

**PLANNING, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT  
AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**Minutes of the Meeting held**

Tuesday, 5th January, 2016, 2.00 pm

**Bath and North East Somerset Councillors:** Rob Appleyard (Chair), Barry Macrae (Vice-Chair), Colin Blackburn, Lisa O'Brien, Fiona Darey, Paul Crossley (In place of Cherry Beath) and David Veale

**Officers :** Lisa Bartlett (Divisional Director for Development), Simon de Beer (Group Manager for Policy & Environment), Graham Sabourn (Head of Housing) and Richard Walker (Planning Officer)

**Cabinet Members in attendance:** Councillor Liz Richardson (Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning) and Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones (Cabinet Member for Economic Development)

**35 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**36 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

**37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor Cherry Beath had sent her apologies to the Panel, Councillor Paul Crossley was present as her substitute for the duration of the meeting.

**38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Fiona Darey declared an other interest with regard to Agenda Item 12 (Student Accommodation) as she is a tutor at the University of Bath.

The Chairman, Councillor Rob Appleyard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest during Agenda Item 8 (Cabinet Member Update) as he is a Director of Curo.

**39 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

There was none.

**40 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING**

Robin Kerr, Chairman of the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FoBRA) made a statement to the Panel on the subject of the Placemaking Plan. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

*FoBRA has been tracking the Placemaking Plan for some years, as we did the Core Strategy. We have contributed to its long development assiduously, meeting with officers and probably making more comments than any other body. Its importance to Bath residents is obvious, but it is lengthy and complicated.*

*From the beginning we have wanted a Student Housing Policy, my colleague Chris Beezley is going to speak about this further later, but that duty cannot be shirked. The seemingly unstoppable expansion of our two universities, however desirable, is a ticking time-bomb threatening our citizens' ability to find homes or jobs here and placing further pressure on the Green Belt.*

*We also want to see space standards for market housing. About half of English Authorities impose minimum space standards on new commercial housing, but not B&NES, with the result that many of our new-build houses are cramped, often with less space than social housing.*

*Lastly, flooding risk, there is much in the Plan about mitigation of this risk in the Enterprise Areas, which is understandable, as otherwise no development would take place in them. However, there is a considerable likelihood some 2000 existing homes upstream, many of them Listed, and of great importance to World Heritage, yet this is hardly mentioned and no practical measures are proposed to deal with it.*

*Moreover, in the sections on development sites in Central Riverside and Manvers Street mitigation is planned for the development parts, but, scandalously, nothing for the existing properties close by, thereby condemning them to damage. In all fairness this has to be rectified and money found to carry out the necessary work.*

Councillor Barry Macrae commented that in a previous representation to the Panel the Environment Agency had clearly stated that upstream flooding would not be a problem.

Ian Herve, Abbey Ward Flood Group made a statement to the Panel on the subject of the Placemaking Plan. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

*Throughout this Draft Placemaking Plan there are many contradictory statements and much wishful thinking where flood risk in Bath is concerned. In the Bath subsection of this Plan, paragraph 122 states that the Recreation Ground "Functions as an important storage area during flood events".*

*All well and good you might say except for one missing piece of information. The flood risk maps for that area. These can be viewed on the B&NES website in the 2013 Black and Veatch Technical Note for the Bath Quays Project.*

*This shows the actual flooded areas for various Annual Probability return risk events. The Rec does indeed flood at a low risk event of a 1:25 year flow but so do the neighbouring properties. As the water rises the neat line drawn on the B&NES map does not define the flooded area.*

*This effectively means that it is now council policy to designate the basement flats of Johnstone Street, Great Pulteney Street, the houses in Pulteney Mews, those along Pulteney Road to the south of the railway bridge, Broadway and the Dolemeads and of course, Widcombe School as “important flood storage”.*

*The Environment Agency predicts that this risk will increase by 10% by 2040. This Placemaking Plan predicts that by 2020 “winter precipitation could increase by up 18% and be more intense”.*

*Paragraph 21 states that the “Council will encourage and support residents throughout Bath”. We would argue that a key element of that support has to be a more thorough recognition of the flooding risks and concrete and funded proposals for protecting the whole city, not merely sites planned for development.*

Councillor Fiona Darey said that she was aware of the concerns of Walcot residents and that a further meeting would be of benefit so that they could ask questions to the Environment Agency.

The Chairman said that he felt it was a matter that the Panel could review at a future meeting.

Chris Beezley made a statement to the Panel on the subject of Student Accommodation in Bath. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel’s Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

*For over 10 years FoBRA has been pressing B&NES to adopt a Student Housing Strategy. With the Placemaking Plan (PMP) reporting 24,000 students now, forecast to rise to 32,000 within 5 years, B&NES has acknowledged FoBRA’s concerns:*

- *that there will be considerable and ever-increasing pressure for private sector student accommodation for the foreseeable future;*
- *that Bath ‘over performs as a host to Higher Education’ (para.252);*
- *that student accommodation ‘is one of the most high profile issues affecting Bath’(para.221);*
- *that student accommodation is ‘clearly a matter that requires policy direction at a strategic and site specific level.’ (para.233); and*
- *that, as early as 2020, even with 1,000 further campus beds, there could be a shortfall of 5,000 private sector beds (para.229)*

*and yet it refuses to advocate a Student Housing Strategy (para.234).*

*The Plan proposes little scope for further accommodation blocks, and there is no indication that the universities will scale back their growth aspirations or risk building more campus bedrooms than the usual demand from new students justifies. This means that more students could find themselves homeless (a trend that has already started at the University of Bath this year) as demand for additional HMOs approaches 1,250, that is 250 per year over the next 5 years.*

*To put this into context, the Government's net additional housing allocation to Bath of 7,020 equates to 390 per year. FoBRA suggests that homeless students and/or a build rate of 640 new dwellings per year to achieve the target figure of 390 would be unsustainable, and is likely to render the PMP 'unsound'.*

*Where in the PMP does it state how the universities intend to house their future students or what increase in HMO numbers would be sustainable? Nowhere. That is why FoBRA believes that a Student Housing Strategy is so desperately needed.*

*FoBRA therefore seeks this Scrutiny Panel's assurance that the long-overdue Student Housing Strategy is now developed as a matter of urgency, is regularly reviewed, engaging openly with the universities and residents, and that the Placemaking Plan and its reviews are guided by it.*

Neil Latham, Bath Spa University made a statement to the Panel on the subject of Student Accommodation in Bath. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

*I would like to start by confirming the University's desire to work with the Council and the community in developing our plans for student housing in the city and wider region. In 2012, the University did not object to the Article 4 proposals about restrictions on the development of houses of multiple occupation (HMOs), recognising the impact in wards such as Oldfield Park and Westmoreland. In 2016, we hope to see our continued contribution to the dialogue around student housing.*

*The data presented in sections 5.10 to 5.15 of the paper does not align with our own projections, which indicate much more modest growth. We will be preparing a full response to the Placemaking Plan consultation and would welcome a meeting with the Council to jointly update the student number projections and housing estimates. In summary, by 2020/21 our estimated number of additional bedspaces is approximately 1,100 (equivalent to around two Green Park House sized developments or three Twerton Mill developments) rather than the 3,895 quoted.*

*Conscious of the impact HMOs have on the city, we are in the early stages of planning a pilot scheme to house some continuing students (i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year undergraduates).*

*We recognise that all new accommodation does not need to be in the city. We have excellent transport links into Bath, particularly on the routes from Bristol. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss possible sites with the Council that fall along those key transport routes into the city.*

*We therefore believe that Bath does not 'over perform' as a host to higher education as some people have suggested, and has the capacity to benefit from some further carefully managed expansion.*

*I would like to close by saying that our students are an extremely important part of this community. They don't just contribute economically, but bring a wealth of creativity and innovation, and also contribute to the cultural life of Bath.*

Councillor Paul Crossley asked what % of students still live at home while studying at the university.

Neil Latham replied that 7% of students are from Bath and live at home, whilst 27% of students live outside of the city but remain in family accommodation.

Councillor Paul Crossley asked if he had a timescale for the proposals relating to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year students.

Neil Latham replied that ideas were at the early planning stages.

Councillor Barry Macrae commented that he was concerned over possible new sites being developed along the A4 as this would add to traffic congestion.

Neil Latham replied that any development in Corsham would be in relation to the 50 post graduate places for that site and enable students to live and study there. He added that in terms of Keynsham sites there would be no car parking at any halls and use of public transport would be highly encouraged.

#### **41 MINUTES - 24TH NOVEMBER 2015**

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

#### **42 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE**

The Head of Housing informed the Panel that the Housing Zone capacity funding bid to DCLG to provide resident support, a viability assessment and a full time Project Officer to manage the Council's involvement in the regeneration of Foxhill and the development of Mulberry Park had been successful. He added that the level of detail was not known at this stage, but the figure was £313,000.

Councillor Paul Crossley asked in terms of gypsy and traveller sites what the unmet demand of the travelling community is.

The Head of Housing replied that the full transit need had been met and that they were 10 permanent pitches short from what was originally identified.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment added that identifying new pitches was in the work programme for the coming 2 to 3 years and that an options document could be published towards the end of 2016 or the beginning of 2017.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien said that she was pleased to read about the successful remodeling and extension of a property in Keynsham, but that she was aware of a similar property that was having difficulty in securing funding.

The Head of Housing said that he was aware of the case referred to by Councillor O'Brien as the costs were higher than the current threshold for funding. He added that low interest loans are available in these circumstances providing security can be given.

The Head of Housing informed the Panel that the annual estimate of rough sleeper numbers was carried out in November in partnership with DHI Reach and Julian House. Twenty two people were identified as rough sleeping, which is a reduction from twenty seven in 2014 and thirty three in 2013.

He said that the Government funding stream for this service was due to end in March 2016. However, the Supporting People & Commissioning Team has confirmed that new funding has been identified for 2016/17.

#### **43 WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT SPATIAL PLAN**

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment introduced this item to the Panel. He explained that the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) is being prepared by the officers of the four UAs and that the costs of which are being managed within existing budgets. However, additional funding has been required to procure specialist expertise and for the public consultation process. It is proposed that this will be funded during 2015/16 from reserves.

He stated that the Joint Transport Study (JTS) is being undertaken by Atkins on behalf of the West of England Councils. The need for additional resource input from Atkins is presently being reviewed, to support the initial transport assessment of JSP options. This is likely to entail a small additional funding requirement from B&NES and the other UAs, the source for which will be identified and approval sought through usual process prior to any further commitment.

He said that chapter 3 of the document sets out the evidence on the quantum of development that needs to be accommodated. In summary, the Wider Bristol Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that around 85,000 dwellings are needed between 2016 and 2036. Around 56,000 are already identified in existing plans leaving around 30,000 still to find. The affordable housing needed between 2016 and 2036 is around 30,000 of which around 20,000 still need to be identified.

He added that the JTS is being undertaken alongside the JSP with complementary milestones. The first stage of the JTS has assessed the performance of the current transport network, study objectives and outline concepts for investment in improving the transport network. In addition, the Issues and Options document includes a commentary on transport issues and a transport-focused spatial scenario.

He informed the Panel that the consultation period closes on January 29<sup>th</sup> 2016 and that a draft Plan could be expected towards the middle of this year.

Councillor Paul Crossley asked if the 'vision' within the Plan had been adopted by any of the four UAs. He stated that he did not agree with it in its entirety.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that this vision had taken key points from existing versions across the four UAs based upon the agreed Strategic Economic Plan, but that no overall agreement for it had yet been received.

Councillor Paul Crossley commented that the housing shortfall in his opinion was through Bristol's inability and their lacking of a High Buildings Strategy.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that the three other authorities encouraged Bristol to complete work relating to urban intensification and that they have acknowledged there is a need for a "step change" in their approach.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien commented that she felt it was a rose tinted vision that was over ambitious and not a solid blueprint. She asked if any consideration had been given to discussing development outside of the four UAs, Monmouthshire for example.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that discussions have only been in relation to the prescribed areas of the SHMA.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien said that she was aware of a number of people that are choosing to live in lower cost homes in Wales and then commute into the area for work. She added that she didn't feel that this element should be ruled out.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that there was a strict process to this work and that the needs of the identified areas must be met first. She added that there were 2 to 3 phases to the process and that discussions were ongoing between the UAs.

Councillor Paul Crossley commented that action should be taken on sites that have planning permission, but have not been developed. He said that it was also too easy to convert employment sites into housing.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that they have highlighted the issue of change of use to the Government as a problem locally.

Councillor Barry Macrae said that he would like to see a timeline of events published for these documents. He added that the needs of our residents must be protected with the correct infrastructure in place.

Councillor Fiona Darey asked if Bristol were truly aware of their need to change.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that they were and that we were awaiting their Urban Intensification document. He said that this was expected in January / February and could be shared with the Panel.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien said that in her opinion the area of North West Bristol / Severnside was the ideal area for development of housing and employment sites. She added that she wished to applaud the Joint Transport work that had been carried out

The Chairman asked if there was a hierarchy to the documents involved in this work area.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that the recently adopted Local Plan takes precedent and that the JSP would guide further Core Strategy work.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to ask that their comments on the West of England Joint Spatial Plan Issues and Options Document and the Joint Transport Study be taken into consideration as part of the consultation process.

#### **44 DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN FOR BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment introduced this item to the Panel, He explained that the draft Placemaking Plan includes;

- Spatial frameworks for Bath, Keynsham, the Somer Valley & the Rural Areas. It allocates sites for development where these are necessary to deliver the strategy, setting out the required land-use mix and the development principles.
- Designations where there is a need to identify and protect valued assets, such as important open hillsides or Local Green Space
- Identifies schemes to be implemented such as road or cycleway improvements
- Generic criteria-based planning policies

He said that the consultation period ends on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016 and any comments from the Panel can be taken into account as part of the forthcoming examination process.

He stated that in Bath, the key issue is how to facilitate the Council's ambitions for growth and change in a relatively small city, recognized for its unique heritage and environment and constrained by the Green Belt. The development of the spatial strategy has therefore required that the Council make choices, in order to ensure its key priorities are met. The Plan reflects the ambitions of the Economic Strategy the Housing & Well-being Strategy and the Bath Transport Strategy. In particular the proposals of the Bath Enterprise Area Masterplan have been formalised. The Plan highlights the transport interventions that are needed to realise the District's growth proposals.

In Keynsham, the Plan seeks to build on the growing strengths of the town, providing a Masterplan for future change. This takes account of the significant growth contained in the Core Strategy. It seeks to consolidate this growth and address the identified key issues facing the town. It includes the allocation of Riverside for mixed use, residential led development including a replacement Leisure Centre. He said that a key element of the strategy for the town is the need to regenerate the High Street and the Plan includes a number of policies to achieve this.

In the Somer Valley, the Plan focuses on regeneration in light of the Core Strategy objectives of seeking a greater balance between homes and jobs. Both Midsomer Norton and Westfield are preparing their own Neighbourhood Plans and the Placemaking Plan complements the Neighbourhood Plans.

In the rural areas, B&NES has worked closely with the parishes to produce spatial frameworks for inclusion either in the Placemaking Plan or in their own Neighbourhood Plans. The approach has been to identify locations for new



development where required in consultation with the local communities whilst identifying the key environmental assets for protection and conservation.

Councillor Paul Crossley questioned the need for approx. 30,000 m<sup>2</sup> of comparison retail up until 2029 as a vast majority of people now do their shopping on the internet.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that this recommendation was within the Plan following advice that had been sought by retail experts.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien commented that whilst internet sales were obviously massive a great number of people still look at items in shops prior to purchasing. She added that to some the whole process of shopping remains an aspect of enjoyment and a pleasurable leisure experience.

The Chairman asked if the Council has a policy that controls the heights of buildings within the City.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that a study had been previously carried out and that this evidence base had been used to formulate the policies in the Draft Plan.

The Chairman asked if as the views of officers and developers will differ would it not be better to firm up our position through a policy.

The Divisional Director for Development said that the Building Heights Study was a thorough piece of work and it has been and would continue to be used by developers and officers to assess development with the benefit of the new draft policies.

Councillor Fiona Darey said that she thought the Plan was an impressive document but asked why there was a lack of guidelines on room areas / heights.

The Group Manager for Policy & Environment replied that including space standards within the Plan was considered but the approach is not supported by Government guidance.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to ask that their comments on the Pre-submission Draft Placemaking Plan be taken into account during this consultation process.

## **45 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

The Divisional Director for Development introduced this item. She explained that the Council has worked closely with local communities in both preparing neighbourhood plans and on the Placemaking Plan. She stated that there are currently three 'made' plans which have been brought into force (Stowey Sutton, Freshford & Limpley Stoke and Clutton) and another 10 plans under preparation with 6-7 expected to be 'made' by the end of 2016.

She said that a number of the Parish and Town Councils have sought to allocate sites or designate local green spaces via the Placemaking Plan rather than through a Neighbourhood Plan. This is an efficient way for the Parish and Town Councils to

impact on development locally without incurring the additional work of a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chairman asked if these Parish & Town Councils were still able to receive CIL funding.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that once the Neighbourhood Plan is made (adopted), a parish will receive 25% of CIL payments for development within their Neighbourhood Area, in line with the CIL Regulations (rather than the typical 15%).

The Panel **RESOLVED** to note the current position on Neighbourhood Planning in B&NES.

#### **46 STUDENT ACCOMMODATION - SCENE SETTING**

The Chairman commented that he welcomed this report as decisions need to be made on how we work in the future regarding this subject.

The Divisional Director for Development introduced the report to the Panel. She explained that at the time of the preparation, examination and adoption of the Core Strategy in 2013/14 the combined published growth forecasts/corporate plans of both institutions were lower than the growth rates achieved prior to 2011.

She said that the data provided by the University of Bath (UoB) in July 2015 shows that it aspires to grow from around 14,000 registered students in 2011/12 to around 19,300 in 2020/21. The forecast growth is very much set to be oriented towards full time study, which generates the greatest need for further study bedrooms. The aspiration is therefore for 5,300 more students and this would equate to a need for 4,700 more bed spaces to 2020/21.

She said that the data provided by Bath Spa University (BSU) between March and July 2015 lacks clarity in respect of future changes in actual students, their mode of study and accommodation needs revising. She added that in its representations at Options stage it stated that it aspired to grow from 6,632 FTEs (full time equivalents) in 2014/15 to 10,500 FTEs in 2020/21. This was broken down by year group but not mode of study. In response to the Council's request to back date FTEs figures to 2011/12 the University provided a figure of 6,060. Total aspired to FTE change for the current decade is therefore around 4,500.

She stated that on the basis of the representations received at the Placemaking Plan Options Stage (Jan- July 2015) it is prudent for the Development Plan to assume in total that:

- aspired to enrolment would see numbers increase from around 22,500 to around 31,700 (+9,200) to 2020/21
- accommodation needs would increase from 16,300 to 24,800 (+8,500)
- that these figures are only to 2020/21 and that if they are not achieved by then, that they may be achieved later in the Plan period. If they are achieved then further growth may be aspired to later in the plan period.

She explained that in December 2015, the Council had taken into account dedicated new supply (on and off-campus) that has been built since 2011, is under construction or is permitted, and estimated additional capacity of not more than 1,000 within specific areas currently shown for accommodation development in the UoB masterplan (2014 update). Exclusive use developments yield around 3,000 bed spaces (1,700 to UoB and 1,300 to BSU). A further 944 bedspaces that are built, under construction or permitted are currently or potentially available to any student.

She said that the Council still seeks to enable, as far as possible, the continued success of The UoB and BSU and the contribution they make to the city's identity, profile and employment base, and their wider contribution to the UK skilled workforce and GVA. However, in terms of the strategy for Bath, the University development requirements and aspirations form part of a whole suite of demands on a highly constrained city, which is a relatively small as a host for two universities and which has a limited land supply for meeting all development needs in full.

She stated that the development of new academic space and student accommodation are clearly matters that require policy direction in the Local Plan at a strategic and site specific level. The Council is mindful that the growth in student numbers has not been accompanied by sufficient on-campus study bedrooms but that the associated expansion of the student lettings market (which the National Planning Practice Guidance or NPPG allows as part of the solution to student housing issues) has diminished the 'normal' housing stock of the city, cancelling out, in part, gross additions to the stock. She added that whilst a student HMO sector is a common feature of University towns its current size in relation to Bath is already a cause for concern and the idea of it increasing further exacerbates this concern for interest groups including residents associations and those seeking to secure a house to rent or buy. The issues relate to the retention of mixed neighbourhoods in the city and also the maintenance of the conventional stock of residential properties from a strategic perspective.

She said that some stakeholders have requested a dedicated student accommodation strategy to inform planning policy. In the Council's view the reality for Bath is that the approach to this issue cannot stand alone outside of an overall integrated suite of planning policies for the whole city that considers and balances all uses and all issues.

She informed the Panel that site allocation policies have been made for the UoB campus at Claverton Down (including the Sulis Club) and for BSU campus (but not including Sion Hill for which generic development management policies will be used to manage change). The UoB's and BSU's work in preparing and consulting on estate and campus masterplans demonstrates the value of proceeding on a strategic basis and has provided part of the evidence base to inform planning policy for future development.

Councillor Barry Macrae said that he agreed with the view that this matter cannot be discussed in isolation. He added that the loss of communities is a concern and that if accommodation sites were to move to rural areas and students were to then commute what effect would this have on other members of the public.

He called for the Universities to contribute fully to this process and welcomed any subsequent debate on the matter.

Councillor Lisa O'Brien asked if the true cost of the summer lettings option had been configured.

The Planning Officer replied that this had not been carried out yet as aspirations can go up and down. He added that sites along the river corridor were being sought. Councillor Paul Crossley asked if any firm proposals had been put forward for the BMW site on the Lower Bristol Road.

The Planning Officer replied that no definitive proposal had been received.

The Chairman asked if a Memorandum of Understanding should be sought between the Council and the Universities to have a holding number of students for a period of time.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that ongoing discussions were taking place with both Universities.

The Planning Officer added that he was aware that Bath Spa University had taken part in a number of discussions with the Council over the past few years.

Councillor Colin Blackburn asked if there had been any studies regarding the possibility of returning current HMOs into regular housing stock.

The Planning Officer replied that he felt it was unlikely that any current HMO would return to its former state.

Councillor Colin Blackburn said that he would be keen to see the Council's thoughts on extending the Article 4 direction to other parts of the City.

Councillor Fiona Darey asked if it was possible to define under the licence the category of residents that live in a particular HMO e.g. Young professionals / students.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that the Planning process does not allow the Council to be that descriptive.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that he endorsed the views of Councillor Blackburn regarding extending the Article 4 direction. He added that it was important for the standards of the property and the responsibilities of the landlord to be identified.

Councillor Liz Richardson, Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning commented that some discussions on this matter have taken place within the Local Development Framework Steering Group. She added that she felt that there were still some properties within the area that are not licensed.

The Chairman asked if officers were supportive of the role that HMOs currently play within the Council.

The Divisional Director for Development replied that the matter of HMOs should not be seen solely as a student issue. She added that she would discuss the SPD with Councillor Richardson.

Councillor Colin Blackburn said that he would welcome further discussion on the matter as he believed that HMOs for young professionals were invaluable.

Neil Latham stated that Bath Spa University would be writing a written contribution as part of the current consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to ask that their comments on the strategy contained in the Draft Placemaking Plan for responding to the demands for student accommodation be taken into account.

**47 PANEL WORKPLAN**

The Panel confirmed their current workplan as printed in the agenda pack.

The meeting ended at 5.05 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**