

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	While welcome the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing, the strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon. All home-owners should be encouraged to make their homes energy-efficient too.
Yes	1. Most of your "Strategy" for housing is about methods for achieving outcomes which are not themselves stated. 2. I support the commitment to improve energy efficiency in housing provided by the Council, but it's also vital that energy efficiency should be improved in ALL housing, and for new housing the Council can and should promote this through the Planning process. 3. And for existing non-Council-provided housing, the Council should encourage house owners to improve their houses' energy efficiency.
Yes	40% of the carbon emissions in Winchester are from heating and cooling buildings. Each new building requires energy to build. The strategy must ensure ALL new building are built to minimize life time heating and cooling requirements. This requires the highest levels of energy efficiency to be designed into new buildings. Building fabric must be from sustainable low energy resources. The design of all new buildings must ensure that renewable energy generation from a building can be maximised eg south facing roofs where ever possible
Yes	All new housing should be built with energy efficiency in mind. Green areas and trees should be planned into any developments Home owners should be encouraged to make their homes energy efficient Emissions of greenhouse gases need to be reduced by 40% by 2020 15% of energy should be coming from renewable sources by 2020
Yes	And all new houses should be built fully energy efficient as standard.
Yes	Double the council houses will not be enough to cover demand. Reduce building sites for posh people coming from London but increase numbers of council house building sites. Energy efficient building is good. Passive houses better.
Yes	Energy efficiency both in new homes and an encouragement for current home owners to be energy efficient is important to me. I'm glad to see energy efficiency as part of the plan
Yes	Energy efficiency is important, both for Council owed properties and privately owned properties. It would be good to see the council supporting energy efficient improvements
Yes	Fine as far as it goes. These are aspirations but there is no guide as to how these will be achieved or what the time scales are. WCC should be leading the way to make private developers adhere to the highest BREEAM conditions. All new housing should be energy efficient and WCC needs to lead the way to encourage current home owners to reduce carbon emissions
Yes	Great to have energy efficiency in Council housing. The Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon. I would strongly encourage the Council to encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too.
Yes	Houses should be made as green (= energy efficient) as possible in response to the threat of climate change.
Yes	I am pleased to see the council will meet the energy efficiency requirement of the Decent Homes Standard but would like to think not only that Winchester City Council, of all City Councils, would aim to exceed such requirements for low carbon in its own housing stock. Please would the council also include a low carbon requirement for all new housing developments, including those recently commenced, e.g. at Barton Farm or King's Barton. As for existing home-owners in Winchester, it would be good if the Council would continue to support and encourage them to increase the energy-efficiency of their homes as well.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	I am very pleased to see solar panels on some of the new Council properties near the bottom of Stanmore Lane. All new council properties should be built such that they produce only small emissions of carbon dioxide ie low carbon whilst being occupied. They should also all be built to produce energy eg PV panels. WCC should continue to encourage home owners to make their own properties, and those they rent out, to be more energy efficient.
Yes	<p>I strongly support reducing HMOs and increasing affordable housing as well as improving access for private tenants to housing. Increasing the number of Council Houses available also feels like a no brainer and provides a brilliant opportunity for the council to become a leader in demonstrating just how new homes can be energy efficient and housing developments low carbon.</p> <p>At the same time an energetic campaign showing how home-owners such as myself could make our own houses more energy efficient might create a sense of shared community purpose with significant impacts on our environment as well as our pockets.</p>
Yes	<p>I welcome the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing.</p> <p>The Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon.</p> <p>The Council should encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too.</p>
Yes	<p>I welcome the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing.</p> <p>The Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon.</p> <p>The Council should encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too.</p> <p>All homes should have green space and wildlife enhancement measures, in particular support for wildlife corridors and wildflower/pollinator areas</p>
Yes	<p>I would like to see all new housing be low carbon as a matter of course.</p> <p>Also the council should encourage all homeowners to make their houses as energy efficient as possible and make them aware of what is on offer and what can be done at low cost.</p>
Yes	Introduce initiatives to encourage homeowners to be more energy efficient like The Green Deal.
Yes	<p>It is imperative that ALL housing developments must be low carbon.</p> <p>The Council must encourage home owners to make their homes more energy efficient.</p>
Yes	<p>It's not an 'outcome' until you get there. It might be a 'desired outcome', but that would be clumsy. It would be less confusing if you could rename 'outcome' as 'aim' or 'objective'. Then you could leave 'outcome' as a distinctive word you use when you are saying what you have actually achieved.</p> <p>More needs to be done to improve energy efficiency in housing beyond 'decent homes standard': council housing standards need to be reviewed to take advantage of the latest energy production, battery storage and insulation technologies.</p> <p>More creative ways should be found to enable energy saving in conservation areas so that conservation officers develop approved forms of double glazing and cladding, and efficient heating.</p> <p>All home owners should be encouraged to increase their energy efficiency.</p>
Yes	<p>More needs to be said about what constitutes a quality home. Energy efficiency needs to be prioritised to keep running costs low for people on lower incomes. Use of durable but low maintenance materials is also important. There is a lot of scope for innovation in methods other than the traditional brick build for delivering homes - prefabrication is one cost effective option.</p>
Yes	<p>My support has reservations - I would like to see all empty properties used before new housing is built. Also how would our green areas be protected?</p> <p>Good to read the commitment to energy efficiency in housing. Would like the strategy to emphasise that all new housing development should be low carbon.</p> <p>The council should encourage all home-owners to make their houses energy efficient.</p>
Yes	New housing should be energy efficient. All new housing should have solar panels, grey water collection, high quality insulation etc.
Yes	<p>One thing important to me when it comes to new housing is that it is not built on the last green spaces in town, people need them - as big and tempting as they might seem in certain areas!</p> <p>Other than that I like to see a commitment to energy efficiency on new houses built by the City Council. It would be good to stress that all new housing developments should be low carbon and of course, the Council should also ask home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too.</p>
Yes	Please be specific about energy efficiency with medium to long-term benefits of solar panel installation for tenants even if the initial capital outlay requires some rental adjustments.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	<p>Please ensure all new houses/flats are zero carbon if possible or low carbon and ensure that the infrastructure which supports them encourages people to live in an environmentally friendly and sustainable way : ie public transport links to town centre, work, school; green space for people to share; fruit trees & space to grow their own food.</p> <p>The council should also be encouraging residents who rent or own their own homes to be energy efficient.</p>
Yes	<p>re. Energy performance of housing stock: it is important that the properties themselves are built to conserve energy use and not just to employ energy efficient appliances.</p> <p>Review the installation and use of wood burners. I do not believe they are as "sustainable" as a provider of heating as we would be led to think.</p>
Yes	The Council should try to ensure that ALL housing in the area is as energy efficient as possible. All new housing should be of a high energy efficiency standard whether private or council owned. Existing house owners should be encouraged to retrofit to improve their energy efficiency.
Yes	The Steategy must make a commitment to new housing stock being low carbon and energy efficient.
Yes	The term "Quality housing" should mean quality in design, including energy efficiency , low carbon etc.
Yes	There should be the best possible energy efficiency and use of renewables in our housing.
Yes	Will energy performance be of the highest standard and not just Decent? Will there be retro-fitting of existing stock to maximise energy efficiency?
Yes	<p>WinACC welcome s the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing and the good steps already taken. This should include solar PV.</p> <p>The Council should also encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient by retrofitting.</p> <p>The Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon, and should specifically enforce the Building Regulation that requires developers to demonstrate that they have considered renewable energy.</p>
Yes	<p>Winchester badly needs more affordable housing. House prices in Winchester are the economics of the mad house. Many of the council house building like Wavell Way in Stanmore are of better quality and landscaping than Badger Farm.</p> <p>All new houses should be low carbon and have solar panels.</p> <p>Priority should be given house builders that build houses so that new houses are energy efficient.</p>
Answ	<p>but as this happens, employ decent architects to produce appropriate contemporary design styles rather than the naff, embarrassing norm that Winchester seems to condone.</p> <p>The commitment to energy efficiency is important - the strategy should prioritise the requirement for all new housing development to be low carbon.</p>
Answ	<p>Housing is typically the largest proportion of a person's carbon footprint.</p> <p>While I welcome the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing, the Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon.</p> <p>The Council should complement this by encouraging home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too.</p>
Answ	<p>I welcome the commitment to energy efficiency in Council housing - WCC must lead by example.</p> <p>The Strategy should emphasise that all new housing developments should be low carbon.</p> <p>The Council should encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too and raise public awareness of how this is possible.</p>
Answ	I would like to see a requirement for all new housing to be low carbon, and for existing home owners to be encouraged (and rewarded) by WCC for improving the energy efficiency of their homes.
Answ	<p>Please put in place measures to ensure all new build council housing are low carbon even from design.</p> <p>Please include details for how the council will encourage all home owners in the area also make their homes energy efficient.</p>

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Answ	<p>Private rents in Winchester are unaffordable for the young and/or lowpaid without support in the form of housing benefit. I welcome the building of council houses but it is far too little. WCC should use every means possible to put pressure on the Govt to maintain level of benefits but also treat the dire housing situation as a matter of urgency and enable councils to build truly affordable houses to rent on a far greater scale.</p> <p>It is also crucial that houses are built to the highest energy efficient standard. This applies not only to council houses. Private developers should be held to energy code conditions included with planning permission and not be allowed to water these down by applying for retrospective amendments using self-assessed questionable viability criteria.</p>
Answ	<p>You probably need to be looking towards more social housing than that. Many people are not even ON the housing list because we know you will never be able to help us so we remain paying more than a mortgage for private and extortionate rents.</p> <p>New housing should be committed to energy efficiency and low carbon.</p> <p>How about a scheme to help home owners lower their carbon output too?</p> <p>A cap on private rents and PLEASE make this a reasonable amount based on average income rather than the 80% market value thing which is not in any way affordable to most people.</p> <p>If you can supply a large housing stock and keep rents low, this will force private landlords to keep theirs low too.</p> <p>Avoid greenfield sites and use up the stock and space already available and underused.</p>
No	<p>Add affordable to the outcome.</p> <p>I welcome the emphasis on energy efficiency in council-owned dwellings. The council should also require high environmental standards in new developments (energy and water efficiency, building materials, renewable heat/energy etc) and encourage energy efficiency in private dwellings.</p>
No	<p>I would like to see new houses meeting higher standards of sustainability: energy efficiency, fewer car parking spaces, sustainable urban drainage. I totally agree that housing is too expensive for a substantial portion of potential buyers but I would like to see new housing provision with aspiration for a truly sustainable future. Climate change and myriad other stresses are coming , regardless of developers' cost margins; they demand a serious, committed response.</p>
No	<p>Mostly good initiatives but I would like to see energy efficiency in housing given more priority. Energy efficiency means lower bills and the only true way to make homes more sustainable and affordable.</p> <p>For new homes,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is crucial and the strategy should be to build sustainable developments which means district heating and public transport ie new train stations, dedicated bus and cycle routes 2) New builds should implement standards that go beyond building regs for private housing. 3) Same standards for your own housing stock too but I would like to see new Winchester Council houses push for Passive housing as a minimum. <p>For existing homes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Retrofit energy efficiency is always difficult but emphasis on helping home owners insulate, draught proof, low energy lights and electrical appliances and conversion to low carbon heating types.
Yes	<p>...but PLEASE can someone have a long-term vision and put the proper infrastructure in place - ie road/rail links etc. South Hampshire is in danger of being the world's largest car park in the near future...</p> <p>Affordability and access to quality housing for all is very important</p>
Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The intention to double the number of Council houses built in the period is laudable but nowhere is it made clear what this number is to be. Is it to be the 300 affordable homes shown on the pictorial on page 3 of the Strategy or some other number? Either way, the number should appear here as a deliverable against which performance can be measured. 2. Similarly the intention to drive down homelessness is laudable but, again, it should be bounded in a manner that allows Council performance to be measured. As written, it is entirely open to interpretation and therefore is unlikely to drive management behaviours or resources to reflect the efficient approach to the delivery of public services desired.
Yes	<p>A company in Warrington are able to erect good quality housing for half conventional new build costs. Are the council looking at this option?</p>

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	According to Shelter, affordable housing in Southern England is unaffordable to 80% of the population. WCC must do much more to create an environment where all income groups can afford to live in Winchester. There appear to be far too many executive homes being built around Winchester, with little accommodation affordable to our teachers, nurses, bin men etc. Failure to accommodate these individuals within Winchester will simply create more traffic, with people having to commute from neighbouring towns and villages.
Yes	Affordability is a big issue, particularly where young families are concerned as stock is in such short supply. Building new council housing that is genuinely affordable and available across a mix of tenures is critical. Much of what the government now defines as 'affordable' (80%) market rent, sadly is not for the majority. (NB I had to look up the definition of 'HMO' and I work in a related field, not very user friendly!)
Yes	Affordable housing is not affordable in and around Winchester, just look at Barton Farm. What do you define as "affordable" housing?
Yes	Affordable private rented Housing is a big need. Many people are happy to rent privately, but the cost of housing is very high here. The number of students drives the demand and price. Winchester is in danger of having home owners of high cost homes or social renting tenants, and not enough in between.
Yes	All good outcomes, but you don't state in the strategy HOW you are going to achieve them. What practical steps?
Yes	All new housing should be extremely energy-efficient - it is time that passifhaus/zero carbon standards are applied. Home owners should be incentivised (e.g. through variable Council Tax rates) to make their homes energy-efficient. These measures are essential if Winchester City Council is to achieve its carbon reduction target.
Yes	All new housing should be low carbon. Encourage home owners to make their homes more energy efficient.
Yes	also more opportunities for shared ownership in a City blighted by high house prices. Perhaps funded by a levy on landlords and estate agents, who benefit from the lack of affordable housing?
Yes	Any new building should be powered by renewable energy - I assume solar panels could be an option - what about solar tiles as has been trialled in the US? try and introduce a cap on private rental properties to bring down the prices
Yes	Areas above shops in Winchester should be developed to provide housing.
Yes	As long as facilities are upgraded and expanded in line with increases.
Yes	At present my children have no hope of owning their own home, until I die and insurances pay out
Yes	build even more council housing - affordable rents are affordable by many
Yes	Building less retirement homes and more homes instead for younger people. Homes and gardens to be of good size - it seems rooms in current houses and gardens are too small when they are meant to be family homes. Variety in the style of building. Plenty of open space and trees in housing developments for a feeling of well being. To ensure there is enough parking areas.
Yes	but marked rents are too high people on a low income cannot afford the rent and that housing benefit has been cut
Yes	But our faith in your ability to control new development on greenfield sites is non-existent after the Barton Farm debacle. These are great aims/goals but do you really have any power to initiate and manage this program?
Yes	But please make sure that new housing is not snapped up by the Buy to rent landlords. We need to make sure that our children and grandchildren can also buy their own houses.
Yes	Council owned/managed social housing is preferable to private rented which appears to benefit landlords rather than tenants.
Yes	Desperate need for low cost homes for 1st time buyers as rents are so high they cannot save a deposit for a home.
Yes	'Double the number of Council houses built in the period 2017 -2020' I assume this means you intend to build twice the number you built during the previous strategy period, but this is not stated.
Yes	Each question in this survey asks me if I agree with the "outcome" which I do not understand, as the outcome can only be judged at the end of 2020 when we see what the council has achieved. My responses should therefore be understood by the Council as a comment on whether or not I agree with the Council's objectives.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	Ensure people who already have a council house/flat are not living with partners who have a council house as well or have council flat/house but living with parents.
Yes	Ensure that any developments are fixed developments of work spaces / retail / private homes and affordable housing so no ghettos are created. Designs of housing should be sympathetic to the area not a generic template of 100s of identikit homes wit adequate space for cars and refuse bins
Yes	Especially welcome drive toward affordable housing and Council housing. Very concerned at lack of attention to protection of open space, nature and countryside, arguably our most precious assets. These should be valued as priorities in their own right, and this should be reflected in the plan.
Yes	Essential that social housing stock is increased. There must be a mix of units (in terms of numbers of beds) that reflect demographic needs now and in 75 years time.
Yes	Establishing an arm's length company to deliver is an option successfully applied by other authorities. Correctly set up it can overcome legislation on right-to-buy, which of course, leaves the authority with a constantly diminishing stock.
Yes	Excellent that you are doubling the number of council houses. How many will that be?
Yes	Given the Council's woeful track record in managing property and re-developments to date, the lack of expertise, experience, monitoring and control already demonstrated makes it obvious that the Council is not equipped to run and manage a Housing Company, nor to provide 'innovative' support to help residents to buy their own homes.
Yes	Given the relatively high prices of Winchester properties, the essential role of the Council is to provide affordable housing. The more affluent section of the community are well catered for.
Yes	Have you considered building technology into the infrastructure and the buildings themselves e.g.: Broadband to cabinets in local areas Smart cities tech such as parking sensors, street lights with movement sensors, waste bins with full sensors, air quality sensors and lastly, water level sensors in or upstream from areas prone to winter flooding?
Yes	Housing is the number 2 priority. Environment is the first, but Housing a close second: it is ESSENTIAL that more houses are built in the district. How can young people buy a house if the prices are so ridiculously high. Too much demand and not enough supply.
Yes	Housing should be affordable to and prioritised for local key workforce to retain social mix in the city and balance the many private developments which target wealthy commuters. Do not sell off council housing stock.
Yes	How do you propose to keep private landlords from raising rents year on year? They appear to be a law unto themselves and no one seems to be able to stop them from profiteering from the lack of accommodation. You do not explain HOW you are going to drive down homelessness. Will this be part of a joint venture with a charity or a separate department to deal with the homeless who are a constantly shifting group.
Yes	How does "Restrict permitted development rights in Winchester so that new HMOs require planning permission from the Council." help to improve access to good housing stock? The statement "Become experts in finding innovative solutions to support residents trying to buy their own home" sounds wonderful but how is W.C.C. going to achieve this?
Yes	However, I am concerned at local areas of density of new housing eg Barton Farm, Chilbolton Avenue, etc and the implications on our city. Traffic is getting busier and busier in the area, not just at Christmas so that it is common to queue along the Stockbridge Road and Andover Road into the city centre. This will only get worse with increased housing. I would support more council owned housing, for those unable to buy themselves and have some concerns re 'right to buy' as it depletes this housing stock.
Yes	I agree although how you make affordable housing in this area for anyone is beyond me. However consideration really does need to be made to services to support these houses and roads around. Winchester traffic is already ridiculous at times and once Andover Road disappears I'm not too sure how anyone will get anywhere.
Yes	I agree but we also need to be clear on the purpose of council housing as a temporary solution for those unable to afford private rented or purchased housing, until they are able to afford it. We shouldn't be encouraging people to live in council owned properties for very long periods especially as their income improves.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	<p>I agree with the above in part. I am not sure establishing a housing company is a good idea. I believe the idea has been circulated before and was rejected. It is far better that existing tenants and those seeking council accommodation can speak directly with council officers rather than trying to communicate with faceless and often uncaring employees of a housing company.</p> <p>Although I once bought a council house myself, I now don't think selling off council stock is a good idea. Anyone who can afford to buy their own home can do so on the open market and perhaps should not be in social housing in the first place. I feel that some people may deliberately obtain council housing as a step to purchasing their own home more cheaply. Selling off council stock also reduces the availability of housing for those genuinely in need.</p>
Yes	<p>I agree, but the housing numbers have to be managed in a context of the infrastructure (traffic, schools, health, etc). I would also add to the housing outcomes that the additional houses should be built with climate change in mind - and so should be as sustainable and carbon neutral as possible. For example, they should be oriented in a way to take advantage of the solar power available (solar thermal, PV and passive solar gain), they should be arranged with local facilities (local shops, health, schools, etc) that people can walk to, they should be created with good facilities for walking and cycling and not dominated by the car - although allowance should be made for sufficient off-street parking for residents. As I see it, the problem with cars in the future will not be one of carbon emissions and pollution as I believe we will move to electric vehicles gradually, but one of traffic congestion.</p>
Yes	<p>I am not sure WCC could or should develop a housing company on its own. it should join up with the county council or neighbouring district councils.</p> <p>Student housing should be part of a separate target and not seen as meeting the general housing need.</p>
Yes	<p>I am pleased at this commitment, but it is crucial that all new housing is low carbon-emitting. The Council should also find ways to encourage and to support home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient</p>
Yes	<p>I believe there could be much more innovative accommodation, albeit on a controlled and timed manner for homeless people. Taking on empty properties. Buying and converting old buses with bunks etc.</p>
Yes	<p>I do agree wit this outcome, however I would think that this is actually a position 5 on your list of priorities instead of position 1.</p>
Yes	<p>I don't agree it should be your top priority on the list though</p>
Yes	<p>I partly agree with the outcomes you state. However, nowhere do you acknowledge that many local people who are in full time work earn far too little to rent any property in W'ter. The term 'affordable' is a misleading sophistry - and applies only to people on largish incomes in W'ter. You do not state this very real problem or how you plan to tackle it. This huge divide between those who are wealthy and those who also work very hard, but are paid very little bodes badly for the future of W'ter. We are already a divided city, and on the way to becoming even more divided. The council must tackle these difficult issues.</p>
Yes	<p>I support community-led plans across the District, of which there are now 26 completed and a further 7 under development. The plans frequently express a desire to see more affordable housing for local people, so the outcome and aims are fully in accord with this. Community plans regularly express a desire to maximise provision for local people and to inform the nature of housing development in their area. It is therefore important to continue to encourage mechanisms that allow local influence, such as neighbourhood plans, design statements and local lettings plans.</p>
Yes	<p>I think it is absolutely right that the Council follow the examples of other authorities, such as Wokingham and Bracknell Forest, in setting up a housing company to enable housing to be delivered as quickly and efficiently as possible. This will put the control with the council rather than being reliant on developers.</p>
Yes	<p>I think totally new housing areas eg Barton Farm are better than packing too many flats into central brownfield sites. This drives useful small traders from their brown fields away to out of town industrial estates. While new developments are good not enough thought has been given to how workers will travel to work. Barton Farm travelers face difficult railway bridges as they go to Central Winchester or to Micheldever train Station - which also lacks car parking capacity.</p>

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
	I welcome the plan to build more homes but would like the Council to ensure they are all built to carbon-neutral standards. This will help the new owners, who will have lower energy bills, and the Council, to meet its environmental targets.
Yes	'Deliver housing stock with good energy performance' - this is on the right track, but I would like the Council to actively add insulation and solar panels to improve energy performance. As well as managing its own housing stock in energy-efficient ways, the Council should encourage Winchester's home-owners to do the same.
Yes	I would like to see greater emphasis on all new homes being low carbon.
Yes	I would not support the establishment of a private Housing company but would suggest a social enterprise/not for profit entity. I would support a right to quality rented housing
Yes	I would rather you concentrated on 3 bed family homes rather than smaller units in the building of any new council homes.
Yes	If we stopped the number of 2nd home owners and investors buying buy to let, there would be enough homes to go round. We risk becoming like London where everyone is driven out and no community left.
Yes	Important that infrastructure eg roads is not overwhelmed, adversely affecting quality of life for all.
Yes	Important to ensure that affordable housing remains in the city and that this is not handed over to landlords for multiple occupation. House prices are extortionate and there need to be suitable housing for all residents not just rich people moving down from London
Yes	In particular developing a realistic strategy for housing key workers, given high property values in Winchester: can parts of the city be zoned to enable this?
Yes	In the context of Winchester house prices and rents what is "affordable"?
Yes	In the interests of saving energy and reducing emissions it might be helpful to build a number of Passivhauses as in Fareham. They also have plans to build more in the development in Welborne
Yes	Increased council housing for those in genuine need is to be welcomed, as is increasing affordable long-term renting - but would like information about how this will be achieved. Hope that all council housing will be built/ re-furbished to the highest environmental standards. The emphasis should be on affordable homes for younger, local people. The Council should hold developers to account to deliver the maximum number of affordable homes. Even with existing housing developments, Winchester will soon be facing excessive congestion and pressure on services. Standing together with other councils, please bring pressure to bear on Government to resist demands to increase housing to unsustainable levels.
Yes	Increasing the number of affordable low rent houses is essential for those families and young people who cannot afford to buy or high rents charged by private landlords. Encouraging young people is the way to avoid the area becoming top heavy with an aging population.
Yes	Innovative ways to bring forwards: Fabric first, with grid becoming decarbonised focus on future ready homes. Benefits/ Incentives for sustainable schemes (e.g. PassivHaus discount on council tax?) Options for self-build - allocate land for self builders. 'Cash-in-the-attic' sell pocket sites to creative self builder/ developers.
Yes	Isn't this what you should be providing anyway and what is an HMO?
Yes	It does seem that every new house build in Winchester is for rich people. In particular those near the centre of the town. I am not in favour of Right to Buy reducing council stock and do not understand why a favoured few get a discount on their house paid for by tax from people paying full price (or worse, unable to buy)
Yes	It is important in considering any expansion of housing provision to consider the impact on the local area in terms of the location, style and intensity of the housing provided. Winchester and the surrounding area has a particular character which makes it popular. Much of the housing price pressure is due to its rail links to London and is inevitable and unavoidable. There should be a balance but not at the expense of the area losing its character and style and becoming more of an urban sprawl and worse one that has no distinct character or connection to Winchester as a historic city.
Yes	It is important that infrastructure and social care provision keep pace with increases in housing.
Yes	It is important to retain pockets of green space within existing areas of housing, rather than building on every available space. We need these green pockets for children to have space to get out and play, and for others in the community to walk, sit, meet, etc.

	Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment
Yes	It makes sense to retain commercial control of as much housing development as possible; if commercial gain from development is ducted into providing better services for the community and appropriate types of housing rather than corporate or private wealth this is to be lauded. Does the council have the commercial skills to do this? How will council ensure this can work?
Yes	it seems odd to exclude any target for new private housing units, given that the Council controls planning.
Yes	It's like motherhood and apple pie, there's nothing here to disagree with. That said, there is no detail about how the council will fund the proposed changes in an environment where there is less money available than today.
Yes	Just how many houses will you be building?? And will they be rented at a reasonable rates or on a par with private renting - so not at all affordable. Think it is ludicrous that housing benefit cap is often much lower than rents being charged by wcc
Yes	Key workers (teachers, nurses etc) need accommodation near their places of work, and access to these should be a priority
Yes	Lack of specificity concerning the statement 'Double the number of Council houses built in the period 2017 -2020'. Does this mean doubling the total number of council houses, or just doubling the number being built? If the latter, which figure will be doubled; currently planned, last year, last ten years etc.?
Yes	Looks reasonable and detailed enough.
Yes	Loud able aims but this is short on specific actions
Yes	More affordable housing is imperative & equally built to the lowest impact on the environment possible (low carbon). I would also seek assurances that the site at the old Hampshire HQ is within this ethos?
Yes	My main interest is in improving affordable housing
Yes	Need to preserve sensitive areas such as Green fields and Ancient Woodlands in the Council's territory.
Yes	Need to think carefully about infrastructure especially roads for new developments.
Yes	Also lack of jobs in Winchester. Need to have jobs for those in housing so that they do not end up with long commutes
Yes	Never enough though
Yes	New Council Housing stock should maximise 'green' energy-efficiency and cost effectiveness for tenants.
	How might the Council publicise or make available the specifications in advance of finalisation?
Yes	New homes should maximise use of renewable energy sources wherever possible.
Yes	Not really sure what the best thing to do is. Good luck. Maybe sort out silver hill?
Yes	Now that solar panels are so cheap and effective, all council-built properties should have them on south-facing roofs. For new build otherwise the HAB housing in Kingsworthy should be highlighted as an exemplar/
Yes	On HMOs, is there a sufficiently strong enforcement department to ensure that HMOs don't persist? The one next to and behind Stanmore stores in Cromwell Road has carried on for four years, despite being turned down twice, because the council's decisions are not enforced. This despite part of the HMO being on council land! The crucial application for change of use from garage/store room was not notified to neighbours in Airlie Lane, or we would have realised what the people planned and objected most strongly, which would have prevented the present situation.
Yes	Perhaps include sustainable housing as well, using renewable energy etc
Yes	Please explain how this is going to be achieved
Yes	Please look to do brown field development.
Yes	Provisions for those who work in Winchester to be able to afford to live there - currently completely priced-out and having to do a heavy commute on over-used Park & Ride bus every day.
Yes	Road structure and adequate parking must also be provided. Not one space per property but plenty to stop life becoming difficult for all. Visitors / residents. Whoever they may be.
Yes	Social housing should be protected and not sold on to tenants.
	Restrict HMO permitted rights across the whole of Winchester now rather than wait until problems arise.
Yes	Social housing should not be mixed with expensive housing - it does not work.
Yes	Sorry to see that there's no commitment to climate-neutral, pre-fab housing. This would make the above aims realistic and achievable.
Yes	Sounds good. With a real commitment it could work. Give it a try.
Yes	Tghis seems a lot to achieve at a time of shrinking budgets!
Yes	The aims should include a commitment to cut emissions from Council controlled housing by 40% by 2020 and to a minimum of 15% of energy to be available from renewable sources.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	The areas that are developed are key. We are very fortunate to live in a rural area and local villages must remain as villages with their own sense of community and local identity. The rapid development of these areas is destroying what is good with the English countryside and must be controlled in favour of more urban areas that in the main already have sufficient transport links, services and other infrastructure to support a growing population. Leave our villages green!
Yes	The Council should actively promote the building of low carbon developments. Other parts of the country where there are such 'eco' developments have found they are immensely popular with homeowners for their obvious energy-saving benefits.
Yes	The Council should also consider a licencing scheme for private sector landlords, or at the very least an accreditation scheme to drive up standards. It should also press central government to legislate for improved security of tenure for private sector renters. This of itself should contribute to reductions in homelessness.
Yes	The Council should encourage home-owners to make their homes energy-efficient too. Information provision and/or awareness campaigns would be an important first step.
Yes	The Council should foster and support the efforts of local organisations dedicated to the provision of affordable homes for local people. There are various restrictions proposed within the Council for the allocation of homes and the ownership in perpetuity of those homes on behalf of local people. These restrictions should not apply to the aforementioned organisations. Statement on behalf of Wickham Community Land Trust
Yes	The final bullet point "Restrict permitted development rights in Winchester so that new HMOs require planning permission from the Council" is critical in the Winnall Area. The sooner this is put in place the better. The number of HMOs puts a strain on local communities and devalues family owned properties.
Yes	The improved quality of housing should include greater energy efficiency.
Yes	The increased provision of council housing is vital to the well being of the community. People of all ages are in need.
Yes	The infrastructure also needs to keep up with the housing. House prices keep going up aren't people just going to keep buying 'affordable housing' and sell it at a profit. Council housing seems like a good option.
Yes	The only thing I would say, is please can the council commit to quality, aesthetically pleasing housing. I see cheap, ugly housing stock going up all over Winchester, which is in absolute contrast to the beauty of the remaining historic buildings. Barton Farm is a prime example of builders profit and the need to squeeze as many houses in as possible, over aesthetics and well considered, educated architect designed buildings. When you visit the lovely small towns of France and Italy, do you easily see such damage to their historic centres? Generally no! It seems such an English thing to so easily create so much architectural monstrosity.
Yes	The overall additional social housing total is woefully inadequate.
Yes	The quality of new homes (and refurbished existing stock) should be a priority: do not cut corners on build costs, and ensure best in class insulation.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Yes	<p>The requirements of the broader community also need careful consideration.</p> <p>In other words, how to retain the unique and desirable character of Winchester? Whilst at the same time making housing more affordable. This needs careful consideration. Otherwise there will be a rush to build and develop and a historic city will find itself losing its reputation as an excellent place to visit and live</p> <p>Transport (burden on traffic flow, train overcrowding) and key public services (schools, GP surgeries) are critical here. These issues cannot be delegated or sidelined as another authority's responsibility.</p> <p>The current, ill-conceived plans for changing the traffic flow along Andover Road into Winchester, re the new King's Barton development, are a case in point. They just haven't been thought through from a practical point of view. Anyone who has seen the traffic on these roads at peak times, especially at around 8-8.30am on a weekday, will see the system is at breaking point and will only be exacerbated by the additional flow of vehicles from the new development.</p> <p>Similarly, delivering new affordable housing is entirely sensible. Yet it needs to be very much carried out hand in hand with planning for how to cope with the extra cars this will bring (so traffic flow, parking) and the extra demand on rail services, which are crowded enough as it is at peak times. What are the negotiations with rail companies in this regard? And what about the infrastructure planning? It is absurd (and utterly pie--in-the-sky thinking) to assume people will want a 'greener' lifestyle hence won't want a car, or will be happy to park in park and ride. Anyone who has been into Winchester over this Christmas period will know to their cost that people want to drive in, park and shop. The catastrophic lack of parking in central Winchester at the moment is costing businesses heavily. The only serious way to address this is to provide adequate parking, and easing traffic flow at peak times. What is being done on this front?</p>
Yes	<p>The risk is that you build loads of houses and damage the attractiveness of Winchester while at the same time you fail to update the infrastructure further damaging the convenience of the town. All new build seems to need parking for at least 2 cars and traffic management needs updating to allow them to move.</p>
Yes	<p>The university needs to take more responsibility for STUDENT numbers and to locate more STUDENT accommodation (like in Southampton) to FREE up family housing that is being WRECKED and abandoned by STUDENT rental landlords . These properties are AFFORDABLE housing sitting there waiting and could be used for providing homes for people who need them . NEW housing projects need to be truly AFFORDABLE unlike Winchester Village which has been advertised as AFFORDABLE HOUSING , Affordable for WHO ?</p> <p>Also the council needs to let council tenants know what is going on with the Conservative policy of increasing Council rents , WHEN and HOW MUCH is this going to cost for those who have improved their income , and is this going to be on a SLIDING scale or is it just one amount of income and if you are a pound over you will pay the same as a millionaire ? Probably the latter which would be ridiculous .</p>
Yes	<p>There does need to be a much quicker turn around from the time houses are vacated until the time they are re-let, this would help with the number of haveing to go into temporary housing due to houses not being ready. It would also save the council much needed funds</p>
Yes	<p>There needs to be sustainable services and infrastructure with attention to the environmental aspects in all planning of development</p>
Yes	<p>There should be a greater commitment to building Council housing - suggest increase target to Triple the number of Council Houses built.</p>
Yes	<p>There should be strict rules on properties in developments such as Barton Farm (Kings Barton), being bought by those in the district who already own a home in Winchester and its environs, as buy to let.</p>
Yes	<p>There should be sufficient small properties for the single and less-well-off.</p> <p>All housing should not only be built to high environmental standards, but should be built to enable owners to further enhance the 'greenness' of their properties, e.g. by ensuring that buildings with pitched roofs have at least one roof that faces south (or near to it) at an appropriate angle for solar panels.</p>
Yes	<p>These are just words, you haven't shown proof of how. Are these guarantees?</p>
Yes	<p>This strategy should go hand in hand with keeping down the number of higher priced, " executive" houses that are allowed to be built. These often attract new people, coming to Winchester from London perhaps resulting in more growth than. The City's infrastructure can support</p>
Yes	<p>Unblock the planning process so that our children have a fighting chance to get accommodation in the city of their birth</p>

	Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment
Yes	Until such time as large scale affordable housing becomes available in Winchester this issue is not going to go away. Allowing developments where the housing costs above the maximum the average wage earner can afford will not help.
Yes	Very aspirational. Is it achievable?
Yes	Very comprehensive and covers all areas
Yes	Very important that no-one is priced out of Winchester housing, and feel there should be better provision of social housing.
Yes	We (Eco church group at St Pauls) support an increase in social and truly affordable housing. We ask the council to improve the quality and sustainability of housing by aiming for Passive House standards. This would be more cost effective in the long run and reduce the carbon footprint of Winchester.
Yes	We desperately need more social housing; at least 2 and/or 3 bedroom properties for the families who cannot afford to rent privately or save a deposit to buy; they don't earn enough to pay exorbitant rents and save! So- called affordable housing in the Winchester area is a joke! Here in Kings Worthy where HAB is building Lovedon Fields the advertisement says ' Affordable Housing' the cheapest is £435.00 and that is for a 2 bedroom terraced property! How on earth are families supposed to afford that? Not everyone earns huge salaries even in supposedly affluent Winchester. As far as we are aware there are no social properties on this development - why not? That would have been preferable to an orchard and a footpath round the perimeter, there are plenty of good footpaths here already. Come on WCC get your priorities right! The word 'affordable' depends on salary so it doesn't apply to many in this area. We are only here because we've been here for 31 years. Couldn't afford to move here now.
Yes	We must prioritise suitable housing for less privileged residents. Such housing must receive needed services to create improved lives.
Yes	We need all new housing developments should be low carbon.
Yes	We need to ensure that we dont trash our villages and need to work with neighbouring authorities to ensure development fits in with wider regional transport etc.
Yes	What are HMOs?
Yes	What infrastructure upgrades will be carried out to enable Winchester to cope with the increase in local population? For example the one way system and train services to London are already at maximum capacity
Yes	What is the decent homes standard?
Yes	When you say that you will double the amount of Council Housing in the period 2017-2020 could you actually put a number to that? If you were only going to build 4 units, 8 units is not going to make a big difference!
Yes	Where is the objective that the supply of Council Housing will be as near to self funding as can be achieved, yes increase the number of starter homes, yes increase the number of council provided homes, but manage them effectively so rents cover costs ?
Yes	While shared ownership is a reasonable form of tenure to provide, I am doubtful about the aim of 'Becoming experts in finding innovative solutions to support residents trying to buy their own home. ' This suggests all sorts of possibilities which are beyond what a local authority should be engaging in and is better left to the private sector.
Yes	Winchester should be aiming above the decent homes standard now as a cornerstone of tackling inequality as manifest in fuel poverty. The Council should use all measures and tools it has available to ensure developers meet policies on provision of smaller, more affordable homes to ensure that local needs are addressed (not simply insatiable demand for high value larger homes)
Yes	Would love to see more developments like that of New Queens Gate in Stanmore and less of the over-priced elitist type eg Chilbolton Avenue. Need to consider the impact on the city's already congested roads.
Yes	You should be ensuring that all new housing developments are low-carbon. We are going to have to have low-carbon housing if we are to address the issue of climate change and doing this at the building stage is the most efficient way of providing this.
Answ	•The aim of doubling the number of Council houses built in the period 2017 -2020 is meaningless when it is not clear what number is being doubled

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
Answer	<p>General comment: You are asking if we approve the OUTCOME but all you offer is some objectives. We can only comment on these objectives so cannot tick yes or no. I have therefore added notes to respond to your proposals. This adds value rather than ticking boxes. It would not have been helpful to have ticked them all no, because there is merit. Just key things missing which force us to say NO.</p> <p>On Housing: What about the owned dwellings that do NOT meet the Decent homes standard? Even MORE important that you address these. Energy standard for new builds should be better than "good": it should be exemplary. These are for the people for whom efficient homes matters most, and it costs very little to do it right when built. Modern homes hardly need heating if they are built properly. Build more council owned rented housing and retain it for renting. And that means many more: doubling it probably is only another hundred or so. Of the new build houses a large proportion should be socially owned, rented and at truly affordable rents. What is an HMO? No idea...</p>
Answer	<p>If Delivering Quality Housing Options is the "Housing outcome", I imagine most people would agree with it (why wouldn't you?). There is a setting the scene introduction and a list of laudable aims but little or no detail of how they will be funded, delivered or measured. A number of dwellings would be much more meaningful than "Double the number of Council houses built in the period 2017 – 2020". There is no context to this aim, for example if the original number is 1 then building 2 is not ambitious and challenging or transparent. Planning should ensure that all "affordable" housing required by planning policy be built and not allow developers to avoid their obligations due to alleged financial viability issues. You should not use acronyms, eg HMO.</p>
Answer	No comment
Answer	<p>You need to review the tenants who are in assisted housing but who are now in a position where they can afford to pay for a private rental. There are a number of people I know who were given housing because they didn't have enough money and had just had a child. Ten years on they are still in the same place, benefiting from the same reduced rates, but their salary is now £40K+ and they are taking up the space of someone who desperately needs the accommodation at the reduced rates.</p>
No	<p>Not an actual outcome - what would success look like</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>Need to make developers provide more small homes through stronger planning policy</p> <p>Need to control landlords across district with licensing scheme</p>
No	<p>"Double the number built in 2017 - 2020" - what on earth did you mean this to say ? What's wrong with using the actual numbers so we'll know if the target is being met ?</p> <p>"Drive down homelessness" ? - an easy bullet point to write down, but where's the detail e.g. causes of homelessness and proposed remedies ?</p> <p>"Become expert" HOW ??</p>
No	<p>...as you only promise "good" energy performance. Energy performance should be as good as possible given the lifespan of the houses.</p> <p>... as you make no reference to transport infrastructure to deal with the increase movements generated</p>
No	Aim higher - let's have environmentally sustainable homes
No	Doubling the housing might seem ambitious, but it is nowhere near enough. Housing needs to remain in Council hands for those who need it rather than for private lets.
No	Everyone should pay a land value tax and therefore own their own home
No	Everything should be aimed at increasing cheap, affordable housing. Look at the Winchester village development where a two bedroom property is 450k. Ludicrous. Allow development but insist on developers including low-priced housing.
No	<p>I agree that houses are needed, but Winchester's infrastructure is struggling to support the population level as it is.</p> <p>We are in danger of a beautiful city becoming a sprawling mass and building over some of Hampshire's most beautiful landscapes.</p>

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
No	<p>I can't agree. This is not an 'Outcome' Define 'Outcome' These are vague terms and can be interpreted in any way the Council or its officers wish.</p> <p>Obviously someone has put a lot of effort into this Document but I'm afraid it will all be meaningless unless the vacuous statements are given more teeth. The overall impression is that the document has been produced to just 'Look Good' and its not until the detail is questioned that it will represent very little in terms of sound policy</p> <p>You have said that you wish to 'Double the Number of houses built in the period 2017- 2020 " BUT you haven't said what the base is. If you have built 2 houses in 2016 you can easily double it. Without specific numerical figures the Strategy is pointless and you wont be able to measure it</p>
No	<p>I dont believe the council is doing enough to protect residents from all the HMOs tougher on landlords and landys is required to insure they intregrate in the community. Not be disruptive and be respectful.</p>
No	<p>I moved from London to get away from the urban sprawl, the noise and the dirt /dust.</p> <p>I moved to a very nice" village" close to Winchester only to find that is being subject to a vast building project close by which in turn will make it a suburb of the city.</p> <p>The authorities should be ashamed of themselves for tearing up land which will never ever be recovered as pleasant fields</p> <p>I thought I had left the concrete jungle behind. Apparently not.</p>
No	<p>If access to quality housing options means the top half of the housing market I strongly disagree. Winchester and District urgently needs to increase the supply of genuinely affordable , low-carbon housing. The current under supply is having a profoundly negative impact on low and middle income groups who cannot afford to buy or rent. This has a knock on effect on transport emissions and traffic congestion and public as people are forced to commute progressively larger distances.</p>
No	<p>If we reduced the amount of immigrants coming into the country - we wouldn't have this problem.</p>
No	<p>In outline I'm broadly in agreement with it, but there is absolutely nothing quantifiable that details what "good" means for example, so it's extremely woolly. As an example, in my mind every new house built, should as a minimum include solar water heating. It appears to the least controversial of all environmental measures and can help to reduce energy bills significantly, as well as being a major way to help our dwindling gas stocks to last longer. I can speak from experience, where my gas usage is virtually zero for the summer months and my energy bills have more than halved in the last four years.</p> <p>Personally I would like to see things taken further and newbuilds to include solar power generation, which in this day and age can mean solar tiles, not large, more obtrusive panels.</p> <p>You only have to look at what Cala Homes are thowing up on Barton Farm to see what an abject failure it is in terms of creating "Good" homes for the future. I accept that the development needs to happen, but it's worse than the "least best" option for Winchester. It might as well have been built last century for all they're doing.</p>
No	<p>It all depends where they are going?</p>
No	<p>Item one refers to energy performance of housing stock. At the moment this is set at a very low standard and really needs an ongoing program of considerable improvement.</p> <p>Item two - Doubling the number of houses proposed to be built from a very low number is still a very low number. Show the figures.</p> <p>Item three - "specialist vehicle" sounds like privatisation. If so, say it.</p>
No	<p>More affordable housing and council housing</p>
No	<p>My answer of "no" is based on an answer I'd like to make but for which there is no option, and that is "Not In Full Agreement" I think some of these objectives and plans are excellent but the balance of keeping the soul of any village or town needs to be part of this thinking.</p>
No	<p>Not quite sure about the accuracy of Para 2 above. When do you hope to double the number of houses built between 2017-2020? in 2020 when the number of houses built in that period has been counted, or in a 3 year period that follows? Or do you mean that in the period 2017-2020 you intend to double the number of house built in an unspecified period before 2017. Is it meant to double the number of houses currently in Council ownership? Please clarify!! This is why I cannot, at this stage, agree with the "housing outcome" proposal as it is incorrectly defined at the moment.</p>
No	<p>Promote the inclusion of renewable energy in all new builds and major refurbishments</p>

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
No	<p>Some of the targets are very measurable. e.g double the number of council houses. However some are not at all measurable, like become experts in finding innovative solutions for residents trying to build their own home. I've been trying to find land for a number of years now and there is simply nothing available for the likes of myself.</p> <p>I would like to see more information on how these aims will be met in reality.</p>
No	Sort the infrastructure out first for your existing citizens before attracting more people in. We don't want a bigger city with a bigger road network and a bigger shopping centre. That's not why we live here. More housing, yes, but with the supporting environmentally sensitive infrastructure so as not to ruin the place beyond repair. Hateful and divisive Council.
No	Stop buying in experts & utilise in house staff with further training if require
No	Stop DFL's (Down From London) people coming down here buying up all the housing stock and pricing local people out of the available housing. The council should double the council tax on second homes to discourage these parasites from moving down here.
No	<p>The basic problem here is that we are sharing an island with 56 million people. In 2015 the net gain in population was a further 0.5 million people. A isolated plan to just build more houses is not going to solve this. We need a plan that has two parts to it.</p> <p>1. Build more houses.</p> <p>2. Figure out how to stop the population on this island getting any bigger.</p> <p>It should be kept in mind that we only produce food for 30 million and so are completely reliant on other countries selling food to us.</p>
No	The city central areas can not take the resulting thousands more cars, all the more so when there is no transport strategy, nor any commitment to commission such a strategy
No	<p>The Council appears to be moving forward with significant expansion of housing without any attempt to deal with existing infrastructure issues. There is a severe lack of parking in the city centre made worse by the re-designation of the Chesil surface car park as yet more housing and the closing of one of the central multi storey car parks. There is a lack of adequate doctors surgeries in Winchester to meet existing demand currently impossible to get an appointment within one week.</p> <p>There appears to be no joined up thinking in the Council and the incompetence shown in the Silver Hill project beggars belief. Thank goodness it was stopped by Cllr Gottlieb.</p>
No	The council should be building more council houses which give people greater long-term security. Private rentals do not provide this. Furthermore private rentals require large deposits which the poorest in our community cannot possibly afford.
No	The District is becoming run down and less attractive. Whilst the City Centre appears neat and tidy it is looking tired and grubby. The outskirts have become overgrown and an eye sore. To build more housing will not solve existing issues. Developers are the only ones to gain from more building - where is the development going to take place, are we to see another Barton Farm.
No	The emphasis on council housing and low cost housing risks turning Winchester from a pretty, attractive and respectable tourist destination and commuter-base into a low-class location that tourists, investors and commuters will shy away from. Winchester's economy strong housing market sets it apart, and is too important to mess with.
No	The government have to stop the policy of selling council/social housing and enable the council to build council houses. Affordable is a joke. Assume a couple on minimum wage earning say £28,000 a year 5 times that is £140,000 which is not-affordable in Winchester and the mortgage is not payable.
No	<p>The overarching ambition is correct, but the numbers involved just don't even begin to stack up with what's required. For instance, doubling the number of council houses built whilst on the face of it very good – and better than doing nothing, doesn't even begin to scratch the surface. It needs to be x10 to even begin to make a difference.</p> <p>there also needs to be encouragement for home owners to adopt sustainable and low energy heating and lighting</p>
No	The priority should be to house homeless people who originate from the area, not immigrants from the UK, Europe and the rest of the world. Also priority and special help should be given to those in the teaching and health industry for example. Given the reported numbers involved this should require the building of apartment blocks or pods (i.e. prefabs), not individual council houses. The incentive should be to provide affordable apartments that people can purchase not enrich the housing development companies. The distribution of welfare payments to-date has proven to be inadequately controlled and advantage is taken of the system. Any housing program adopted must have adequate controls.
No	There is no mention of protecting green space. The council's recent house building activity has been on green space not brownfield sites, which is not acceptable when the amount of green space available for residents in Winchester is already unacceptably low.

Do you agree with the Housing outcome? - Do you have any other comment	
No	There is no point increasing affordable housing if the transport infrastructure remains in its parlous state.
No	There is too much housing being built currently in and around Winchester without the necessary other infrastructure going in (hospitals, doctors, roads, utilities, schools). Until WCC expands these other services there should be no more houses built. Winchester is full.
No	This cannot be achieved without improving infrastructure and roads, house building and planning only forms part of this.
No	<p>This is all very good, and I agree adequate housing needs to be provided for all. But an overall view needs to be considered as to how the infrastructure of Winchester will cope with the additional population and traffic.</p> <p>With 2000 homes planned for Barton farms and 200 at Winchester village, given 47% of Uk average home owners have two or more cars that is minimum of 4400 cars on our oneway system. And if Silver Hill and The Station Approach go ahead the town would be gridlock. Especially as Winchester City Council seem to be building on all the car parks with no consideration as to the impact of this on local businesses.</p>
No	<p>Top priority should be to increase rates for empty properties.</p> <p>The council should abandon its strategy of expanding population and housing provision.</p>
No	Unless new housing stock is built to the highest energy saving / sustainability standards
No	We already have enough housing companies it would be added You had a very good housing department and It it go sold off houses under right to buy and are reinventing the wheel
No	<p>What do you mean by 'quality housing'? The Decent homes standard only sets only a minimum standard; see https://england.shelter.org.uk/housing_advice/repairs/what_counts_as_a_decent_home</p> <p>If WCC had any ambition it would aim higher, such as low-carbon or zero-carbon homes. That is what is really required. Houses built now will have to cope with the climatic conditions in the second half of the 21st century. Why is there no mention of improving the insulation and energy consumption of privately owned housing in the district? Home owners could be persuaded to improve their homes (and pay less council tax if they do so?) and developers should be strongly encouraged to build only low-carbon or zero-carbon homes. Some other local councils have managed to do this.</p>
No	Where there is a disparity between supply and demand, as there is with housing, increasing supply is one option and reducing demand is another. Politicians need to grasp the nettle of understanding and addressing the reasons for growing demand, in order that as a country we live within our environmental means.
No	While some of the proposals are clearly good and necessary, phrases such as 'becoming experts in finding innovative solutions to support residents trying to buy their own homes' are meaningless and riddled with management jargon. Winchester need to provide some proper consideration as to what they are intending to do which the policy does not identify. Doubling the number of council houses is unclear. Doubling a very low construction rate or doubling the total. This is misleading.
No	Winchester is already saturated. Traffic is dreadful, pollution is illegal and there is no infrastructure for more housing.
No	Would like to see precise numbers of what is needed in this area and then as and when houses built this number reduced. There has been a huge amount of building going on in the area and no obvious counting down when figures are achieved
No	You don't state where all these houses will be build and what controls will be in place to stop development on green belt land and infilling between villages.