

Chris Clements

Throughout the papers and reports, there have been a number of points raised that contradict subsequent points in the papers, or information that does not fully support the point it is meant to. One of the main examples of this is that an Article 4 Direction will work towards the Councils Core Strategy of “creating neighbourhoods where people are proud to live”. This is despite the acknowledgement in point 5.5 of the paper that the feasibility study found no evidence to link high concentrations of HMOs with anti-social behaviour in the city. There has also been no argument sustained as to why a HMO is “worse” than a regular house in all cases. Using this legislation suggests that the different use classes of property have distinct characteristics, and limiting Use Class 4 properties (HMOs) suggests that they are inferior compared to Class 3 properties. There has been no argument as to why high concentrations of HMOs are a problem apart from rising house prices, the reverse of which can be argued with respect to causing a rise in rental prices.

One of the main “problems” that has been identified regarding “creating neighbourhoods where people are proud to live” is the existence of a largely transient population. Whilst students are generally a transient group who live in HMOs, creating purpose built accommodation blocks in the city will only increase this perceived distance from Bath as a city and place of home amongst student residents. This in turn will only amplify any problems associated with this. Throughout the private rented sector there are many other groups of society who are transient who do not occupy HMOs specifically. Alongside this, many other, less transient residents of Bath rely on HMOs and an Article 4 Direction would adversely affect these residents without solving one of the perceived problems.