

In review of the Selective licensing consultation, the following summary outlines the results. More importantly to note; is the demographic makeup of the completed questionnaires and the limited numbers of response received, despite several forms of engagement undertaken during the consultation period. Very few respondents were actual tenants of the private rented sector (23), with landlords making up the highest number who completed questionnaires (68), closely followed by residents of the area (61).

Given the makeup of the responses, and the issues highlighted as concerns between residents and private rented properties, there are clear indications of concerns in each of the proposed areas. Consideration has been given to the proportionality of the responses and subsequent proposals put forward. Without a proactive form of regulation and accountable proportionality, issues indicated within the consultation results cannot be effectively tackled, reduced and offer a better environment for all. This would require a system of designation with an approved set of dialogues and conditions for all landlords in the respective areas.

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	100.00%	-	170
Private renting	13.53%	13.53%	23
Owner/occupier	35.88%	35.88%	61
Council tenant	3.53%	3.53%	6
Landlord	40.00%	40.00%	68
Housing Association tenant	2.35%	2.35%	4
Other	4.71%	4.71%	8
[No Response]	0.00%	-	0
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Question 12: Do you feel that Council should implement a selective licensing scheme as described above in your area? Of the respondents, 70 voted YES and 99 voted NO.

Of the questionnaires completed, 48% felt that there were issues with private rented properties, relating to how well managed private rented properties were. Crime did not appear to be an issue for many in the proposed areas. Of the questionnaires completed, 36% felt that there was a problem with crime in their area.

An overwhelming 77% of respondents felt that landlords should take action against tenants who cause antisocial behaviour. More than half of the respondents felt that tenants in the private sector should be given better information relating to how they conduct themselves.

Issues relating to refuse: 61% felt that landlords should provide enough receptacles and ensure waste is presented correctly. More than 92% of respondents voted in favour of tenants presenting waste for collection and ensuring yards and gardens are kept clean and tidy.

The following five questions asked respondents to give their preference between **5 = High** and **1 = Low** and **0 = Not a concern**.

Noise from property: Only 12% felt this was an issue in their areas. 37% responded with “not a concern”.

Refuse in gardens: 40% marked this as a high priority.

Antisocial behaviour: Combined 52% gave this a mark of 3-5. (19% responding “High”). Whilst 45% combined gave a preference of 0-2. (22% responded “not a concern”).

Too many people sharing properties: 45% of respondents did not feel this was an issue.

Poor property conditions: Combined 52% gave a preference of 3-5 (31% responding “High”), whilst 45% combined gave a preference of 0-2 (23% responding “not a concern”).

The overall view of those consulted was against the implementation of a Selective Licensing scheme. However, the above questions indicate that there is a requirement to abate some of the issues which are creating tensions within the communities proposed.

The most significant issues appear to be around refuse, gardens and presentation of waste and property conditions in private rented properties. This in all areas plays a part in many of the ASB complaints received, in addition to landlord-tenant relationships, management and perceived conduct of tenants.

Due to the numbers of private rented concentrations in the proposed areas and the significant issues highlighted requiring action, a combination of measures which can be actioned will be required under the designation area.

Questionnaires were made available online and paper copies available at all drop-in events and libraries in the designated areas. Completed paper questionnaires were sent to our IT department and added to the completed online questionnaire data. The total number of completed questionnaires was 170.

Do you think the Council should implement a Selective licensing scheme in your area?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	99.41%	-	169
Yes	41.18%	41.42%	70
No	58.24%	58.58%	99
[No Response]	0.59%	-	1
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Questions 1-8 inclusive asked respondents regarding the general conditions of the area relating to the private rented sector (PRS).

Have you experienced problems with private rented properties in this area or their occupiers and/or visitors

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	96.47%	-	164
Yes	48.82%	50.61%	83
No	47.65%	49.39%	81
[No Response]	3.53%	-	6
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Do you believe private rented properties in your area are well managed?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	90.59%	-	154
Yes	51.76%	57.14%	88
No	38.82%	42.86%	66
[No Response]	9.41%	-	16
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Do you consider that the levels of crime in your area are higher than in other areas?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	91.18%	-	155
Yes	36.47%	40.00%	62
No	54.71%	60.00%	93
[No Response]	8.82%	-	15
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Do you consider private rented tenants require better information and guidance relating to how they conduct themselves in this area?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	93.53%	-	159
Yes	51.18%	54.72%	87
No	42.35%	45.28%	72
[No Response]	6.47%	-	11
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Should private rented landlords take action against tenants who cause a nuisance and antisocial behaviour?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	95.88%	-	163
Yes	77.06%	80.37%	131
No	18.82%	19.63%	32
[No Response]	4.12%	-	7
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Should private rented landlords provide enough refuse bins and boxes to ensure waste is presented correctly?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	93.53%	-	159
Yes	61.76%	66.04%	105
No	31.76%	33.96%	54
[No Response]	6.47%	-	11
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Should all tenants ensure their waste is presented for collection and gardens/ yards are kept clean and tidy?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	95.88%	-	163
Yes	92.35%	96.32%	157
No	3.53%	3.68%	6
[No Response]	4.12%	-	7
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Question 9 asked respondents to rate the main issues in your area, awarding in order of importance the following five statements (5 = High and 1= Low).

- a) Noise from Property
- b) Refuse and litter in yards/gardens and the street.
- c) Antisocial behaviour (ASB)
- d) Too many people sharing properties.
- e) Poor property maintenance appearance/ condition.

Noise from property

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	94.12%	-	160
5	11.76%	12.50%	20
4	8.24%	8.75%	14
3	12.94%	13.75%	22
2	10.59%	11.25%	18
1	15.29%	16.25%	26
0	35.29%	37.50%	60
[No Response]	5.88%	-	10
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Refuse and litter in yards/gardens and street

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	94.71%	-	161
5	38.24%	40.37%	65
4	10.59%	11.18%	18
3	11.18%	11.80%	19
2	5.88%	6.21%	10
1	11.18%	11.80%	19
0	17.65%	18.63%	30
[No Response]	5.29%	-	9
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	95.29%	-	162
5	19.41%	20.37%	33
4	15.29%	16.05%	26
3	15.88%	16.67%	27
2	12.35%	12.96%	21
1	11.18%	11.73%	19
0	21.18%	22.22%	36
[No Response]	4.71%	-	8
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Too many people sharing properties

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	92.35%	-	157
5	16.47%	17.83%	28
4	7.65%	8.28%	13
3	7.65%	8.28%	13
2	6.47%	7.01%	11
1	12.35%	13.38%	21
0	41.76%	45.22%	71
[No Response]	7.65%	-	13
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Poor property maintenance/appearance/conditions

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	94.12%	-	160
5	30.00%	31.88%	51
4	7.06%	7.50%	12
3	13.53%	14.38%	23
2	11.18%	11.88%	19
1	10.59%	11.25%	18
0	21.76%	23.13%	37
[No Response]	5.88%	-	10
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

Numerous responses were recorded both in general emails to this department, at the landlords meetings, via FOI requests, and within the text of objections put forward, relating to the Council having enough statutory powers to deal with non-compliant landlords and therefore landlords felt there was no requirement to have an 'added layer of bureaucracy' by implementing a selective licensing scheme. In addition there were also questions posed relating to the use of interim management orders to deal with 'Isolated' properties as appeared to be the general consensus among landlords.

Do you think the council should have more powers to regulate landlords?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	97.65%	-	166
Yes	44.12%	45.18%	75
No	53.53%	54.82%	91
[No Response]	2.35%	-	4
Total	100.00%	100.00%	170

CONSULTATION EVENTS AND INFORMATION PROVIDED.

During the consultation period (5th July – 24th September 2017) several consultation events were held. Other than the landlord events, these were not well attended. These events consisted of drop in events in the four localities, an open day event at the Town Hall and two landlord specific events. These were held close to the start and towards the end of the consultation period. During the latter events, landlords were advised all questions would be taken down and added to the Q&A document which would be updated and added to the website. To note: Some questions asked were not included due to relevance to the scheme itself and questioned data and information which could reveal personal information. This document was made available for all to view on the web pages. (A copy is attached as part of the appendices to this report).

A Selective Licensing webpage was also set up to allow and answer queries relating to the scheme. However, in some cases this was used to circumvent the Freedom of Information (FOI) process, if a request was refused via the formal process.

In response to comparisons raised and comments of ‘unworkability and unnecessary bureaucracy’ which were raised based on other local authority SL schemes. In addition to the questionnaire, BMBC sent out a questionnaire to four other Local authorities to establish their rationale and outcome for implementing such schemes. These were sent to: **Rotherham** MBC (A large SL scheme of 1200 properties); **Birmingham** CC (A new SL scheme which is under consultation from September 2017 to November 2017); **Doncaster** MBC (having just implemented their 2nd Co-regulation scheme) and **Weston Super Mare** CC (who opted for an accreditation scheme over SL following a judicial review). The implemented schemes were undertaken to tackle specific issues within each of the boroughs. Questions raised related to how, why or when/if they had considered Selective Licensing (SL) schemes were yielding results. Of those already implemented (Doncaster, Rotherham) felt the schemes were warranted and yielding the results required. Birmingham was still under consultation and could not comment. Weston Super Mare did not respond.

To Note: The scheme has not been consulted upon in relation to migrant concentrations. However, an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken. This was evaluated at the beginning and part way through the consultation period to assess the outcome response from BME groups. It was again updated after the close of the consultation to assess the overall take up. Responses from those groups have been poor. Consideration has been given to door-to-door street evaluation. However, these were discounted to prevent issues of impartiality or courting responses. Consultation was undertaken towards the end of the consultation event at an engagement event for specified BME groups. However, engagement was limited despite translated additional documents provided. Additional re-engagement with Polish and Russian Facebook pages requested groups to complete questionnaires online. Again, this was also limited in its take up.