Consultation Report on Houses in Multiple Occupation & Purpose Built Student Accommodation

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) City and County of Swansea Council July 2017

LICHFIELDS

31445/GW/SDv 13727450v1

1.0 Introduction

- A total of 195 responses were received as part of the 6 week public consultation between 23rd January – 5th March 2017. Responses were received via the Council's website e-consultation system, via email and on paper.
- ^{1.2} Of those who completed the consultation response forms, 38 respondents ticked that they were making an objection, 3 noted they were in support, and 32 respondents indicated they were making a comment.
- All responses have been reviewed in the table below. Comments raised have been categorised into issues/themes and the Council's response provided within a separate column adjacent to each. In addition, the table outlines the changes that have been made to the SPG document as a result.

Theme	Issues Raised	Response	Changes to SPG
1. Issues raised with the format of the SPG, the	The SPG should be written in plain English.	A full review of the SPG has been undertaken to ensure that the document is clear and understandable.	General changes have been made throughout the document to ensure
language and clarity.	Further clarity and definition required on key phrases e.g. 'material consideration'; 'exceptional circumstances' that would outweigh the	Where necessary further clarity and definition has been provided within the SPG e.g. 'material considerations' in Chapter 2.	Further definitions have been included within Chapter 2: Terms of Reference.
	harmful concentration and intensification of a HMO; and ' no adverse effect'. Concern was raised that there were areas of vagueness which are open to interpretation.	Having two separate documents was considered. However, as HMOs and PBSA are interrelated, a strategic approach has been taken by the Council to address the issues and	A monitoring section has been added to the SPG outlining the frequency of the SPG review and monitoring (paragraph 1.6).
	There should be two separate SPG documents - one for HMOs and another for PBSA.	having one document enables the issues to be considered alongside one another. This was concluded to be the most appropriate option.	
	Concern was raised that the maps were not easy to understand and should be simplified.	The maps are clearly annotated and have keys to define the data illustrated. Difficulties experienced are mainly due to the large-scale nature of some of the	
	The SPG should be reviewed regularly so that it is fit for purpose and for the Council's HMO register to be kept up- to-date.	maps. This is an inherent difficulty when considering data on a Local Authority scale. Maps have been simplified where possible.	
		It is the Council's intention that the SPG will firstly be reviewed when the Local Development Plan (LDP) is	
		adopted to ensure it is compatible with the new development plan policy	
		framework. It will subsequently from	D= 2

		this be regularly monitored.	
2. Consultation undertaken as part of the drafting of the SPG	Why were residents not part of the stakeholder group used to draft the SPG? Perceptions that there was not enough publicity about the SPG.	The Council's database of licensed HMOs is updated regularly by the Council's Housing and Public Health Team and the HMO public register (available on the Council's website) is updated approximately every 4 weeks. In terms of unlicensed HMOs, the Council's Housing and Public Health Team is currently undertaking survey work in the St Thomas ward to identify potential further HMOs. The results of the survey will be reported back to the Cabinet Member. Councillors were consulted in drafting the consultation document so they could represent the views of their local Ward constituents ahead of the full public consultation on the draft document. This was achieved through the consultation with the Student Liaison Forum, the Scrutiny Working Group and the Councillor Workshop. The Council then undertook a 6 week public consultation during which Officers hosted a drop-in event to	After careful consideration of these comments it was felt that no changes were required to the SPG for the reasons set out in the response. The level of engagement and publicity undertaken on this SPG has been appropriate.
		answer queries from members of the public. Direct email notifications about the public consultation period were sent to members of the public who requested to be informed or who had	

[
		commented on relevant policies in the	
		recent Deposit LDP consultation. Press	
		and social media publicity was	
		undertaken before and throughout the	
		consultation period (further details are	
		provided in Appendix 2 of the SPG).	
3. Comments	Respondents highlighted the need for	The Council's database of licensed	Additional text has been added to
relating to the	robust evidence to be obtained to	HMOs is updated regularly by the	paragraph 4.14 to further recognise
Evidence base	identify HMOs that are outside the	Council's Housing and Public Health	that HMOs provide important
	'Additional Licensing' areas of Castle	Team and the HMO public register	accommodation for students and
	and Uplands Wards, and the	(available on the Council's website) is	non-students.
	requirement for this information to be	updated approximately every 4 weeks.	
	continuously kept up to date. It was		No additional information is needed
	considered that more work is required	In order to understand the full extent of	in relation to the increase in student
	to ensure account is taken of all	HMOs within the radius areas to be	numbers and university expansion
	existing HMOs (unlicensed and	applied the LPA will, for proposals in	plans.
	licenced) as part of this SPG.	Uplands and Castle Ward, use the	
	, ,	Council's public register of licensed	Reference to the 'bedroom tax' has
	Increase in students living and studying	1 3	been included at paragraph 4.16.
	in Swansea, not least as a result of	The public register of licensed HMOs is	
	significant university expansion, should		
	be further reflected in the Evidence	Housing and Public Health Team. For	
	Base.	all HMO proposals, including those	
		outside this Additional Licensing Area,	
	It was noted that the SPG should	the LPA will draw upon all available	
	include more emphasis on the fact that	•	
	HMOs provide important	addition, when calculating the	
	accommodation for non-students -	proportion of HMOs, the LPA will also	
	particularly asylum seekers and	consider representations received as	
	immigrants. This is also important in	part of the consultation process on	
	the context of Welfare Reform which	planning applications in order to	
	was noted to have impacts on those	establish the use of properties.	
	not just under 35 years - but those who	· · ·	
	will be impacted by the 'spare room	Additional Licensing Area outside	
<u> </u>			

subsidy'. Perception that the SPG is not "founded on a comprehensive and up to date evidence base", and that it is based on evidence from existing HMO licensing records and therefore could exclude current HMOs which are not licensed in St Thomas Ward.	Uplands and Castle Wards, the Council is actively reviewing the evidence available in this regard to establish whether other areas meet the criteria for such a designation. Appropriate surveys, inspections and engagement will be carried out to provide the necessary evidence to underpin such a designation, which will highlight whether a significant proportion of HMOs in a given area are being ineffectively managed and likely to give rise to one or more particular problems, either for those occupying the HMOs or for members or the public. Chapter 4 of the SPG sets out that there has been an increase in the number of students with both universities on average growing by 4% per annum over the last 15 years. It also recognises the future plans of the two Universities to grow its student numbers and their expansion plans, including the new Swansea University Bay Campus and UWTSD SA1 Waterfront innovation Quarter. It is considered therefore that the increase of students living and studying in Swansea and the Universities'	
	considered therefore that the increase	

HMOs provide important accommodation for non-students. However, further text has been added to paragraph 4.14 to emphasise this. It is not considered necessary though to describe in further detail the different circumstances of non-students who might need/choose HMO accommodation.	
The SPG recognises the impact of Welfare Reform on the demand for HMOs. Reference is made to the forthcoming changes to Housing Benefit which will reduce payments to social tenants if their rent is currently higher than the amount of Housing Benefit they would receive in the private rented sector (see paragraph 4.15 in particular). However, it is recognised that the SPG does not make specific reference to the impact of the 'spare room' tax and therefore additional text has been added on this in paragraph 4.16.	
The evidence base for the SPG is founded on the most up-to-date data which is currently available. The SPG does recognise that there may be properties that now fall under the new C4 HMO use class, that are not recorded on any Council licensing or planning database. As a result, the	

		SPG recognises that the production and maintenance of a comprehensive database mapping Use Class C4 HMOs outside of Castle and Uplands Wards will be an important and urgent task for the Council to support the application of this SPG. In addition, the Council's Housing and Public Health Team is currently undertaking survey work in the St Thomas ward to identify potential HMOs. When considering individual planning applications for a conversion to a HMO, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will draw on up-to-date information to inform their decision. This will include the Council's public register of licensed HMOs and other information in the public domain. The LPA will work closely with the Housing and Public Health Team, particularly in relation to applications outside of the Additional Licensing Areas. The LPA may carry out a site visit.	
4. HMO Threshold Levels and boundary	on the threshold level. The majority of comments received considered that the threshold level within the HMO Management Area was too high -	HMOs have an important role in providing affordable housing choice, however, the research and evidence undertaken as part of the SPG shows that there is correlation between areas with high densities of HMOs, and	The threshold level within the HMO Management Areas has been changed from 30% to 25%. Additional wording has been added to make it clearer that the

	community cohesion issues. It is	concentration test takes into account
	therefore important to achieve a	the impact of the additional
	balance of managing the	(proposed) HMO and all properties
	concentrations of HMOs in the public	within the radius irrespective of land
threshold within the HMO Management	interest, whilst also allowing for some	use.
Areas should be raised to 50%. 5%	sustainable growth to meet demand.	
was specifically identified as being		
appropriate in the St Thomas and	Swansea has an uneven concentration	
Uplands wards, but also in all areas	of licensed HMOs. The research	
outside the HMO Management Area. A	undertaken to evidence the SPG	
5% 'buffer' threshold was suggested as	clearly shows the distinct pattern that	
appropriate in Uplands around the	characterises the provision of HMOs in	
HMO Management Area. Suggestions	Swansea, which is partly due to the	
were made that there should not be a	location and relative proximity of the	
two-tiered approach and that one	City's universities, but also the mixed	
threshold of 10% should be applied	use nature of certain areas within more	
across Swansea.	dense, urban areas of the County,	
	including near the City Centre. A	
Objections were raised to any further	single figure blanket threshold across	
increase in HMOs particularly in	the County would not reflect the	
Uplands and Brynmill. Comments were	evidence regarding the nature of	
made that the SPG should impose a 5	Swansea, the differences in character	
year moratorium on further HMO	of areas and the future needs to allow	
conversions in Brynmill and Uplands -	sustainable low level growth of HMOs.	
and other communities where current	A two-tier threshold approach is	
concentrations are over 40%.	therefore necessary, to limit any further	
	harmful concentration or intensification	
Representations recognised the need	of HMOs within the HMO Management	
•	Area (which comprises parts of	
for students - who contribute to the	Uplands and Castle wards) where	
Swansea economy.	HMO levels are already very high,	
	whilst also allowing some limited	
It was felt that the wording of the	opportunities for future HMO provision	
criteria test should be made clearer –	to be more sustainably dispersed to	

	namely that the concentrations should	other areas in a managed manner.	
	be calculated taking into account the		
	impact of the proposed additional	Appendix 4 of the SPG includes a map	
	HMO.	which shows the current concentration	
		of licenced HMOs on a Lower Super	
	It was queried whether adopting a	Output Area (LSOA) scale. Whilst this	
	criteria approach for decision making	scale is obviously larger than the radius	
	around HMOs is a more subjective	to be used in calculating the threshold,	
	approach compared to exercising a	it serves to demonstrate that the	
	more scientific approach.	majority of the proposed HMO	
		Management Area includes current	
	Some specific queries were made	concentrations of 10.1-20.0%, 20.1 -	
	about the HMO Management Area	30.0% and >30.0%. A 30% threshold	
	Boundary. Its western boundary was	was consulted upon for this area.	
	queried, it was felt that it includes some		
	streets that comprise predominantly	On reflection and following further	
	owner occupied family homes. Some	sampling and analysis it has been	
	comments felt that the Boundary	concluded that, having regard to the	
	should be extended to incorporate	representations received, the SPG	
	more areas with larger houses which it	should be amended and that the	
	was felt do not lend themselves to	threshold should be reduced to 25% in	
	family homes including areas north of	light of this further analysis in order to	
	Sketty Road.	encourage future provision to be more	
		dispersed. The 25% figure strikes an	
		appropriate balance between	
		responding to the evidence on	
		demographic patterns and character	
		areas, alongside the desire to support	
		balanced communities, which in certain	
		areas will include family housing,	
		shared living, and other uses such as	
		commercial use. The analysis	
		undertaken to evidence the SPG has	
		highlighted that, given the relative size	
L	1		

[1
	of the proposed HMO Management	
	Area, the existing location of HMOs,	
	and the needs of the County in respect	
	of providing affordable accommodation	
	for shared users, a figure lower than	
	25% would not achieve an appropriate	
	balance as described above. The	
	research undertaken to evidence the	
	SPG highlighted that other Authorities	
	have used a range of threshold figures,	
	however it is imperative that Swansea	
	applies a figure that is appropriate for	
	this Authority. In the case of Cardiff for	
	example, the 20% figure that is	
	identified for a 'Management Area'	
	applies to an area much larger than	
	that proposed for Swansea, thereby	
	allowing scope for a higher volume of	
	growth. The cordon for Swansea is	
	drawn tighter having regard to the	
	specific issues that apply in Swansea	
	as described in the SPG.	
	The 10% threshold that is proposed in	
	the SPG for all areas outside of the	
	HMO Management Area is based on	
	the so called 'tipping point' identified in	
	National Research referenced in the	
	SPG. A reduction to 5% was not	
	considered appropriate or justifiable in	
	light of this evidence, and such a	
	reduction could not be sustained at	
	appeal. This also applies to the	
	proposal by consultees to apply 5% as	
L]

a 'buffer' at the edge of the HMO Management Area i.e. individual applications for HMOs must be considered having regard to their particular impact and, again, there is no evidence to support the application of 5% as being a justifiable figure above which any adverse impact would be sustained to the character or balance of a community. Furthermore, the notion of a 'buffer' is likely to have the effect of increasing pressure either side of any delineated area of this nature, leading to a less disbursed pattern at the fringes. In applying the concentration test – the calculation will take into account the impact of the proposed additional HMO property. The calculation will include all properties (individual planning units) of all uses located within the radius, not iust residential uses. Proposals for conversion to a HMO will be expected to meet all of the criteria specified within UDP Policy HC5 'Houses in Multiple Occupation'. The threshold is therefore only one test that the HMO must meet, and all other criteria also apply, such as impact on residential amenity, character, parking etc.

The boundary was defined following
analysis of the existing concentrations
of HMOs and other factors. Within
much of the defined boundary there are
already high concentrations of HMOs
and as such the 25% threshold will limit
any further harmful concentration or
intensification within this area, to the
extent that proposals for a HMO will
normally be resisted where it would
result in more than one in four
properties being HMOs with the
radius. The effect of applying the
threshold will be to significantly limit the
opportunity for further HMOs within this
defined HMO Management Area,
therefore the boundary has been drawn
to include some limited opportunities
for establishment of HMOs to
sustainably satisfy demand and future
needs for affordable housing, at
sustainable locations within attractive
walking distance to the University. The
boundary takes into account the
character of properties (e.g. detached
dwellings are generally omitted as they
are not typically converted to HMOs),
and extends only as far as Sketty Road
in the north to create a clear and
defensible boundary.

5.HMO	Comments were received in relation to	It is considered appropriate to take a	After careful consideration of these
Exceptions	the paragraphs in the SPG which allow	flexible approach to HMO proposals, in	comments it was felt that no changes
	for flexibility in the application of the	exceptional circumstances, to ensure	to the SPG were necessary for the
	threshold test in exceptional	the sustainable use of properties rather	reasons set out in the response.
	circumstances in the case of 'very high'		
	concentrations. The majority felt there	long periods – which in themselves can	
	should be no flexibility.	have negative impacts.	
	It was considered that the 80%	The test for exceptional case is	
	threshold proposed should be reduced	rigorous and applicants will be required	
	to 50%.	to submit robust evidence to	
		demonstrate why an exceptional case	
	It was considered that the exceptions	is justified.	
	should not apply if the concentration		
	threshold is breached. It was felt that a	It is not considered appropriate to	
	flexible approach to applications need	reduce the threshold level from 80% to	
	not be applied to larger dwellings in	50% as the Council considers this	
	areas of high HMO concentration as	flexibility should only apply in	
	the draft SPG suggests, although	exceptional circumstances.	
	conversely it was considered that the	Eventional test no. 2 energifically	
	SPG needs to encourage larger (empty) houses to be converted to	Exceptional test no. 3 specifically references any particular	
	HMOs and concerns were raised about	characteristics of the property (e.g.	
	whether people would be able to sell	scale or layout) which make it suited to	
	large homes in these areas.	HMO use and unsuitable for other uses	
		such as C3.	
	It was raised that many purchasers are		
	discouraged from buying a house in	Normally, planning permission will only	
	areas with high HMO levels therefore it		
	was queried whether including an	bedrooms in a property, if the increase	
	exception clause seeking properties to	results in the change of use of the	
	be placed on the market for over 6	property from a C4 HMO to a Sui	
	months prior to being converted was	Generis HMO, or if physical alterations	
	appropriate.	are required to the property to facilitate	

6. HMO Radius	It was perceived that an additional clause was needed to state that planning applications seeking permission to increase the number of bedrooms in a property should be resisted, unless evidence is submitted to demonstrate that the property has been unsuccessfully marketed for a 6 month period.	the increase in number of bedrooms. In such circumstances, the planning application will be determined in accordance with adopted planning policies. As such, it is not considered appropriate to apply a clause which seeks to resist the increase in number of bedrooms unless evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the property has been unsuccessfully marketed for a 6 month period, as other policies apply to ensure that the proposal is acceptable.	
approach	methodology should be applied, rather than a radius approach.		from 65m to 50m.
		considered to more accurately reflect	With regard to the evidence, the
	There was agreement with the principle of a radius approach but that the radius should be decreased to 50m.	the spatial extent of the likely impacts	SPG has been amended to state that: in instances where a HMO proposal
	Should be decreased to som.	adjacent streets. Furthermore, streets	outside the Management Area is on
	It was suggested that a method be used which considers concentration on a radius basis in parallel with an analysis of concentration by street.	will vary considerably in length, thereby being likely to produce non- representative outcomes in terms of identifying concentrations, whereas a	u
	analysis of concentration by street.	radius approach provides a more	street will be permitted to be millios.
	HMO properties with less than 50% of its frontage should be counted within	consistent, meaningful approach.	in instances where a HMO proposal inside the Management Area is on a
	the radius.	In response to concerns raised during the consultation however, the SPG has been amended to ensure the guidance	small street (definition provided), no more than 25% of the total number of all properties on that street will be
		does take account of instances where 'small streets' (which can include	permitted to be HMOs
		distinct small sub-sections of long	

streets) fall within the defined 50m radius area. Sampling undertaken to evidence the SPG has demonstrated that there could be occasions where there is a disproportionate concentration of HMOs in a single small street, where there are few or even no other HMOs in other streets within the radius area. This could result in the scenario where a proposal would pass the radius threshold test despite creating a harmful concentration of HMOs in the small street. As such, having regard to the evidence, the SPG has been amended to state that: in instances where a HMO is on a small street (definition provided), no more than 10%/25% of the total number of all properties on that street will be permitted to be HMOs, depending on whether the proposal is within or outside the Management Area. A 65m radius was consulted upon originally, however as a result of comments received in this public consultation further analysis has been undertaken on the merits of using a	
50m radius. On balance it has been concluded that a 50m radius would take appropriate account of the direct	
impacts of a HMO and the radius has been amended accordingly.	

7. Impact of high concentrations of HMOs on residential amenity.	A large number of comments received on the SPG referenced the impacts concentrations of HMOs are considered to have on general residential amenity e.g. litter, poor maintenance and disrepair of some properties, to-let signs, anti-social behaviour, crime, noise, general community cohesion etc.	Section 4 of the SPG includes analysis of the impacts of HMO concentrations. This includes the recognition of the impact on the viability of schools through falling rolls, increased litter, and the reduction in the quality of the local environment, including high numbers of letting signs. Section 4 is considered to adequately summarise the key impacts.	Additional background information has been provided in the SPG on the Council's Voluntary Code for Letting Boards. After careful consideration of the comments received, no further changes to the SPG were felt to be necessary for the reasons set out in the response.
	More mention needs to be made of the negative impact of high concentrations of HMOs on schools.	Specifically in relation to letting boards, the Council has a Voluntary Code for landlords and their agents (adopted in	
	The appearance of letting boards is negative and should be recognised in the SPG.	December 2013). The code aims to control visual impact of 'To Let' boards whilst allowing landlords to legitimately advertise their properties. This SPG	
	Specifically in relation to refuse, it was considered the issue of vermin control needs to be referenced in the SPG.	does not seek to duplicate these wider measures in place.	
	It was considered that bin storage was potentially appropriate to the front of properties, if kept tidy.	UDP Policy HC5 'Houses in Multiple Occupation', criterion 'v' requires all proposals for HMOs to provide appropriate refuse storage arrangement. Paragraphs 5.44 to 5.46	
	Sound insulation should be required for all C4 HMOs as well as larger ones. SPG needs to be more specific about what is meant by noise insulation "may		
	be required" in the SPG. The SPG should consider the impact of	rear of properties. However, recognising that this may not always be possible, the paragraph goes onto say that proposals for refuse storage to the	

impacts of doors slamming.front of properties will not be permitted, if they detract from the local streetEnsure through the SPG that HMOs do not alter the front external appearance of properties to the detriment of the street.front of properties storage to the front. It further notes that details of the proposed refuse storage arrangements must be provided with the planning application, and as such each application will be assessed on its own merit.It was queried whether there is a means by which landlords can be made more responsible for their tenant's refuse and the propertyThe SPG considers it appropriate to consider noise insulation when converting existing properties into larger HMOs (more than 6 percents)			
appearance e.g. incence clauses, links and/or enforcement The SPG needs to recognise that well- managed HMOs do not cause problems. problems. UDP Policy HC5 'Houses in Multiple Occupation' notes at criterion 'iii' that proposals for conversion of properties to HMO will only be permitted where there would be no adverse effect upon the external appearance of the property and the character of the locality.	Ensure through the SPG that HMOs do not alter the front external appearance of properties to the detriment of the street. The loss of front gardens to make way for parking should be avoided. It was queried whether there is a means by which landlords can be made more responsible for their tenant's refuse and the property appearance e.g. licence clauses, fines and/or enforcement The SPG needs to recognise that well- managed HMOs do not cause	if they detract from the local street scene. The SPG does not therefore prevent refuse storage to the front. It further notes that details of the proposed refuse storage arrangements must be provided with the planning application, and as such each application will be assessed on its own merit. The SPG considers it appropriate to consider noise insulation when converting existing properties into larger HMOs (more than 6 persons – Sui Generis Use Class). However the Council considers it is not reasonable to apply this requirement to C4 HMOs since the scale of C4 HMOs is similar to family housing in terms of the number of bedrooms and on this basis, noise insulation conditions cannot be justified as reasonable on planning grounds. UDP Policy HC5 'Houses in Multiple Occupation' notes at criterion 'iii' that proposals for conversion of properties to HMO will only be permitted where there would be no adverse effect upon the external appearance of the property and the character of the locality.	
acceptability of any physical alterations			

on HMO properties will be considered against guidance included in 'A Design Guide for Householder Development SPG'. Any changes to the front external appearance will therefore be considered in accordance with the Council's adopted guidance, and must
not have an adverse effect on the external appearance of the property and the character of the locality.
Inclusion of a reference to not permitting the loss of front gardens for hardstanding was not considered appropriate. Permitted Development Rights can exist for this type of development.
Once planning permission is granted, development must be carried out in accordance with the planning conditions included on the decision notice. If these conditions are not adhered to, then the LPA would be able to take enforcement action. The LPA is only able to apply planning conditions that meet the 6 tests, as set out within Circular 016/2014 'The Use
of Planning Conditions for Development Management'. The tests require planning conditions to be necessary, not duplicate other controls, be relevant to planning, relevant to the development, enforceable, precise and

		reasonable. The LPA does therefore have some power to control the management of HMOs once planning permission is granted, provided that the planning conditions meet the 6 tests. For example, planning conditions may relate to sound insulation, bicycle storage and/or refuse storage being retained thereafter. A planning condition can be applied which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. UDP Policy HC5 'Houses in Multiple Occupation' allows for the conversion of dwellings or non-residential properties to HMOs subject to the proposal meeting all of the 5 criteria. The SPG provides further guidance in relation to how these criteria will be used in assessing planning applications. The SPG therefore recognises that HMOs that satisfactorily meet UDP policy requirements will be permitted.	
8. Impact of HMOs on car parking, highway safety, and cycling	It was considered that concentrations of HMOs are a key cause of parking problems in some areas and that parking in Uplands and Brynmill has reached saturation point.	The SPG must be read in conjunction with the Council's SPG Parking Standards. Whilst it is recognised that the adopted Parking Standards pre- date the introduction of use Class C4 for HMOs they remain relevant to decisions on individual planning	After careful consideration of these comments, some clarification has been added to the SPG wording in paragraphs 5.39 and 5.40.
	It was queried, is there a way landlords can contribute financially towards the	for HMOs they remain relevant to	

	provision of off-street car parking.	parking standards and each application	
	provision of on-street car parking.	will be considered on its own merit	
	Concern was raised over the absence	based on the evidence submitted as	
	of parking permit policing and general	part of the planning application.	
	policing of traffic. Conversely it was		
	stated that there are too many resident	The SPG at paragraph 5.40 notes that	
	5	LPA's may also seek to apply planning	
	parking areas and not enough unrestricted areas which is causing	conditions which remove the	
	parking problems.	opportunity for occupants to apply for a	
		parking permit where there is evidence	
	Concern was raised with the current	that there is an issue that needs to be	
	parking standards. These were not	addressed. The Council's policing of	
	considered fit for purpose. The	traffic is outside the scope of this SPG.	
	standards should differentiate between	Developments 5 44 medices also at the towards	
	wards - with St Thomas Ward (along	Paragraph 5.41 makes clear that cycle	
	with Castle and Uplands) allowing no	storage should be provided in a	
	more than 3 or 4 cars per household.	dedicated cycle storage area, and that	
	T he second state of the	all storage areas that are visible from	
	There was disagreement with the logic		
	of allowing 3 parking spaces for up to 6	0	
	occupants and an extra space for every		
	extra occupant above. Instead it was	notes that where rear access	
	suggested that the main consideration	arrangements allow, cycles should be	
	should be given to the amount of space		
	available within or immediately within	than in front gardens. The LPA	
	the curtilage of a dwelling, not to the	encourages sustainable modes of	
	number of occupants. Where levels of	transport, such as cycling, and it is	
	street parking have reached a point of	considered unreasonable to request	
	saturation and no other space is	that rear access <i>must</i> be provided for	
	available, further HMOs should be	cycling, as this is not always possible	
	refused.	and therefore unduly restrictive.	
	Car parking requirements were	The request for weekend parking	
	considered to reduce for students and	surveys falls outside the scope of this	
·			

	HMO residents, as car ownership		
levels		recognises that evidence regarding the	
		particular parking issues in the locality,	
		including whether there are any	
	,	particular land uses that generate high	
	•	levels of traffic and car parking, will be	
bringi	.	treated as a material planning	
		consideration.	
	SPG should include reference to		
		Any planning obligations required by	
	•	the Council from applicants need to be	
shelte		justified in accordance with Planning	
		Policy Wales, Community Infrastructure	
	s asked if weekend parking	Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)	
surve	eys will be undertaken.	and Welsh Office Circular 13/97	
		'Planning Obligations' (or subsequent	
	s considered that the SPG needs	versions) (necessary, relevant to	
	-	planning, directly related to the	
	y 1	proposed development, fairly and	
	01	reasonably related and reasonable in	
be ba		all other respects). These will need to	
		be considered on a case-by-case	
		basis. This could in theory relate to off-	
		street parking provision provided the	
		obligation meets the Circular tests and	
		therefore does not necessarily warrant	
		specific mention in this SPG.	
		Poferring to the encouragement of the	
		Referring to the encouragement of the	
		Council and the University to work	
		together to reduce car ownership is outside the scope the SPG.	
	·		

0 Duran a Duilt		Deference is made in serves 4 CO 70 is	After coreful corecideration of these
9. Purpose Built	General comments received were	Reference is made in paras. 4.69-70 in	After careful consideration of these
Student	largely supportive of the PBSA element		comments, no changes were felt to
	of the SPG however it was highlighted	preferences and price differences	be necessary to address the issues
(PBSA)	that 2nd and 3rd year students do not	between PBSA and HMOs.	raised, for the reasons set out in the
	necessarily want to live in PBSA often		response.
	due to the high cost but also due to	The development of PBSA in city-	
	student personal preference.	centre locations is considered to dove-	
		tail with the Council's regeneration	
	Support for the provision of PBSA	aims for the city-centre, for example in	
	particularly in city centre locations.	terms of generating an increase in	
		footfall and vibrancy. Therefore the	
	Support only for PBSA on the	Council does not consider it is	
	University campus.	appropriate to support PBSA in	
		alternative locations, other than within	
	Concern that PBSA would make the	University campuses.	
	city centre a 'ghost town'.		
		The proposal's impact on amenity will	
	It was considered, in relation to the	be one of the considerations informing	
	criteria which requires applicants to	the LPA's decision. This will consider	
	demonstrate there are no available and	impacts relating to any concentrations	
	suitable sites in the City Centre, that	of PBSA in a given area and impact on	
	this could potentially benefit from	local amenity.	
	excluding areas to the north-west of the		
	University Wales Trinity St David's	Suggested specific references to the	
	Swansea Waterfront Innovation	exclusion of areas such as the areas to	
	Quarter.	the north-west of the University of	
		Wales Trinity St David's Swansea	
	The SPG needs to allow for PSBA at	Waterfront Innovation Quarter are	
	alternative locations, outside the city	considered superfluous. Consideration	
	centre.	in relation to location and accessibility	
		as well as the availability and suitability	
	Support for the proposed approach to	of other sites are likely to more robustly	
	parking standards in respect of PBSA.	demonstrate the appropriateness of a	
		PSBA scheme, rather than applying	
L		real and the second sec	1

	It was perceived that there is low provision of PBSA in Swansea and that the University needs to build more.	specific area exclusions. The SPG does not prevent PBSA outside the city centre. It states that the Council will favour city centre sites in the first instance, unless the proposed site is within a Higher Education Campus. The Council will consider PBSA proposals on edge of city-centre locations subject to a number of tests. This approach is considered appropriate and underpins the Council's regeneration objectives for the city centre. The SPG is not able to stipulate who PBSA developers or applicants are or should be.	
10. Other Matters	A non-'sandwich' policy should be included in the SPG - preventing HMOs being located either side of a non-HMO property. Building Regulation consent should be given prior to a planning application being submitted to the authority for a HMO. Development should adhere to fire safety regulations, but ensure the house can be returned in the future to family use without excessive expenditure.		

Comments were made in rela exemptions and the scope fo amending current tax regimes Requests were made for min	s. the wider public interest, rather than the concerns of the individual.
room sizes (similar to the Car approach) to be specified in t It was highlighted that many s	diffMatters relating to Building Regulationshe SPG.and fire safety regulations compliancefall outside the (planning) remit of this
scale properties in Swansea suitable for conversion and th should be excluded from bein permitted as a HMO.	at they Matters relating to tax exemption fall
	ded in the erties back The Council has adopted guidance for minimum floor areas for certain types of bedrooms in licensed HMOs. It is not legally possible to introduce minimum
Is there scope to include HM 10+ occupiers where the curr position exempts those mana educational establishments fr licensing.	ent under Housing legislation although ged by assessments are made for space and
The SPG should recognise th Council could play in helping properties of poor standard a upgraded.	e role the be covered by Housing Legislation and to ensure it is not therefore considered necessary
It should be ensured that con cohesion is a top priority and HMOs are to be discouraged replaces them.	that if properties in Swansea may not be

Additional licencing powers should be applied to the whole of Swansea - and not just specific wards. The University has an important role to play by working with students to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities to the community. Landlords should be held more accountable.	exemptions and amendments are outside the (planning) remit of this SPG. It is considered that this SPG strikes a balance between allowing for sustainable growth in HMOs and managing HMO concentrations to better effect for all. As explained above the SPG takes a flexible approach to HMO proposals, in exceptional circumstances, to ensure the sustainable use of properties rather than have properties stand vacant for long periods – which in themselves can have negative impacts. The test for exceptional case is rigorous and applicants will be required	
	long periods – which in themselves can have negative impacts. The test for exceptional case is	
	The Council already works closely with the Universities. This is outside the (planning) remit of the SPG.	

The remit of this SPG is focussed on the planning system. Measures to make landlords more accountable, beyond the planning
conditions/planning obligations already specified in the SPG and/or responses,
are outside the remit of this SPG.