/residents said the discount is about right, 17% too high and 7% too low, with 30% stating the discount should not be offered. This compares with 23% of landlords that said the discount was about right, 20% too high, 15% too low and 43% stating the discount should not be offered.
5.9. 384 respondents that said any of the fees are too high or low, provided comments. Approximately 10% of respondents to this question said they were opposed to the licensing schemes and consequently the fees are too high. The main comments were:

- Tenants/residents were concerned that fees, if too high, will be passed on to tenants (approximately 30% of respondents to this question).
- Landlords said the fees are too high, acting like an additional tax and making it unprofitable to be a landlord (approximately 20% of respondents to this question).
- There should not be any discounts in general and especially to landlords with multiple flats in the same block as this only benefits larger/portfolio landlords (approximately 10% of respondents to this question).
- Landlords or tenants have not received any benefits or seen any improvements as a result of the current high fees and similarly landlords have not seen any activity for the fees paid for the current scheme (approximately 10% of respondents to this question).
- The fee is set too high and will deter bad landlords from registering because they will try to avoid a high fee (approximately 5% of respondents to this question).
- The fee should be consistent with neighbouring boroughs (approximately 5% of respondents to this question).
- The fee has gone up a lot since the current Selective Licensing scheme started (approximately 2-3% of respondents to this question).

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you think the proposed fees are about right, too much or too little?
5.10. Several participants at the landlord events reiterated similar points to those stated above. In particular, landlords asked to understand how the costs/fees are arrived at, how the fees are spent and the impact of licensing activity:

“When you add it all up, it is a lot of money the council is getting. I paid my fee and all I got for it was a bit of paperwork. No visits, no benefits. I’d like to see how that money has been spent over the last few years. I haven’t seen several million pounds of activity or improvements. I think landlords would be more on board if we could get a breakdown of how the fees are arrived at and how the money is spent. That way we could see how the fees are justified and that the money is being spent well and having a positive impact. More transparency and accountability.”

Landlord
Section 6: Licence conditions

Selective Licence conditions

Most respondents said the Selective Licence conditions are clear and understandable, although there is room for further clarity and refinement

6.1. Overall, 81% of respondents said the Selective Licence conditions are clear and understandable.

6.2. 87% of tenants/residents said they are clear and understandable (although there were high numbers of don’t know responses), compared with 68% of landlords/agents.

Figure 6.1: Selective Licence conditions clear and understandable

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you think that the proposed Selective Licence conditions are sufficiently clear and understandable?

6.3. 122 respondents that said that the conditions were not clear and understandable, provided comments. The main comments were:

- The conditions do not use plain English and/or are there are too many to understand (approximately 60% of the comments to this question).

- There are too many conditions, which will place an unreasonable burden/bureaucracy on landlords, and they will not always be able to comply (approximately 20% of the comments to this question).

- The definition of ‘fit and proper’ and what it entails needs to be clearer (approximately 5% of the comments to this question).

- Two respondents provided detailed comments, which focussed on asking for clarity around some of the specific conditions, terms and definitions (related to both Selective
Licence and Additional Licence conditions). This included clarifying that references from previous landlords are not required for first time renters; being more specific about requirements such as testing appliances or maintaining smoke alarms; and clarifying how long documents should be held for, especially in light of GDPR.

- One respondent (and also The National Approved Letting Scheme) said they wanted clarity over “tenancy management point 5) adequate checks and proof obtained that occupiers belong to a single household. How can a landlord check if individuals are related?”.

A tenth of respondents said there are Selective Licence conditions that should not be included

6.4. Overall, 10% of all respondents said that there are Selective Licence conditions that should not be included. 6% of tenants/residents and 23% of landlords said this.

6.5. 105 respondents that said there are licence conditions that should not be included, provided comments. Approximately half of the comments were in general opposition to introducing a Selective Licence scheme and the associated conditions and/or said that most of the conditions are already covered in law or within all good tenancy agreements. The other main comments were:

- Landlords should not be responsible for the anti-social behaviour of their tenants, including their visitors because this is out of their control and a matter for the council/police to deal with in existing legislation (a similar point was also cited at the landlord events) (approximately 20% of comments to this question).
- Pre-occupancy checks, including references and/or checking the relationship between tenants is difficult and can be falsified (approximately 10% of comments to this question).
- The frequency of visits is overzealous and an invasion of privacy and could be a breach of tenancy agreements (approximately 5% of comments to this question). Similar points were also made by the National Landlords Association and National Approved Letting Scheme.
- Two respondents said there should be an amendment to the condition around spare keys to be more practical and not potentially require landlords to have to change the locks between tenancies.
- One landlord, and the National Landlords Association and National Approved Letting Scheme, asked to change the requirement for landlords to provide receipts within seven days of payment, especially where payment is electronic, and consequently proof is already provided.
- The Almshouse Association asked the council to consider whether the conditions proposed under the Health and Safety Section (6,7,8,9 and 10) are unlawful in light of the result of Brown v Hyndburn Borough Council [2018] EWCA Civ, in the Court of Appeal.
- The National Landlords Association said the requirement to upload gas safety certificates annually is onerous and not in the spirit of a light touch approach with good landlords. They would prefer to see this measure applied to landlords as a sanction where they have failed compliance.
One in twenty respondents said there are further Selective Licence conditions that should be included

6.6. Overall, 5% of all respondents said that there are additional Selective Licence conditions that should be included. 5% of tenants/residents and 5% of landlords said this.

6.7. Some 45 respondents that said there are further licence conditions that should be included, provided comments. Most of these conditions were either raised by only one respondent or are already included within the existing proposed conditions. In addition, the following were raised by more than one respondent:

- There should be a requirement for tenants to receive their deposit soon after the end of tenancy (approximately 10% of comments to this question).
- There should be an onus on tenants to maintain the cleanliness of the property and gardens (approximately 5% of comments to this question).
- There should be a limit on the number of vehicles tenants can keep at the property (approximately 5% of comments to this question).
- Some landlords at the landlord events said that the licence should be transferable to the new landlord if the property is sold, albeit with basic fit and proper person checks applied to the new landlord at a discounted rate.
**Additional Licence conditions**

Most respondents said the Additional Licence conditions are clear and understandable, although there is room for further clarity and refinement.

6.8. Overall, 83% of respondents said the Additional Licence conditions are clear and understandable.

6.9. 89% of tenants/residents said they are clear and understandable (although there were high numbers of don’t know responses), compared with 68% of landlords/agents.

**Figure 6.2: Additional Licence conditions clear and understandable**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who found the Additional Licence conditions clear and understandable](chart.png)

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, ‘don’t know’.

Question asked: Do you think that the proposed Additional Licence conditions are sufficiently clear and understandable?

6.10. 79 respondents that said that the conditions were not clear and understandable, provided comments. Almost all the comments said that there are too many conditions and/or that they are not plain English.

**Almost a tenth of respondents said there are Additional Licence conditions that should not be included**

6.11. Overall, 8% of all respondents said that there are Additional Licence conditions that should not be included. 6% of tenants/residents and 16% of landlords said this.

6.12. 74 respondents that said there are licence conditions that should not be included, provided comments. As with the same question about Selective Licence conditions, approximately half of the comments were in general opposition to introducing an Additional Licence scheme and the associated conditions and/or said that most of the conditions are already covered in law or within all good tenancy agreements. The other main comments were also similar to those for Selective Licensing. In addition, respondents said that landlords should not be responsible for the anti-social behaviour of their tenants, including their visitors.
because this is out of their control and a matter for the council/police to deal with in existing legislation (approximately 20% of comments to this question).

One in twenty respondents said there are further Additional Licence conditions that should be included

6.13. Overall, 5% of all respondents said that there are further Additional Licence conditions that should be included. 4% of tenants/residents and 5% of landlords said this.

6.14. Some 59 respondents that said there are further licence conditions that should be included, provided comments. Most of these conditions were either raised by only respondent or are already included within the existing proposed conditions. In addition, a small number of respondents said that anti-social behaviour should be more clearly defined, and the responsibility of landlords clarified. A small number of respondents said that conditions around over-crowding and ensuring sufficient space within HMOs should be included/clarified.

6.15. The National Landlords Association raised the issue of distinguishing between shared house and bedsit style HMOs, using LACORS guidance - well managed 2 storey shared houses for example do not require fire doors whereas 2 storey bedsit style properties do.

6.16. The National Approved Letting Scheme (NALS) makes several detailed comments about licence conditions. In the interests of succinctness and to avoid duplication, these can be seen as a separate document on request and will require consideration by the council.
Section 7: Access to tenant and landlord services

Most respondents support proposals to offer licence holders discounts to council services and/or provide access to support services

7.1. Overall, 67% of respondents agree with the proposal to offer licence holders discounts to council services and/or to provide access to support services that could benefit landlords or tenants.

7.2. 66% of tenants/residents agree and 67% of landlords/agents agree.

Figure 7.1: Access to tenant and landlord services

![Chart showing access to tenant and landlord services]

Note: Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents. Excludes respondents that said, 'don’t know'.

Question asked: The council is considering providing licence holders (landlords) discounts to council services that may benefit landlords, such as pest control. The council is also considering providing access to support services that could benefit landlords or tenants, such as information, advice and guidance. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

7.3. Some participants in the Landlord events stated that they wanted the council to work in partnership with landlords and agents to deal with poor property conditions and anti-social behaviour. Similarly, they said that they wanted access to services and support that would help generate greater benefit from licensing schemes. As one landlord said:

“I’ve paid my licence fee, but I don’t get anything in return. It feels like the licence is a tax on landlords and that the council is against us. They need to work with us, in partnership to deal with these issues. I’d like to see more benefits from licensing if it carries on, more help and support from the council. I just want to get something back for the money I pay.”

Landlord
7.4. Respondents noted the services and support they would like to be available:

- Pest control (approximately 10% of all respondents).
- Access to information, advice and guidance to tenants, including legal advice, advice around evictions, advice to deal with bad landlords, advice around tenant rights and landlords’ responsibilities (approximately 10% of all respondents). Jeanette Arnold, London Assembly Member for Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest supports this point: “The council must ensure that tenants are aware of the licensing scheme and the obligations that licence holders have in terms of upkeep of the property, and ways to report issues must be clearly signposted.”
- Access to information, advice and guidance for landlords, including advice dealing with bad tenants, anti-social behaviour and advice about how to comply with licence conditions (the National Landlords Association also make this point and it was a point made by several participants at the landlord events). This could also include access to the council’s in-house lettings agency (approximately 5% of all respondents and 15% of landlords/agents). Jeanette Arnold, London Assembly Member for Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest supports this point: “Licence holders could be provided a discount to the services of Lettings Waltham Forest, to encourage them to use the council’s in-house lettings agency. This would ensure better quality of services provided in terms of maintenance and repairs, to both the landlord and the tenants’ benefit.”
- Bulky waste collections (approximately 5% of all respondents and 15% of landlords/agents).
- Access to maintenance and repair services, including list of vetted/approved suppliers (approximately 5% of all respondents and 15% of landlords/agents).
- Parking permits for landlords/agents and maintenance/repair services (approximately 2-3% of all respondents and 10% of landlords/agents).
## Appendix 1: Profile of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>On-line consultation questionnaire</th>
<th>Face-to-face survey of residents and tenants</th>
<th>Borough population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented tenant</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52%*</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association/Council tenant</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupier/buying a home on a mortgage</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting/managing agent</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident or not</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in the borough</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live outside the borough</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location and number of properties let</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let properties in the borough</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let properties outside the borough</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets properties in North of borough</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets properties in Centre of borough</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets properties in South West of borough</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets properties in South East of borough</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets 1 property</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets 2-4 properties</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets 5-49 properties</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets 50+ properties</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British/Irish</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White British/Irish</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where live in borough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cann Hall</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathall</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Chapel End</td>
<td>Chingford Green</td>
<td>Endlebury</td>
<td>Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Questions about gender, age, ethnicity and where live in borough were only asked to residents of Waltham Forest and consequently the figures are only for respondents that live in the borough.

*The survey deliberately over-sampled private rented tenants to ensure sufficient numbers of this group were included to allow for reliable analysis. The results have been re-weighted back to the wider population proportions to ensure they are representative and not overly skewed towards the views of private rented tenants.
Appendix 2: Consultation questionnaire
Private Rented Property Licensing: Consultation Questionnaire

Prior to responding to this questionnaire, we encourage you to read the background information at: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

Please note that all your personal details are managed securely and within data protection legislation. Your responses are anonymous and confidential, which means your personal information will not be reported alongside your answers. Please visit the following to read our privacy notices:

www.publicperspectives.co.uk/privacy
www.walthamforest.gov.uk/content/landlords-licensing-privacy-notice

This consultation questionnaire asks you about the current private rented property Selective Licensing scheme and the proposed future property licence schemes, including the proposed scope of the schemes, fees and licence conditions. It will take about 15 minutes to complete.

You can either complete the questionnaire via this paper copy or complete it on-line by visiting: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

About you

Q1. Are you . . .?

Please select all relevant answers.

☐ A tenant living in private rented accommodation
☐ An owner occupier/buying a home on a mortgage
☐ The owner of a shared ownership property
☐ Housing Association/Council Tenant
☐ Landlord who manages their own property
☐ Landlord who uses a Managing Agent
☐ Letting/Managing Agent
☐ Registered Provider (Housing Association)
☐ Business owner/representative
☐ Representative of an organisation
☐ Other

If 'Other', please specify:


If an organisation or business, please specify the name:


If a business, does your business have a base/office in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Yes
☐ No
If a landlord or agent, do you own or manage properties in Waltham Forest and/or outside the borough?

Please select all relevant answers.

☐ In Waltham Forest
☐ Outside Waltham Forest

If a landlord or agent, where are the properties you let or manage located in Waltham Forest?

Please select all relevant answers.

☐ North - Chingford (including Highams Park, North Chingford, Chingford Hatch, Chingford Mount)
☐ Central - Walthamstow (including Blackhorse Lane, Walthamstow Village, St James Street, Wood Street, Higham Hill)
☐ South West – Leyton (including Markhouse Village, Lea Bridge, Bakers Arms)
☐ South East – Leytonstone (including Whipps Cross)

If a landlord or agent, approximately, how many residential properties do you let or manage in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only. (Each separate flat or property counts as one)

☐ 1
☐ 2-4
☐ 5-9
☐ 10-19
☐ 20-49
☐ 50-99
☐ 100 or more
☐ None

If a landlord or agent, approximately, how many residential properties do you let or manage outside Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only. (Each separate flat or property counts as one)

☐ 1
☐ 2-4
☐ 5-9
☐ 10-19
☐ 20-49
☐ 50-99
☐ 100 or more
☐ None

Q2. Do you live in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Yes
☐ No
The current private rented property Selective Licensing scheme

We would like to ask you some questions about your knowledge of the existing scheme and what has changed over the past three years.

Waltham Forest Council introduced a borough wide private rented housing Selective Licensing scheme in April 2015, which is due to expire on the 31st March 2020. The scheme was introduced to tackle some of the problems associated with privately rented properties in the area, such as anti-social behaviour. Since the licensing scheme began:
- Over 25,000 properties have been licensed.
- More than 4,500 audit and compliance checks have been made.
- There have been 94 prosecutions against private landlords and fines worth more than £300,000 imposed.
- Nearly 100 financial penalties have been imposed for breaches of housing law with penalties of more than £600,000 imposed.
- More than 20 Interim Management Orders have been served, allowing the Council to take control of unlicensed or poorly managed properties.

More information about the impact of the current scheme is available in the background evidence pack at (see pages 8 to 11 and pages 42 to 46): www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

Q3. Were you aware of the borough’s privately rented property Selective Licensing scheme before you took part in this consultation?

Please select one answer only.
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not sure

Q4. Do you think property conditions in privately rented housing have got better, stayed the same or got worse in Waltham Forest over the past 3 years?

Please select one answer only.
☐ Got better  ☐ Stayed the same  ☐ Got worse  ☐ Don't know

Q5. Do you think anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties has got better, stayed the same or got worse in Waltham Forest over the past 3 years?

Please select one answer only.
☐ Got better  ☐ Stayed the same  ☐ Got worse  ☐ Don't know

Q6. If the current licensing scheme stopped and was NOT continued, what impact do you think this would have on the condition and management of privately rented properties in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only.
☐ There would be a negative impact  ☐ There would be a positive impact  ☐ There would be no impact  ☐ Don't know

Q7. And if the current licensing scheme stopped and was NOT continued, what impact do you think this would have on anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only.
☐ There would be a negative impact  ☐ There would be a positive impact  ☐ There would be no impact  ☐ Don't know
Private rented property conditions, management and anti-social behaviour

Waltham Forest Council’s priorities include ensuring that residents have a choice of safe, good quality and well-maintained accommodation and have a good quality of life.

We recognise that private rented properties play a valuable role in providing housing for residents of the borough. A predicted 37% or 39,685 of Waltham Forest’s homes are now privately rented. We know many landlords operate professionally and the private rented sector provides housing options for local people. Despite the impact of the current privately rented property licence scheme, we still have concerns that some properties are in poor condition or badly managed and that more could be done to work with landlords to reduce anti-social behaviour (ASB).

The evidence base highlights the scale of problems relating to property conditions and ASB in the private rented sector. This indicates that more than 8,000 privately rented homes have a serious housing hazard, that privately rented properties generate a disproportionate level of ASB and Houses in Multiple Occupation generate a higher level of service demand compared with other tenures.

More information about the problems associated with privately rented properties is available in the background evidence pack at (see pages 15 to 25) and the Ward summaries: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

Q8. How much of a problem do you think each of the following are in Waltham Forest? Please select one answer for each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>A very big problem</th>
<th>A fairly big problem</th>
<th>Neither a big nor a small problem</th>
<th>A fairly small problem</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor conditions in private rented properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly managed private rented properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe private rented properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning issues such as sub-standard conversions of homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish in front gardens or front gardens that are messy or poorly maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly-tipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety hazards in Houses in Multiple Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition of Houses in Multiple Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly managed Houses in Multiple Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed new private rented property licensing schemes

Under a property licensing scheme, licensable addresses must hold a property licence to be legally let to private tenants. For a licence to be granted, the local authority must be satisfied, among other matters, that the licence holder (usually the landlord) and anyone else involved in the management of the property meets a 'fit and proper person' test. All granted property licences impose a set of conditions on the licence holder relating to the letting, management, occupation and condition of the rented property.

Under Government legislation, many Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) are required to hold a property licence. This ‘Mandatory HMO Licensing’ applies to properties that accommodate 5 or more tenants forming 2 or more households.

Local authorities can also require that other privately rented properties are licensed by introducing ‘Selective Licensing’ and/or ‘Additional Licensing’ schemes that cover all or part of their area.

We are proposing to introduce two schemes to regulate property conditions and management and help tackle anti-social behaviour:

**A Selective Licensing scheme across all wards in Waltham Forest** (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards, where the proportion of private sector housing is below the national average and therefore they do not meet the criteria for inclusion) from 1st April 2020 after its current scheme comes to an end on 31st March 2020: Under this scheme, most privately rented homes that are rented to single households or to no more than two unrelated people would require a Selective Licence.

**A borough-wide ‘Additional Licensing scheme’**: The Additional Licensing scheme would cover ALL eligible HMOs that are not within the scope of Mandatory HMO Licensing where tenants share some basic facilities or amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This is proposed to apply across all of Waltham Forest and will ensure that all HMOs are licensed.

We calculate that of the predicted 39,685 private rented homes, just under 6,000 are HMOs (that would be subject to Mandatory Licensing or the proposed Additional Licensing). The remainder would be subject to the proposed Selective Licensing (except properties in Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards).

The following table summarises the different schemes (pto):
Private sector property licensing can help to improve the condition and management of privately rented property and reduce anti-social behaviour by requiring landlords to register their property with the Council and meet certain property management conditions. This ensures the regulation of privately rented accommodation and enables the Council to audit and inspect licensed properties and target properties and landlords that are not licensed or meeting their licence conditions.

You can find out more about the reasons for proposing property licensing and the potential benefits by reviewing the background evidence pack at (see pages 12 to 28):
www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

We have considered the following alternatives to improve property conditions, management and reduce anti-social behaviour associated with privately rented properties (pto):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Area of the borough</th>
<th>Being consulted on?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Licensing of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)</td>
<td>Houses, converted flats and some purpose-built flats that have 5 or more persons forming 2 or more households, where households share facilities such as a kitchen or bathroom</td>
<td>Borough wide</td>
<td>No — this is a national legal requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Licensing</td>
<td>Properties rented to single households or two unrelated people</td>
<td>All wards except Endlebury and Hatch Lane (where the proportion of private sector housing is below the national average and therefore, they do not meet the criteria for inclusion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Licensing</td>
<td>All HMOs not covered by Mandatory HMO Licensing where there is sharing of some basic facilities or amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom</td>
<td>Borough Wide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Measure</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Part 1 Housing Act 2004 enforcement powers [HHSRS] and Public Health powers</td>
<td>Formal notices can be served that require improvements to be carried out. Councils can carry out work in default if a notice is not complied with. Landlords also risk being prosecuted if they do not comply with the notice.</td>
<td>Formal action is generally a slow process and most types of notices served can be appealed, which can significantly delay the time period for compliance. These powers do not place any obligation on landlords to be proactive in improving conditions. Work carried out in default can be effective but it is expensive and time consuming to the Council, with the risk that not all costs are recovered. Successful prosecutions do not in themselves secure improvements in property conditions and the Council's prosecution costs are often not met in full. Further, Part 1 of the 2004 Act does not enable the Council to regulate or improve the management or occupation of privately rented accommodation, just the condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Accreditation schemes facilitate improvement in management practices and standards</td>
<td>For those landlords who take part, accreditation can improve the ability to effectively manage a property.</td>
<td>This requires voluntary landlord engagement and rogue operators are unlikely to attend/engage. In Waltham Forest, there was a poor take up of the voluntary accreditation scheme prior to the implementation of the current Selective Licensing scheme. As of January 2018, only 757 landlords had registered on the London Landlord Accreditation Scheme (as reported by London Property Licensing News), which we estimate represents less than 10% of landlords operating in Waltham Forest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on prosecutions and civil penalties for housing offences</td>
<td>Provides a disincentive to keep properties in poor conditions.</td>
<td>These powers do not place any obligation on landlords to be proactive in improving the condition or management of their properties. Successful prosecutions, or the imposition of civil penalties, do not in themselves secure improvements in property conditions. The absence of large-scale licensing significantly reduces the scope of the Council to impose civil penalties because it is difficult to monitor and identify housing breaches without licensing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to improve sub-standard properties</td>
<td>Grants subsidise improvement works, improving standards and creating benefits for landlords and tenants.</td>
<td>Generally, there are few grants available and the Council has very limited scope to offer grants through successful external funding bids. In the most part, grant awards would fund improvements that the landlord should already be carrying out to meet their legal obligations. Any grant scheme would be discretionary and would rely on voluntary landlord engagement and is highly unlikely to ever be substantial enough to have a notable impact on property conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB powers</td>
<td>Formal notices can be served that deal with ASB identified at individual properties which, if complied with, would remedy ASB at that location.</td>
<td>Action would generally be taken against the tenant in occupation. These powers do not place any obligation on landlords to be proactive in managing their properties to prevent or reduce the likelihood of ASB occurring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe that we can only continue to improve property conditions, management and help reduce anti-social behaviour through private rented property licensing. We believe that licensing helps make best use of existing powers mentioned in the table above. For example, by providing the intelligence and resources to conduct audits, inspections and enforcement activity, allowing us to identify bad landlords that have not licensed their property or those who fail to meet property management conditions, and then take enforcement action where appropriate.

You can find out more about the alternatives in the background evidence pack at (see pages 29 to 30): www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation

We would now like to ask you some questions about these proposals.

Proposal 1: Selective Licensing scheme

Q9. Do you agree or disagree with the Council’s proposal to introduce Selective Licensing in Waltham Forest (except Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards) to regulate privately rented property conditions and management and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

Please select one answer only.

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know

Q10. Do you think the proposal to include 18 of the 20 Wards in the borough is appropriate? (Hatch Lane and Endlebury wards are not proposed for inclusion in the scheme because the proportion of private sector housing in those wards is below the national average and therefore they do not meet the criteria for inclusion. You may wish to refer to the evidence base which shows why the scheme is proposed in 18 of the 20 wards in the borough - see the background evidence pack at: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation)

Please select one answer only.

- Yes, it is appropriate to cover the 18 wards and not include Hatch Lane or Endlebury wards
- No, less wards should be included
- No, more wards should be included
- I don’t think that there should be a Selective Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest
- Don’t know

If you have answered 'No', please indicate what wards you think should or should not be included in a Selective Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest and why:
Q11. Do you think the Council should consider alternatives to a Selective Licensing scheme to regulate private rented property conditions and management effectively and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please specify the alternatives and indicate whether they would be relevant to the entire area covered by the proposed Selective Licensing scheme or a specific part of it:

Proposal 2 – Additional Licensing scheme

Q12. Do you agree or disagree with the Council’s proposal to introduce Additional Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in all of Waltham Forest to regulate property conditions and management in HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

Please select one answer only.

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q13. Do you think the proposal to introduce Additional Licensing across the whole of Waltham Forest is appropriate? (You may wish to refer to the evidence base which shows why the scheme is proposed across the borough - see the background evidence pack at: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation)

Please select one answer only.

- Yes, it is appropriate to cover all of Waltham Forest
- No, less wards should be included
- I don’t think that there should be an Additional Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest
- Don’t know

If you have answered 'No', please indicate what wards you think should or should not be included in an Additional Licensing scheme in Waltham Forest and why:
Q14. Considering the alternatives presented previously, do you think the Council should consider alternatives to an Additional Licensing scheme to regulate property conditions and management effectively in HMOs and help tackle anti-social behaviour?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please specify the alternatives and indicate whether they would be relevant to the entire area covered by the proposed Additional Licensing scheme or a specific part of it:

**Proposed fees, charges and discounts**

We propose, as with the existing licensing scheme, that a fee will be charged for a licence. The proposal is to set fees for licence applications taking into account all of our costs in administering and carrying out our licensing functions and carrying out our functions under Chapter 1 of Part 4 Housing Act 2004 (where steps are necessary to make Interim and Final Management Orders). We have not included costs we can recover directly from landlords when undertaking those functions.

We are proposing a reduced fee (Early Bird discount). This is to encourage landlords to comply with their obligation to licence their rented homes at the earliest opportunity by making an application within a 3-month window that may be in the lead up to or at the start of the scheme. Charging the full standard fee will start at the end of the 3-month early bird period.

We also propose a discounted rate to properties that come onto the market after the end of the early bird period that have good energy performance ratings certificates (EPC) of C or better (this will include new build properties). This discount will apply to eligible properties under the Selective Licensing and Additional HMO Licensing schemes, but not properties that require a Mandatory HMO Licence.

We also recognise that landlords may own multiple properties (flats) in the same block or building and propose a discount for those additional properties.

We also know that licence applications relating to Houses in Multiple Occupation are the most expensive to administer. We are committed to inspecting all HMOs to assess standards before a licence application is determined.

Inspections to ensure compliance with licensing conditions are also required for properties, especially HMOs, where we have received a complaint or information indicating that there may be a problem with the property. This is expensive but necessary and is reflected in the level of the fees proposed.

The fees have been calculated to meet the full cost of licensing administration. Further information on the proposed fees can be found in the background evidence pack at (see pages 31 to 37): www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation
Q15. Do you agree or disagree with following proposed approaches to licence fees? Please select one answer for each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landlords who apply within an early window should receive an 'early bird' discount</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landlords should receive a discount for properties that have an energy rating of C and above and first become available for rent after the end of the early bird discount period</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlords should receive a discount where they let multiple flats within the same block</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have answered 'Tend to disagree' or 'Strongly disagree' for any of the above questions, please explain your answers:


Q16. What, if any, other approaches to fees or discounts do you think the Council should consider?


We are required to divide the licence fee charged into two parts, an amount representing the costs of processing an application for a licence and the amount of the fees that relate to the costs of operating and enforcing a licensing scheme. In order to keep administrative costs down we will only require payment of the licence fee at the point the licence application is decided (if this was charged in two parts it would be likely to increase the fee). If an application for a licence is not granted we will only charge the amount that represents the costs of processing the application.

Q17. Do you agree or disagree with the above approach to require payment of the licence fee at the point the licence application is decided?

Please select one answer only.

○ Strongly agree
○ Tend to agree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Tend to disagree
○ Strongly disagree
○ Don't know
The following provides information and asks questions about the proposed fee level.

Since the 1st April 2016, Waltham Forest’s Selective Licence fee is currently £650. The proposal is to increase the full fee for the new scheme to £700 starting on the 1st April 2020. The proposed fees for both schemes are set-out below (pto):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence type</th>
<th>Standard fee</th>
<th>Early bird discount rate</th>
<th>EPC discount rate (which includes new build properties)</th>
<th>Multiple property discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selective Licence</td>
<td>£700 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£450 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£450 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£100 discount per flat in a block for 2nd, 3rd etc. flat after first flat pays full fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Licence (HMOs)</td>
<td>£1000 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£750 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£750 for up to 5 years licence</td>
<td>£100 discount per flat in a block for 2nd, 3rd etc. flat after first flat pays full fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees levied for Mandatory HMO Licence applications vary depending on the size of the HMO and start from £1500. Mandatory HMO Licence fees are not part of this consultation.

The following table highlights how these proposed fees compare to other London Boroughs that operate similar schemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Borough</th>
<th>Selective Licence</th>
<th>Additional Licence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>Currently proposing to increase to £900</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td>No scheme in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td>£1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>£604</td>
<td>£1,198 to £1,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18. Do you think the proposed fees are about right, too much or too little? Please select one answer for each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Much too low</th>
<th>A little too low</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>A little too high</th>
<th>Much too high</th>
<th>Don't think the Council should be charging this fee at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £450 for a Selective Licence within the early bird period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £700 for a Selective Licence after the early bird discount rate ends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £450 for a Selective Licence for properties with an energy performance certificate of C or more that become available to rent for the first time after the early bird period has ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £750 for an Additional Licence within the early bird period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £1000 for an Additional Licence after the early bird discount rate ends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fee of £750 for an Additional Licence for properties with an energy performance certificate of C or more that become available to rent for the first time after the early bird period has ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discount of £100 for each property licensed under a single landlord in a block of flats after the first property is charged at the full rate (applies to both Selective Licensing and Additional Licensing schemes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you said 'too much' or 'too little', please explain your answer and the fee level you would suggest:
Licence conditions

We propose to include licence conditions about tenancy management, licence holders, property standards, property management and occupancy levels. The intention of these is to:
- Ensure landlords/agents provide safe homes of adequate quality.
- Increase the professionalism and accountability of landlords.
- Reduce anti-social behaviour.
- Control occupancy levels.

Failure to comply with conditions attached to a licence is a criminal offence and could result in prosecution and, on conviction, the Court may impose an unlimited fine. Alternatively, the Council may impose a financial (Civil) penalty of up to £30,000 for each offence.

Some of these conditions are mandatory and are already required of landlords. In other words they must be imposed as a licensing condition for every granted licence. Mandatory conditions include:
- Providing each occupier with a written statement of the terms of their occupancy.
- Holding a current gas safety certificate.
- Making sure the electrical appliances and furniture supplied are in a safe condition and meet current regulatory standards.
- Ensuring smoke alarms are provided in the house and are kept in good working order.

Licensing imposes these obligations on landlords and enforcement of licensing conditions helps ensure they are met, although the mandatory conditions themselves are not being consulted upon because they are already required of landlords.

We also propose to introduce local licensing conditions such as:
- Providing occupants of the house with written notice about how they should deal with repair and maintenance issues and with emergencies, should they arise.
- Ensuring that all reasonable steps are taken to prevent and deal effectively with anti-social behaviour (ASB) resulting from the conduct of occupiers of, or visitors to, the property.
- Making sure the landlord or licensee is fit and proper.
- Ensuring any repairs or maintenance are carried out quickly and by competent persons.
- Regularly inspecting properties.
- Various measures to deal with anti-social behaviour associated with private rented properties.

The effective implementation of the proposed licensing schemes will provide the Council with the information and resources to check that landlords are complying with these conditions and to take enforcement action where required.

Full details of the proposed licensing conditions for Selective and Additional Licensing schemes can be found at: www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation. For ease of reference, these documents include both the mandatory licence conditions and proposed local conditions for each licence type.

Selective Licensing conditions

Q19. Do you think that the proposed Selective Licence conditions are sufficiently clear and understandable?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'No', please state which conditions are not clear and why:
Q20. Do you think that any of the proposed Selective Licence conditions should not be included?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please indicate which condition (or conditions) should not be included and why:


Q21. Do you think there are any other Selective Licence conditions (that are not already covered by a mandatory or proposed local licence condition) that should be included?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please state below:


Additional Licensing conditions

Q22. Do you think that the proposed Additional Licence conditions are sufficiently clear and understandable?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'No', please state which conditions are not clear and why:


Q23. Do you think that any of the proposed Additional Licence conditions should not be included?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please indicate which condition (or conditions) should not be included and why:


Q24. Do you think there are any other Additional Licence conditions (that are not already covered by a mandatory or proposed local licence condition) that should be included?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If 'Yes', please state below:

Access to landlord and tenant services

Q25. The Council is considering providing licence holders (landlords) discounts to Council services that may benefit landlords, such as pest control. The Council is also considering providing access to support services that could benefit landlords or tenants, such as information, advice and guidance. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

Please select one answer only.

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q26. What services do you think should be discounted to licence holders?

Q27. What support services do you think could be made available to landlords and tenants?

Other comments

Q28. Overall, are there any other comments that you would like to make about the licensing proposals?
About you

Only answer these questions (questions 29 to 36) if you are a resident of the London Borough of Waltham Forest. If you are not a resident of Waltham Forest, please go to the end of the questionnaire.

We want to ask you some questions about yourself. This will help us identify the opinions and understand the impact of the proposals on different groups of people. Please be assured that your answers are confidential and will be treated anonymously. This means that we will not report your answers alongside your personal details and the information you provide will only be used for the purposes of this consultation. All your answers and personal information will be managed securely and in accordance with data protection legislation.

Q29. How long have you lived in Waltham Forest?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Less than 1 year
☐ 1 to 2 years
☐ 3 to 5 years
☐ 6 to 10 years
☐ Over 10 years

Q30. How would you describe your gender?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Other

Q31. What was your age on your last birthday?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Under 18
☐ 18-24
☐ 25-34
☐ 35-44
☐ 45-54
☐ 55-64
☐ 65-74
☐ 75+

Q32. Are the day-to-day activities of you or anyone in your household limited because of a physical or mental impairment which has lasted or is expected to last at least 12 months, including problems related to old age?

Please select one answer only.

☐ Yes, a lot
☐ Yes, a little
☐ No
Q33. How would you describe the occupation (or if retired the former occupation) of the chief income earner in your household?

Please select one answer only.

- Higher managerial / professional / administrative
- Intermediate managerial / professional / administrative
- Supervisory or clerical / junior managerial / professional / administrator
- Skilled manual worker
- Semi-skilled or unskilled manual worker
- Student
- Retired and living on state pension only
- Unemployed for over 6 months or not working due to long term sickness
- Prefer not to say

Q34. How would you describe your ethnic background?

Please select one answer only.

- White British or Irish
- White Central or Eastern European
- White other
- Asian / Asian British
- Black / African / Caribbean / Black British
- Mixed / multiple ethnic group
- Other ethnic group
- Prefer not to say

Q35. Is your first or native language English?

Please select one answer only.

- Yes
- No

Q36. What is your postcode? (We ask this so we can analyse the results by different areas. We are not able to identify you personally) (please list the first four digits of your postcode only e.g. E17 3)
Public Meetings

You've reached the end of the questionnaire - thank you for your responses. Before you submit your responses please read the information below about other ways to take part in the consultation and next steps.

You can also attend public meetings being held separately for residents and landlords/agents/property professionals. Use the links provided below to register your place. It is important that you let us know you are attending so that we can plan effectively.

**Landlord meetings:**
Tuesday 19th March: 2pm to 4pm  
Tuesday 19th March: 6pm to 8pm

Waltham Forest Community Hub, 18A Orford Rd, Walthamstow, London E17 9LN.

Register your place by visiting: [www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation](http://www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation)

**Resident/Tenant meetings:**
Tuesday 26th March: 6pm to 8pm  
Thursday 28th March: 6pm to 8pm

Waltham Forest Community Hub, 18A Orford Rd, Walthamstow, London E17 9LN.

Register your place by visiting: [www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation](http://www.walthamforest.gov.uk/propertylicensingconsultation)

**Next steps**

Public Perspectives, the organisation helping us manage the consultation, will produce an independent report of the consultation results. This report, along with other evidence about the impact of the proposals will be considered by Waltham Forest Council’s Cabinet (which is our decision-making committee in respect of these proposals) in July 2019. The report and documentation will be published on the Council’s website ahead of the meeting. The decision taken will also be published and available on the Council's website.

Depending on our decision, an application will be made to the Secretary of State for permission to implement a private sector property Selective Licensing scheme once the existing scheme finishes at the end of March 2020.

The borough-wide Additional Licensing scheme for HMOs will be implemented in line with the timetable that will be set out in the report to Cabinet, if a decision to adopt such a scheme is made.

**Send your responses to the following address by the end of the consultation (29th April 2019) (write the address on an envelope, no stamp is needed):**

Freepost RSGJ-HSTC-CGTT  
Waltham Forest Council  
C/O Public Perspectives Ltd  
20 Camp View Road  
St. Albans  
United Kingdom  
AL1 5LL