

**Providing Council with Written Responses to Questions at Council
27 July 2017**

1.	<p>Mrs Mayberry In relation to Minute 42 “Swansea Local Development Plan (LDP) – Update on Deposit LDP Public Consultation, Evidence Base Review and Next Stages” Is the Council ignoring the Welsh Assembly’s guidelines on the preservation of green field sites, and UK Government’s White Paper that brown field sites should be used before any green field sites be adopted.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Commercial Opportunities and Innovation Cabinet Member The Council is fully aware of national planning policy (Planning Policy Wales (PPW 2016)) which requires that previously developed (or brownfield) land should, wherever possible, be used in preference to greenfield sites. The Council has followed the PPW search sequence in identifying sites to be allocated in the Local Development Plan (LDP), starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>The Housing Landbank and Previously Developed Land Capacity Study, which forms part of the LDP evidence base, explored the extent to which brownfield land and windfall opportunities could contribute to meeting the LDP’s housing requirement. Sources of windfall assessed included feasible and practical opportunities to utilise existing assets such as living above the shop, bringing empty properties back into use, and windfall arising from the Council’s Quality in Education programme. The findings of the Study clearly highlighted that there would be an insufficient amount of such opportunities to meet the identified housing requirement. It is therefore necessary for the Council to pursue a combination of greenfield and brownfield approaches to deliver the land use requirements over the Plan period</p>
2.	<p>Sue Elward In relation to Minute 50 “Councillors’ Questions – Question 8” The 'Licence holder' has multiple responsibilities all and any of which could be covered by the offence of 'failing to properly manage a house in multiple occupation'. Other councils successfully prosecute under this broad simplification and Swansea Council's own licencing conditions state that 'The Council may apply 'other' licencing conditions with discretion'. In view of this, can you explain what the offence is that other councils have been using to successfully prosecute landlords who fail to manage their Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)?</p> <p>A transgression of any licencing condition amounts to a failure to manage a house in multiple occupation and there is no need for any other reason in order to prosecute.”</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services The offence under Section 72(3), Housing Act 2004 relates to the failure of a licence holder to comply with any condition of the licence.</p>

The offence under Section 234(3), Housing Act 2004 relates to failure of a person managing a house to comply with management regulations. In Wales these regulations are The Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006 and The Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007.

'Failing to properly manage a house in multiple occupation' is a general term, but in order for any local authority to prosecute a landlord under the legislation they must have relevant evidence that can withstand legal tests in the Magistrates Court. The offence must be proved beyond all reasonable doubt. Any defendant will have the opportunity to mount a defence.

3.

Bill Trimby

In relation to Minute 50 "Councillors' Questions – Question 8"
City and County of Swansea have advised in a written response to Cllrs Irene Mann and Peter May that:

- No licence holder has been re-charged per the Housing Act 2004;
- There has been no cost to the taxpayer directly attributable to the licence holder for refuse collection;
- No legal sanctions have been undertaken by the Council for breaches of Sections 30 and 32 in the last year;
- The last time the Council took prosecutions against landlords for failing to comply with HMO licence conditions was May 2013 some 4 years ago.

i) City and Council of Swansea also state they have a "robust approach" to enforcement. How can the Council state that it has a "robust approach" to enforcement when it is not using the provisions available to it in law to protect the interests of the residents of the area.

ii) Can the Council give details of its "robust approach" as there is no visible evidence that this approach is working?"

Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services

Specifically in relation to issues of waste, officers from Public Protection, Waste and Cleansing are currently looking at these issues to determine what more can be done to improve matters and reassure residents.

The reference to 'visible evidence' is important. It must be stressed that officers do a large volume of work in relation to HMOs that is not visible to the public. The legislation around HMOs and HMO licensing is primarily about protecting and ensuring occupant and property safety. Officers are inspecting properties, issuing licences with schedules of work and responding to complaints on a daily basis. There are also many many HMOs that are well managed and never cause any problem to tenants or local residents.

The Council has always taken an approach of working with landlords and agents and helping to educate them and providing an opportunity for networking and sharing good practice via the local landlords' forum whilst always taking enforcement action in appropriate cases based upon risk and regulatory requirements.

4.

John Row

In relation to Minute 50 “Councillors’ Questions – Question 8”

- i) “Page 52, Paragraph 2.1. Why are they refusing to put room sizes and bicycle standards in the new Supplementary Policy Guidance (SPG) document, which they have included in the adopted Cardiff SPG on HMO? Being that room sizes and bicycle standards are material considerations that can protect our areas and promote higher quality accommodation for students.
- ii) Page 72, Paragraph 5.12 states ‘unless there are material considerations that demonstrably outweigh regarding harmful concentration’. Can you explain please?
- iii) Page 73, Paragraph 5.20. Can you please clarify?
- iv) Page 77, Paragraph 5.27. Can you explain these points (maybe, material considerations, and or exceptional circumstances outweighs 50 metre radius) (but not on every occasion be the final determining factor) in plain English?
- v) Page 77, Paragraph 5.28. Can you explain these statements (even the proposal what not give rise to threshold limits exceeding 50 metres whether or not it is a material consideration)?
- vi) Page 78, Paragraph 5.31. Don’t understand. Explain what % you would have with more than 34 houses in a small street? Can you please provide the % for larger streets with 40, 50 and 60 houses in the street?
- vii) Page 78, Paragraph 5.32 states ‘In management areas 1 HMO property will be permitted within the street of 10. In the case of streets of 10 or fewer properties outside the management area a maximum of 2 properties will be permitted. One has 10% the other has 20% Why?’

Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services

- i) Bicycle storage standards are proposed in paragraphs 5.43 and 5.44 of the Draft Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and Purpose Built Student Accommodation Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

In terms of room sizes, 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 room sizes in other circumstances under Housing legislation although assessments are made for space and overcrowding purposes using the Housing Health and Safety Rating System. This matter is considered to be covered by Housing Legislation and it is not therefore considered necessary or possible to specify minimum room sizes within the SPG.

It is recognised that small-scale properties in Swansea may not be suitable for conversion. It is not reasonable to automatically preclude the conversion of all small-scale properties from being permitted as HMO. Residential amenity is a material planning consideration and each planning application will be considered on its own individual merits in terms of its suitability for a HMO.

- ii) The Draft SPG sets out the following text in Chapter 2 to help define and provide examples of ‘Material Considerations’. This was inserted following the consultation process to bring greater clarity, as requested by consultees:

Material Planning Considerations

2.1 Material considerations refer to matters to be taken into account when making a decision on an application for planning permission, including the determination of an appeal. Such considerations must be relevant planning matters, having regard to national guidance^[1], and may for example include issues relating to:

- Highway safety
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light or overshadowing
- Parking
- Noise
- Effect on listed building and conservation areas
- Visual appearance, design and layout
- Government policy
- Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)
- A community's need for affordable housing is also a material planning consideration.

2.1 Common matters that are not relevant to the planning decision making process (i.e. non-material planning considerations) include, for example, matters controlled under building regulations and loss of property value. The identity of future occupiers of a HMO property is also not a material planning consideration.

2.2 Material considerations are varied and the relevance of the issue will depend on the individual circumstances of each application.

Planning Policy Wales, Welsh Government

<http://gov.wales/topics/planning/policy/ppw/?lang=en>

Paragraph 5.12 of the SPG states that “The LPA will seek to resist planning applications for HMOs that breach the identified threshold for that area, unless there are material considerations that demonstrably outweigh the identified concerns regarding harmful concentration or intensification”.

It is noted above that material considerations are varied and the relevance of the issue will depend on the individual circumstances of each planning application. There may be occasions where the concentration threshold is breached, but the applicant has provided sufficient robust evidence to prove that the proposed development will mitigate any potential harmful impacts (material planning considerations) associated with high concentrations of HMOs, such as noise nuisance, to the extent that the benefits of the development in providing affordable housing for the community outweigh any concerns associated with the concentration of HMOs in the vicinity.

iii) Paragraph 5.20 means that it is considered that the 50m radius around the planning application should contain a minimum of 10 properties for the purpose of calculating the threshold test. In such cases where there are

fewer than 10 properties within the 50m radius, the Council will select the nearest properties from the same side of the street as the proposed HMO so that at least 10 properties are included in the threshold calculation.

iv) & v) These queries have been answered together as the two paragraphs referred to are related. They reflect that the consideration of harmful concentration is one policy criteria in the UDP and material planning considerations relating to other policies and criteria in the Plan also have to be considered in the balance of determining the planning application.

It is considered that the information that has been added to the draft SPG, which is reproduced above to answer question ii, provides sufficient information as to what the reference to 'material planning considerations' means in practice.

Paragraph 5.28 means that there may be instances where the proposed development passes the concentration threshold test but other material planning considerations fail to comply with other UDP policy criteria making the development unacceptable. In some instances, a planning application might pass the threshold concentration test but, for example, not satisfy highway safety or general design policy relating to residential amenity or visual appearance, design and layout.

vi) The SPG sets out that it is considered that there are certain street patterns and layouts that are characteristic of areas of Swansea where applying the threshold on a radius basis could fail to protect against an unacceptable concentration of HMO uses where the proposal is located on a small street. Sampling has shown that there could be occasions where there is a disproportionate concentration of HMOs in a single small street, but few or no other HMOs on other streets within the 50m radius area, resulting in the proposal passing the radius threshold test. Paragraph 5.31 defines a small street as containing between 11 and 34 properties inclusive. Where the proposal is on such a small street, in addition to passing the radius test, the proposal must also not exceed the threshold in terms of the numbers of HMOs in the small street (25% inside the HMO Management Area and 10% outside it). For streets containing more than 34 properties, these would not be classified as a small street and only the 50m radius test will be used. Sampling has shown that the small streets issue would not arise in these cases where there are more than 34 properties.

vii) The SPG should read that in the case of streets of 10 or fewer properties within the HMO Management Area, a maximum of two HMO properties will be permitted within the street. In the case of streets of 10 or fewer properties outside the HMO Management Area, a maximum of one HMO property will be permitted within the street. This would reflect the radius thresholds proposed for locations within and outside the HMO Management Area respectively and will be reviewed.

5.

Jayne Keeley

In relation to Minute 50 "Councillors' Questions – Question 8"

It is apparent that the HMO negative issues have continued to cause misery and concern to Uplands and Brynmill. This is a direct result of a lack of enforcement from licensing conditions. Why have you failed to enforce such conditions, which would have gone some way to protecting the welfare of Uplands and Brynmill residents?

Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services

See above response to Mr Trimby which is equally applicable to Mrs Keeley's question.

Conditions are enforced using a variety of informal and formal methods as described.

Also as indicated and specifically in relation to issues of waste, Officers from Public Protection, Waste and Cleansing are currently looking at these issues to determine what more can be done to improve matters and reassure residents.

6.

John Williams

In relation to Minute 50 "Councillors' Questions – Question 8"

Earlier this month the council tried to pass Supplementary Planning Guidance to allow a limit of 25% in some part of Uplands Ward. This would have allowed about another 300 HMOs to be created. The Council is plainly having difficulty in enforcing the conditions on existing HMOs. How can they reassure us that they could cope with regulating even more?"

Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services

The successful introduction of the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for HMOs, which would have set the maximum limit of HMOs in the Wards of Castle and Uplands at 25%, would have given much greater control of HMO limits and protected against streets and areas within those Wards exceeding the saturation limit of 25%. This would have resulted in the majority of new HMO planning applications being recommended for refusal as opposed to approval, as evidenced in the two most recent Planning Committee meetings.

The Council has not produced a definitive figure regarding the absolute number of HMO change of use applications that could theoretically be approved if the SPG thresholds were put into place. Such a number is not practically possible to calculate. There are too many potential scenarios that could arise since every new HMO planning permission, depending where it is, would affect the next calculation and so on.

Significant analysis has been undertaken to inform the production of the draft SPG, including testing of the radius methodology. This has clearly demonstrated that the opportunity for new HMOs within the draft SPG HMO Management Area (where the 25% threshold is proposed) would be very limited given the evidence regarding existing HMO concentration levels, and every new HMO granted permission in the future would increase these levels. The Council is aware that the public have carried out an exercise to arrive at what they consider to be a robust figure for the future numbers of HMOs with the proposed SPG threshold in place, but the methodology used has not been independently reviewed and the figures are questioned given the reasons outlined above. Fundamentally, the thresholds proposed in the SPG would have imposed more of a restriction on the future number of HMOs within Uplands and Castle Wards than is currently the case.

	<p>Until such SPG is in place, should there be a large increase in the number of licensable HMOs in the City & County of Swansea, the Council would review its staffing arrangements accordingly.</p>
7.	<p>John Thomas In relation to Minute 50 “Councillors’ Questions – Question 8” Since 2012 apart from Landlords actually prosecuted, how many have been approached by the council following complaints? When/How many of those were repeat calls?</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services I have assumed Mr. Thomas’s query relates to HMOs, licensing conditions and matters regarding waste. Officers will contact him to confirm that is correct, seek clarification on his request and to advise what information can be provided.</p>
8.	<p>Councillor E W Fitzgerald In relation to Minute 42 “Swansea Local Development Plan (LDP) – Update on Deposit LDP Public Consultation, Evidence Base Review and Next Stages”</p> <p>i) Can I have assurances that, following the approval by Council of the Deposit Plan on 16 June 2016, for consultation, no changes have been subsequently made to any boundaries of strategic sites?</p> <p>ii) The Preferred Strategy identified a need for 3,210 new homes in the Central Zone so that people could live and work within the same area. How many permanent homes are being delivered via the Deposit Plan and what changes in processes have to led to any increase/reduction in the original figure?</p> <p>iii) The report indicates that there is a lack of capacity in sewage infrastructure with developers being expected to pay for any upgrades. Welsh Water has requested clarification in regard to these contributions and it’s acknowledged that there is a potential for disparity in the time frames. Do you agree that sewage infrastructure issues could cause delays in site viability? Do you also agree and that this is an issue that Welsh Government has concerns about (Page 76) pointing out that infrastructure improvements need to be costed and may have a detrimental impact on the viability / timing of site and ultimately their delivery which is why it held a conference for planners on this matter in January this year?</p> <p>iv) It’s stated in the Green Belt and Green Wedge Designation report (June 2016) that land, which included site SD C, needed some form of anti coalescence protection. However, applying this approach to GBGWD the only question then was whether this should be Green Wedge or Green Belt. Do you agree that you didn’t resolve this question but simply proceeded in the GBGWD to reduce substantially the land that would be given any form of anti-coalescence protection. Do you also agree that this was not consistent with the staged approach and processes described in GBGWD, and neither was it justified on exceptional ground, and that this undermines the credibility of the planning judgment made on this critical issue.</p>

Response of the Cabinet Member for Commercial Opportunities and Innovation Cabinet Member

i) No changes have been made to the boundaries of strategic sites since the Deposit Plan was approved for consultation by Council in 2016.

ii) The consultation draft LDP Preferred Strategy was based upon the latest evidence at that time which was the 2013 Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA). The final LDP Preferred Strategy identified an updated requirement for 2,100 homes in the Central Strategic Housing Policy Zone (SHPZ) over the Plan period. This was based on the latest analysis apportioning the overall housing requirement by SHPZ and the land supply potential of areas to deliver new housing contained in the Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) Update.

The final Preferred Strategy identified that the Central SHPZ is largely built out and that the future residential strategy for this area would be focussed on the delivery of new homes associated with City Centre regeneration projects in the central and waterfront areas, windfall Brownfield sites and conversion of vacant accommodation above shops.

The Deposit Plan allocates land for a total of 1,760 homes in the Central SHPZ, which are expected to deliver the following numbers of housing units over the remainder of the Plan period up to 2025:

- SD J Central Area and City Waterfront = 1,000
- SD L Tawe Riverside Corridor and Hafod Morfa Copper Works = 370
- H1.1 Former Vetch Field = 40
- H1.2 Llwyn Y Bryn Campus = 200
- H1.3 Townhill Campus = 150

The remainder of the housing requirement is delivered by sites already built or granted planning permission during the Plan period since 2010. These sites provide a further 939 dwellings in the Central SHPZ as of July 2017 and are listed in the Revised July 2017 Housing LDP Topic Paper Addendum.

Therefore, a total of 2,699 homes are being delivered in the Central SHPZ over the Plan period, more than the identified housing requirement, but providing an important flexibility allowance for the delivery of future schemes and with potential for some further windfall development over the remaining years of the Plan up to 2025.

iii) Surface water compensatory removal will be required to enable foul connections to be made as part of an agreed scheme to be submitted as part of the Planning application, in accordance with the requirements of the Burry Inlet Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) relating to the treatment of waste and foul water. A new MOU is currently being drafted relating to the long term strategic development needs as identified in the respective partner Councils' LDPs. This process will help ensure that the Plan allocations can be efficiently implemented without damage to the water quality.

The Council has been and will continue to engage with Welsh Water on the site allocations. Welsh Water's investment in water and sewerage infrastructure is managed in rolling 5 year Asset Management Plans (AMPs) which seek to ensure appropriate large scale investment is undertaken to

provide capacity for growth. Due to the regulatory, financial and legislative framework that they have to work within there is the potential for disparity in the timeframes of the AMP and LDPs. Development that requires infrastructure improvements in advance of delivery through Welsh Water's investment programme will be required to provide an appropriate contribution to secure the provision of the infrastructure. Developers are fully aware of this requirement.

iv) The Green Belt and Green Wedge Designation Assessment only identifies land that is genuinely needed for anti-coalescence purposes and therefore warrants either a Green Belt or Green Wedge designation. This is in-line with National Planning Policy as explained in Section 2.1 of the assessment.

The Green Belt and Green Wedge Designation assessment followed a 3 stage process.

Stage 1 established potential Green Belt or Green Wedge areas by identifying countryside that acts as a buffer between settlements and therefore acts to prevent settlement coalescence.

Stage 2 examined the potential Green Belt or Green Wedge areas in detail and established whether such areas should be Green Belt or Green Wedge designations.

Stage 3 defined precise boundaries for the Green Belt.

The proposed Green Belt adjacent to SD C was considered in Stage 1 part 1 under:

- The review of existing UDP Green Wedges (section 4.1.2 and Table 1 refer). Part of the proposed Green Belt forms the existing Llan Valley Green Wedge. The assessment determined that because this land lies between settlements it warranted further consideration for a Green Belt or Green Wedge designation.
- Consideration of the LDP proposed Strategic Development Area Allocations (section 4.1.4 and Table 3 refer). This assessment looked at existing and proposed new settlements and determined that there was potential for coalescence with Kingsbridge to the west and Fforestfach to the south and further consideration for a Green Belt or Green Wedge was required, whilst acknowledging that considerable new development of strategic scale was to be accommodated within this area

And Stage 1 part 2 under:

- Distances between Settlements (Sections 4.1.7 – 4.1.8 and Table 6 refer). The assessment determined that the distance between proposed SD C and SD H meant that the settlements were vulnerable to coalescence and more detailed assessment for a Green Belt or Green Wedge was required.

Other factors taken into consideration at this stage that affected the need for a green wedge/belt designation at SD C included existing development and landform. The majority of the proposed development at SD C represents rounding off that extends no further south than existing development abutting the A483, whilst that part of the site which projects further south is constrained by landform and other features which act as a barrier to further development.

The proposed Green Belt adjacent to SD C was given detailed consideration in Stage 2 under:

- UDP Green Wedge Areas (assessment 1 LLan Valley refers). This assessment looked to identify factors that removed the risk of coalescence and indicators for an increased risk for coalescence. The assessment determined the risk of coalescence could not be eliminated between the settlements of Waunarlwydd, Gowerton, Gorseinon, Kingsbridge, Penllergaer and Fforestfach and that these settlements remained at risk of coalescence. It also determined that a Green Belt designation would be most appropriate.

It is clear that the assessment established that anti-coalescence protection was needed on land between Waunarlwydd, Gowerton, Gorseinon, Kingsbridge, Penllergaer, Fforestfach and that the assessment considered more than simply should this land be a Green Belt or Green Wedge. The decision to only propose Green Belt or Green Wedge designations on land where it is needed to prevent coalescence and in particular the proposed designation of a Green Belt adjacent to SD C is based on sound planning judgement.

9. **Councillor P M Black**

In relation to Minute No. 43 City and County of Swansea – Policy Commitments Statement.

Page 108, Paragraph 2.3. Can the Leader of the Council confirm the £1bn over five years is an increase on current budgets? What percentage increase and how will it impact on per pupil funding?

Response of the Leader

The figure of a total £1bn was predominantly based on:

- The current 2017-18 approved Education Portfolio revenue budget of £164.7m which over 5 years would total £823.5m at just today's prices.
- The likely scale, and now subsequently confirmed, 21st Century Schools Programme Band B capital bid of £149.7m.

Taking total spending to around £973.2m in 2017-18 prices and equating to the 'nearly £1bn' commitment within the election manifesto.

This assumes that the capital bid is approved in full, which is of course subject to Welsh Government consideration, but our capital assumptions and plans to fund this Council's share of the costs anticipate full approval. It should be noted that technically the Band B bid covers a slightly different and later 5 years (April 19 onwards) but the manifesto commitment and delivery intention remains clear.

	<p>Of course education and training and development opportunities extend beyond schools and the education portfolio and once lifelong learning, wider training and development and vocational opportunities, and the benefits flowing from the City Deal are factored in then we will potentially exceed our £1billion manifesto commitment.</p> <p>The Policy Commitment continues the consistent prioritisation of the delegated schools budget and other areas of pupil specific support across Education services in Swansea. This has seen the largest percentage increase in budgeted net revenue expenditure on education for Swansea in 2017-18 of 4.4% by comparison with an average of 1% across Wales according to the latest published statistics from the Welsh Government and at a time when 8 authorities approved cash reductions in education spending.</p> <p>In 2017-18 the delegated schools budget in Swansea saw a 3.1% increase - the third highest in Wales and this is in turn reflected in the per pupil funding levels.</p> <p>Future budget allocations to education will of course be a decision for Council in each February's culmination of the budget setting round and will to some extent depend upon the decisions taken by Council but more so on the overall funding settlement we receive from Welsh Government. That in turn will determine the amount available for education as a whole, schools in particular and per pupil funding.</p>
10.	<p>Councillor P N May In relation to Minute No. 43 City and County of Swansea – Policy Commitments Statement. How many Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) have been issued due to breaches of the Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licence conditions?</p> <p>Response of the Leader There is no provision in the Housing Act 2004, the legislation dealing with HMO licensing, which allows local authorities to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for offences relating to HMO licences. The Housing (Wales) Act 2014 does contain provision for FPNs <u>but</u> these relate to failure to register/license with Rent Smart Wales. They are not, as indicated, a tool to deal with HMO conditions.</p>
11.	<p>Councillor A M Day In relation to Minute No. 43 Estyn Inspection of Local Authority Education Services for Children and Young People 2013 – Update on Progress in Addressing the Five Recommendations. How many Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) have been issued in relation to school absences and the value of those notices?</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Lifelong Learning</p> <p>The total number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued since the system was introduced in in January 2015 is 1,162.</p> <p>The amount of payments collected into the PN account from start to date is £36,360.00</p>

	<p>The funding/income is used to fund the salary and on-costs for the administrator who undertakes all the administrative work to process these notices – which includes extensive record keeping to ensure tracked attendance meets the criteria for a penalty notice and invoices etc. This is in accordance with Welsh Government agreement that the fines are used to support the costs to administer the system.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Councillor C A Holley In relation to Minute No. 43 Asset Management Plan 2017/2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i) Can an update be provided in relation to the Review of Depots?</i> <i>ii) Can a copy of the feasibility study referred to on Page 140 ‘Disposals’ be shared with all Councillors?</i> <i>iii) Can a copy of the JLL report referred to on Page 141 ‘Property Investments’ be shared with all Councillors?</i> <i>iv) Can an update be provided in relation to the Felindre site?”</i> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member Service Transformation & Business Operations</p> <p>i) Following a report to Cabinet on the 21st April 2016 (Minute Number 231) with regards to Depot rationalisation there were a number of summary recommendations with regards to the Depot Review. Officers continue to investigate a number of options based on those recommendations however at this stage these investigations are commercially sensitive.</p> <p>ii) Feasibility study referred to Page 140 is still to be concluded, however, it is unlikely this would be shared more widely as this would relate to commercially confidential proposals. Any further individual sites that may be brought forward will be dealt with in the normal manner.</p> <p>iii) The report referred to was reported to Cabinet on the 21st July 2016 (Minute Number 41). On legal advice Cabinet excluded the public when considering the matter due to confidential information within the report. However all councillors would have received a copy of that report including the JLL attachment at that time. Councillors are still entitled to see that report (which can be circulated on request) but on a confidential basis.</p> <p>iv) Agents have been appointed to undertake marketing which is due to commence. In addition, the Welsh Government are undertaking a feasibility study on the greenfield site for housing. The housing use in the LDP which has been approved by Council to go out for consultation.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Councillor P M Black In relation to Minute 50 “Councillors’ Questions – Question 1” Can the Cabinet Member provide an update and timeline relating to the installation of sprinklers in the Authority’s high-rise blocks?</p>

	<p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services</p> <p>I can confirm all high-rise blocks have been reviewed in terms of feasibility and the initial design work has commenced. It is expected that we will be in a position to commence procurement of the first schemes by October, with a start on site on a phased basis by November.</p> <p>The Council is looking to prioritise those blocks where cladding works have been carried out and will need to agree a programme of works around the completion of the contractor's works around the last block at Clyne Court. In addition it is intended to carry out installation to those blocks where cladding works have not yet been carried out as part of an overall scheme.</p> <p>As such it is difficult to give estimated completion dates as this will also depend on industry capacity but I would be happy to update you and Council when tenders have been received and firm dates for each scheme are known.</p>
14.	<p>Councillor P N May</p> <p>In relation to Minute 50 "Councillors' Questions – Question 8" Can the Cabinet Member provide further information relating to the 'further cases pending' referred to in the written response? How many are there and when will the Authority see the outcome?</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Energy & Building Services</p> <p>On 8th August 2017, Paul Williams, Director of Shotblue Limited, pleaded guilty in Swansea Magistrates Court to 25 offences of failure to comply with HMO licence conditions and failure to comply with Management Regulations relating to a licensed HMO at 40 Carlton Terrace.</p> <p>There had been a fire at the property on 26th December 2016 which was attended by Mid and West Fire and Rescue Service. Subsequent visits by Senior Environmental Health Officers in January 2017 revealed a series of failings and property in very poor condition. Magistrates described conditions as "quite deplorable" and fined Mr. Williams a total of £18,600. The Council was also awarded full costs of £1,692.</p> <p>This case shows the length of time that can be taken from the offence being committed to having a successful outcome in court.</p> <p>As the other cases have not yet been heard in the Magistrates Court, I am not able to provide any further information. However, when the cases have been heard the results will be published on the Council's website.</p>
