LEEDS CITY COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO THE FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM LANDLORDS AND AGENTS DURING THE SELECTIVE LICENSING CONSULTATION PERIOD

Over 1600 comments were captured in total from landlords and agents during the consultation period. The majority were made on the landlord/agent questionnaire in both paper and online format and a lesser number on the proformas and officer notes made at the drop-in events. Formal written representations were also received at the office by the project team.

The comments have been collated and, where possible, themed. Each theme is detailed below and the Council’s response to the feedback follows.

The text in *italics* are the comments that have been extracted directly from the completed questionnaires and proformas.

All references to "proposals" relate to the initial proposals that were the subject of the consultation.

# 1.1 Proposed licence fee & fee structure

## 1.1.1 Theme: The fee is too high

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made about the level of the proposed fee. Here are some that are representative of the issue raised;   * *“It’s expensive considering I rent a 1 bed property”* * *“It’s a good idea but i’m a private landlord with a long term tenant in a low cost, high quality property. The license cost is high for me”* * *“I am at a loss to understand how an admin fee for adding the property onto the register is £1,250”* * *“Many landlords have mortgages which have gone up and therefore cannot afford to absorb extra costs”*   Some respondents gave an indication of what any fee should be, here are some of the suggestions;   * *“Think a more reasonable amount should be £500-£750 total”* * *“I would support the idea of licensing properties if the fee was set at a reasonable amount of £100 per property”* * *“We are being asked to fork over a significant sum for what essentially amounts to a piece of paper that shouldn’t cost more than £50 to issue”* * *“It's a very high fee for a no or little benefit to a landlord struggling to let a property. In London this fee is £400 for a 5 year license”*   Some respondents agreed with the proposed fee e.g. *“The fee is fair should it last for a reasonable duration. Paying £100-200 a year on a licence should not be unreasonable”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| As part of the proposed scheme, each property or unit of accommodation would require a licence which is subject to a fee. The proposed fee is £1,100 for licence applications made online and £1,225 if made on paper. If any Selective Licensing scheme was to run for 5 years, this would equate to £220 per year for online applications and £245 for paper applications.  A discount of £150 per application is proposed for members of the Leeds Rental Standard subject to them meeting qualifying criteria. This would reduce the licence fee to £950 per property/unit of accommodation for online applications and £1075 for paper applications. If any Selective Licensing scheme was to run for 5 years, this would equate to £190 per year / £15.83 per month / £3.65 per week for online applications and £215 per year / £17.91 per month / £4.13 per week for paper applications.  The proposed fee is based on fully costed estimate of the predicted resources that will be needed to administer and deliver any scheme over a 5-year term. A breakdown of the fee calculation will be included in the business case when published. It is important to highlight that the Council cannot make a profit from any scheme – any surplus raised by the fee would be refunded to applicants/licence holders.  The fee is not a tax nor a registration fee. As stated above, it is based on fully costed estimate of the predicted resources needed to administer and deliver any scheme over its duration. This includes, for example receiving, processing and determining licence applications; varying and revoking licences; maintaining a public register and the cost of monitoring any scheme including inspecting properties to ensure they are compliant with licence conditions and investigating unlicensed houses.  Selective licensing is a cost-effective tool to improve the management of private sector housing and standards of accommodation in the area. Any scheme needs to be sustainable over a 5 year period.  The licensing fees charged by local authorities do vary across the country. It is acknowledged that the proposed fee is higher than the fees charged by other local authorities. A breakdown of the fee calculation will be included in the business case when published. |

## 1.1.2 Theme: Payment of the licence fee

|  |
| --- |
| A number of questions were asked and statements made relating to the payment of the licence fee. Here are some that are representative of the issue raised;   * *“I don't understand, is that per annum or for a 5 year block? It seems a lot if it's PA but about right for a 5yr licence, given the work likely to be involved”* * *“It just give a land lord extra cost especially when the landlord has portfolio of houses last time leeds city council refused to let landlords pay direct debit when other council offered that facility”* * *“This has far as i am concerned beggars belief the fee you are proposing the council must allow direct debit if this is implemented or i think there could be legal action against the council”* * *“payments should be able to spread across the five years”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | The proposed licence fee covers the term of any scheme. Currently, schemes can last a maximum of 5 years. Licences issued as part of any scheme will be subject to one fee (payable in two parts – see below) and will expire on the end date of any designation.  Further to case law, the licence fee would be payable in two instalments; the first part (for the cost of processing and determining an application) on making an application with the second part (for the monitoring and enforcement of the scheme) being payable *only* if an application is successful.  The Council has explored the possibility of payments by further instalments – |  |  1. Legal advice has been taken on the fee structure which makes it clear that any additional licence condition linked to payment of the fee in instalments is likely to be outside the scope of permissible licence conditions as set out in Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004.   ii. options offered by third party providers that would have allowed payment by instalments have been considered, however none proved to be feasible for any scheme.  In any case, allowing payment by more frequent instalments for any scheme would incur additional administrative costs which would potentially result in a higher fee given the proposed fee has been calculated on the basis of two payments. It could also result in a higher level of unpaid fees which would mean the Council having to realign resources to carry out fee recovery work. Unpaid fees would also present a risk that there would be insufficient money available for the Council to adequately resource the scheme.  The risks of the issues identified in relation to the level and payment of the fee as identified in the feedback and the business case, need to be balanced against the strong evidence of deprivation and housing related issues in the area, and the need to take action to improve these in the area. |

## 1.1.3 Theme: Why has the fee has increased?

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made about the level of the proposed fee compared to the fee for the previous schemes in Beeston and Harehills. Here are some that are representative of the matters raised;   * *“Should not have to pay more than last time”.* * *“Compared to the £800 charged last time that is a massive increase, well above inflation”.* * *“A larger selective licensing area should provide you with some economies of scale and so should cost you less to implement, not more”.* * *“Why would you charge £825 5 years ago and now charge£1225 when you achieved everything you set out for in past 5 years”.* * *“This is a very big hike from the previous fee. How can the council justify this unless they say they need to employ new staff to cover the new areas”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Selective Licensing designations for Beeston and Harehills commenced on 6th January 2020 and came to an end on 5th January 2025. The cost of a licence was £825 (£675 for confirmed members of The Leeds Rental Standard) and was based on the Council taking one payment to cover the costs of administering and delivering the schemes. The fee was calculated in 2018 prior to the start of the consultation for the schemes which launched in August of that year.  Further to a court ruling in the case of R(Gaskin) v LB Richmond Upon Thames (2018), the Council recognised that the fee would have to be collected in 2 parts – the first part, £425 (for the cost of processing and determining an application) being payable on making an application and the second part, £400 or £250 for confirmed members of the Leeds Rental Standard (for the monitoring and enforcement of the scheme) being payable *only* if an application was successful. Due to the increased work associated with having a two-part payment process, the *actual* cost associated with each licence increased to £875. This £50 increase however was not passed onto landlords but was absorbed by the Council.  The proposed fee is based on fully costed estimates of the predicted resources that will be needed to administer and deliver any scheme over a 5 year term. The estimated cost of delivery has increased as costs have increased. It is also not a like for like comparison with the previous Selective Licensing schemes due to variables in the associated costs.  For the proposed Selective Licensing scheme, an application made online is proposed to cost £1100 per property or unit of accommodation. Further to the above, the *actual* cost of a licence has increased from £875 to £1,100 - an increase of just under 26% since the commencement of the Beeston and Harehills schemes .  Using the Bank of England’s inflation calculator, goods and services costing £875 in 2018 would cost £1105.73 in 2024. The calculator indicates that inflation averaged 4.0% a year.  The link to the calculator is here: [www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy/inflation/inflation-calculator](https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy/inflation/inflation-caluculator)  The business case will contain a breakdown of the proposed fee. |

## 1.1.4 Theme: The requirement for a licence for each unit of accommodation

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents raised concerns over the requirement to obtain a licence for each unit of accommodation. Here are some of the comments:   * *“You shouldn't charge a fee per house/flat.”* * *“Many landlords have large houses divided up into single self-contained units. The low rents reflect the size of these units”* * *“The onerous nature for large-scale landlords – with a form being required for each home, which are repetitive and often paper-based, there are no economies of scale and the administrative time and cost to BTR operators is significant.” …… “An alternative policy option would be to provide a block licence for larger residential blocks which are held under single ownership.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 (the Act) makes it clear that all houses in an area designated for Selective Licensing are required to be licensed by the local housing authority unless they are specifically exempted by law.  Section 91(1) of the Act states that a licence may not relate to more than one Part 3 house.  Section 99 of the Act clarifies the meaning of “house”, ie. a building or part of a building consisting of one or more dwellings (where “dwelling” means a building or part of a building occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate dwelling). In most circumstances the Council will treat each unit of accommodation, including each self-contained flat in a larger house/building, as requiring its own licence.  Section 87 of the Act allows a local housing authority to charge a fee for a licence. In relation to the proposed scheme, a simple fee structure with differentiation for online applications and paper applications is proposed and with no reduction for landlords with a large number of properties or with properties that are managed to a good standard nor any differentiation for the level of rent charged. See 1.1.7 below. |

## 1.1.5 Theme: My properties are up to a good standard

|  |
| --- |
| There were a lot of respondents that made comments about being good landlords and having properties that were up to a good standard in the proposed Selective Licensing area. Here are some of the comments:   * *“We have 4 properties in the area, all of which are compliant and were regarded by the housing officer as the best she had inspected. We will have to pay a fee of £4,400 for no benefit to our buildings or tenants.”* * *“Such a shame that good landlords still have their names blackened by the minority that are bad landlords and still have to pay costs to clear up the bad landlords mess!”* * *“it penalises landlords who own well maintained buildings and who are already paying high service charges, high Maintenance to comply with fire regs (post Grenfell), high insurance costs etc. It is likely to drive good landlords from the market.”* * *“Our property was inspected and signed off after the work was completed and any problems that our tennant has is dealt with asap and our agent will confirm. So I don’t see why all landlords should be penalised by licensing them!”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council acknowledges that there will be properties that could be classed as being to a ‘good standard’ and/or well managed that fall within the boundary of the proposed Selective Licensing area. The boundary in the proposal is a logical boundary taking into account available deprivation data within each ward and the mapping data (including existing railway, road and river lines).  The area proposed for Selective Licensing suffers from a significantly higher level of deprivation than other comparable areas of the city.  Compliant landlords with properties in the proposed area should not need to spend significant sums of money and do a lot of work in order to meet the licence conditions.  A fee discount of £150 per application is proposed for confirmed members of the Leeds Rental Standard, see 1.1.6 below. |

## 1.1.6 Theme: Discounts for landlords

|  |
| --- |
| A number of comments were made about the availability of discounts for landlords  as well as the proposed fee discount for members of the Leeds Rental Standard, here are  some of them;   * *“This is a huge increase on the last scheme, and a far smaller discount for joining the rental scheme, why?”* * *“As a generality, it would seem that the discount for online applications reflects the Council's reduced operational costs being shared with applicants.”* * *“If you can provide a discount on licensing costs for landlords with a lot of properties in the licensing areas then I'd be more receptive”.* * *“A discount could be considered for landlords who are members of a property management company”.* * *“Save £150 is a joke. So still "tax" those who are compliant. Not much incentive there …”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council acknowledges that there are a number of landlords who offer good quality accommodation and manage their properties well. Unfortunately, if an area is designated  for Selective Licensing, these landlords would still require a licence to operate their business.  Good landlords cannot be exempted from any scheme under the legislation but the Council  will recognise them. Therefore, it is proposed that accredited landlords, who are members of the Leeds Rental Standard (LRS) and are applying for a licence for properties in their ownership, will be offered a £150 discount on the licence fee. To be eligible for the discount, landlords would have to be a confirmed member of the LRS at the time of their application and the discount would be available to the proposed licence holder *only*.  In order to process any licence application, all landlords are liable for the first part of any fee. The discount offered to LRS members would be applied to the second part of the fee (the element covering the ongoing administration, monitoring and enforcement costs of the scheme) as they should require less resources as part of the enforcement of any scheme. This has been calculated as the likely reduction in time due to the fact that, to access the LRS scheme, a property should already be well managed and at a good standard.    In addition to paying a lower licence fee, there are other benefits of LRS membership, including for example access to advice and guidance; access to the Council’s Private Tenant Letting Scheme (PSLS); business parking permits to allow landlords who need regular access to a residential parking zone to park and a waste disposal concession for some household waste. Further information can be found at [www.leedsrentalstandard.org.uk](http://www.leedsrentalstandard.org.uk)  As well as the tangible benefits outlined above, the proposed fee discount is *per* *licensable* *property* which will help offset LRS membership costs for landlords with multiple properties. |

## 1.1.7 Theme: Proposed fee structure

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made about the proposed fee structure, some concerned the proposed discount (see 1.1.6 above) while others related to exemptions and incentives. Some suggested there should be no fee. Here are some of the comments;   * *“If the local council believes this licensing scheme is necessary, they should cover the cost themselves”* * *“should not have to pay again within 3 years of last payment"* * *“The fee is unjustified”* * *“Those with multiple properties who run it as a business should be part of scheme”* * *“Other areas I have licences in offer higher discounts for landlords. Is there an option for a sliding scale depending on type of housing and current level of maintenance?”* * *“Why the difference in paper or online. Alot of older landlords or one time landlords prefer paper as it is easier to keep a record of. So charging extra discriminates against them”* * *“it needs to be pro rata. So if you join 2.5 years in your only pay half etc”* * *“This service should be covered in an increase in overall council tax”* * *“When a landlord applies for a licence this should be viewed as a licence to act as a landlord, you don't need multiple drivers licences to own multiple vehicles.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed fee is based on a fully costed estimate of the predicted resources that will be needed to administer and deliver any scheme over a 5 year term.  To avoid ambiguity, a simple fee structure with differentiation for online applications and paper applications is proposed with no reduction for landlords with a large number of properties or with properties that are managed to a good standard, and the fee remaining the same regardless of the size of a property and the level of rental income. The fee structure cannot be pro-rata as the cost to the Council to process a licence application and administer, monitor and enforce the scheme would be the same irrespective of when an application was submitted. A discount of £150 per licence is proposed for accredited landlords, who are members of the Leeds Rental Standard (LRS) and are applying for a licence for properties in their ownership. To be eligible for the discount, landlords would have to be a confirmed member of the LRS at the time of their application and the discount would be available to the proposed licence holder only.  It would not be appropriate to apply no fee at all (or a much lower fee) to good landlords as their houses still need to be licensed and would incur costs to the Council. Similarly, there is no provision in the fee structure for refunding any part of the licence fee for compliant landlords as the Council will incur costs in administering the licence application and undertaking a compliance inspection.  It would not be appropriate to fund a Selective Licensing scheme via council tax.  Landlords who do not wish to complete a Selective Licence application online have the option to submit a paper application. Unfortunately, the fee for making a paper application is higher as it costs the Council more to process. Landlords applying for a licence online for the Council’s previous Selective Licensing schemes received a copy of their submitted application by email together with email receipts confirming payment. This enabled them to keep records of their application(s).  The legislation requires a licence to be obtained per house and not per landlord. The legislation provides for houses being licensed with an individual (who has been deemed Fit and Proper by the local housing authority) being named as the Licence Holder.  Further to the above, licences cannot be transferred to another person. If, for example, a licensed property is sold and it continues to meet the criteria for Selective Licensing, the new owner is legally required to make a new licence application.  Exemptions for Selective Licensing are specified in The Selective Licensing of Houses   |  | | --- | | (Specified Exemptions) (England) Order 2006, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made> See 1.3 below. | |

## 1.1.8 Theme: How will the licence fee income be used?

|  |
| --- |
| Many questions were asked and comments made about how money generated from the licensing fees will be used. Some of the comments made reference to the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills. Here are some of the questions and comments:   * “*I don't know what the fee is for”.* * *“The money we have paid does not correlate to it being used in a public way to make things better”.* * *“The revenue raised by Selective Licensing also does not appear to be spent on developing the area, reducing the deprivation or improving the health outcomes of tenants”.* * *“You can’t / won’t even tell us how the previous licensing fee monies have been spent. I have a right to know where my money has gone, because I certainly haven’t seen or heard of any benefits of how it has been used. I feel like I have given you money for nothing, because I certainly haven’t seen any benefits for paying it”.* * *“On the positive side LS9 has the potential to be a strong area given it's proximity to the city centre and noting that a lot of money is going into East Leeds so if the money raised from the licencing scheme was used to improve the area I would be comfortable with it”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Whilst the Housing Act 2004 (the Act) allows councils to charge a licence fee to cover the cost of Selective Licensing, it does not allow them to make a financial gain from it.  If Selective Licensing is introduced in parts of east, south and west Leeds, the licence fee will cover the costs associated with administering, monitoring and enforcing the scheme. This would include the cost of implementation i.e. receiving, logging and acknowledging licence applications; determining applications; preparing and issuing draft and final licences together with the required accompanying paperwork; varying and revoking licences; maintaining a public register; identifying unlicensed properties and inspecting licensed properties to ensure compliance with licence conditions together with all resultant follow up/enforcement action associated with Selective Licensing. The fee income would provide for a dedicated team of housing officers to carry out this work and for them to work in any designated area with partners e.g. the Police, the third sector and other stakeholders, to help tackle deprivation and inequalities.  No part of the licence fee income would be used for the enforcement of housing conditions under Part 1 of the Housing Act 2004, for mandatory licensing of HMO’s or for dealing with empty homes in any designated area. This work would be paid for from the Councils’ existing budget and HMO licence fee income. As with the previous Selective Licensing schemes, the Council would realign existing resources to support other enforcement in any designated Selective Licensing area.  Because licensed privately rented properties within a designated area would be visited, it would allow the Council to not only assess compliance with licence conditions  but to also engage with landlords, agents and tenants to hear what they have to say about  the area; to ensure they are aware of their rights and obligations; to offer help and advice  and to ensure that needs were being met. Residents, landlords and agents would be encouraged to discuss problems and issues they may have in the area which would then  be followed up with the relevant agency, which could include for example the ASB and  waste teams at Leeds City Council.  In terms of investment, the Council would invest significant targeted resources into the  area to tackle issues and help bring about improvements to the benefit of all. Unfortunately, licence fee income cannot be used to provide tangible benefits e.g. new play areas, refurbished community buildings etc to an area.  Information relating to the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills can be found as follows:   * on the consultation webpage via the link <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/slconsultation>; * in a report to Scrutiny Board <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605>; * in the business case for Selective Licensing in east, south and west Leeds (once published). The business case will be available on the Council’s website, [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) |

## 1.1.9 Theme: The licence fee will impact tenants and homelessness

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents indicated that the cost of the licence would be passed on to tenants via higher rents and in some cases, tenants would be made homeless. Here are some of the comments;   * *“£1100 over 12 months is £91 and let's say round it to £100.  I cannot see tenants being happy they have to pay an extra £100 rent”.* * *“Whatever I am charged will be passed on the rent”* * *“These fees are proposed during a time of austerity which both tenants and landlords feel.*   *Landlords will have a compulsion to increase rents”.*   * *“LCC has made no improvement to the areas for the public or tenants they have caused rents to go up for example when SL was started rents were £550 on average for a 2 bedroom now they are £850 plus”.* * *“This plan will just create more homelessness because landlords will sell up”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed licence fee is not an annual fee but a ‘one off’ that covers the duration of any designation. Over five years - for landlords applying online - it equates to £18.33 per month / £4.23 per week for non-accredited landlords and £15.83 per month / £3.65 per week for accredited landlords.  The Council acknowledgesthat some landlords may choose toincrease the rent to cover  the cost of a licence. For some tenants this may unfortunately mean that they have no  option but to look for an alternative home within or outside any designated area. Support  would be available from the Council for those who find themselves in this situation.  It is also acknowledged that some existing tenants may face losing their home as a result  of them not being able to pay any additional rent. Again, support will be available from the Council and/or partners for tenants finding themselves in this situation.  Any alleged cases of illegal eviction will be investigated and the appropriate action taken not just in relation to the specific case but it may also form the grounds for looking at a specific landlord who considers this as an option, to ensure that they are fully compliant with all aspects of housing legislation.  The Council’s housing options service, which assists people threatened with homelessness  or who are homeless, is aware of the proposed scheme and is aware of the potential impact  and demand for services and this has been taken into account. The above provision of  services will assist with the mitigation of any increase in homelessness as a result of any designation of Selective Licensing.  The overall aim of the proposed scheme is to reduce deprivation, predominantly through improving the management and condition of the private rented sector in the area which should have a longer-term impact on improving homelessness as more accommodation in the private sector will become suitable for longer term occupation. The risk of the issues identified related to the potential to increase rents needs to be balanced against the other evidence of the need to take action to improve the housing situation in the proposes designated area.  In relation to the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills, there is no evidence to indicate that rents went up as a direct result. The rental market in the city has seen an increase in rent levels given the issues over the last five years, such as high inflation and rising interest rates causing an increase in mortgage costs. This general increase has also been seen across the country. |

## 1.1.10 Theme: Homes will be left empty or put up for sale and investment will be impacted

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents believed that properties in the proposed designated area would be sold or left empty, that landlords would leave or not invest in the area and that there would be an impact on the availability of private rented property. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Im selling it now due to the selective licence and hassle this has caused”.* * *“Ultimately landlords have been under attack for several years and many are leaving the sector. This will lead to more people being made homeless and extra strain on the council to provide housing”.* * *“This new fee would alter our plans to buy in the selective licensing area”.* * *“Landlords might just decide to sell the properties. This would impact the PRS but there are plenty of landlords out there who do keep properties in good condition so I would not expect to see a big drop in rental stock”.* * *“If there are a lot of properties being sold that might make it more affordable for those looking to buy a home”* * *…… “Selective licensing schemes have a detrimental impact on investment viability as well as a knock-on impact on S106 and affordable housing contributions” …….. “Standards in the BTR sector far outstrip the quality standards that selective licensing schemes seek to address”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council acknowledges that some landlords may choose, as a business decision, to leave their properties empty, sell them or not invest in the area in order to avoid Selective Licensing and as a consequence there may be an increase in the number of empty homes. If this was the case, the Council would realign existing resources to tackle empty homes in any area designated for Selective Licensing.  The Council works closely with the Empty Homes Doctor, an independent not-for-profit  organisation that provides a free service to support and guide owners of empty homes.  Also, details are held of private investors and charitable organisations who buy empty  homes. Owners of empty homes in any Selective Licensing area would be made aware of  these options as well as any potential buy back schemes.  Empty homes blighting an area or causing a nuisance to neighbouring homes would be the subject of enforcement action, potential buyback schemes as mentioned above and, ultimately compulsory purchase.  The above resources will assist to reduce the impact of any increase in empty properties as  a result of any Selective Licensing designation. The longer term aims of the proposed scheme should improve demand in the area and potentially lead to longer term reduction of empty  Homes.  The loss of properties from the private rented sector (PRS) together with the area being considered less attractive to or viable for investors was identified as a risk prior to the start of the Beeston and Harehills Selective Licensing schemes in January 2020.Unfortunately, there is no specific data relating to the overall size of the PRS at the start and the end of the designations in Beeston and Harehills. This is not an omission on the part of the local authority rather it reflects the fact that homes can be rented out without the need for them to be registered anywhere. The following however would suggest that the PRS in Beeston and Harehills has not been significantly impacted by the Council’s decision to designate the areas for Selective Licensing -  1. During the life of the schemes, there were at any point approximately 6000 licensed,  privately rented homes in the two areas. Whilst there were fluctuations  (that were largely linked to stages of the licensing process e.g. an existing licence being  revoked before the new landlord submitted a valid, new licence application) overall the  number of licensed houses remained reasonably constant over the life of the schemes.  2. Data collected on 21 March 2021 (Census Day) by the Office of National Statistics indicates  that the private rented sector in Beeston had increased by 8.6% since the 2011 Census.  Similarly in Harehills the PRS grew by 9% over the same period. The Council acknowledges  that there will have been fluctuations between the two Census Days and between the 2021  Census data and the end of the schemes on 5 January 2025. |

## 1.1.11 Theme: Cost of licensing and impact on maintenance

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents said that the licence fee and the cost of complying with a licence would have an impact on the maintenance of their properties. Some also referred to their experience of the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills. Here are some examples of the comments received:   * “*these high fees would deter many good landlords, who do have rolling maintenance programmes from investing in annual upkeep of their properties”* * *“landlords may not be able to afford the work that is needed or the license costs”* * *“we found the whole procedure lengthy and costly in addition to all the other regulations that landlords have to deal with”* * *“I presume all improvement costs will be met by landlords and using penalties to pay for improvements”.* * *“It goes to far with requirements meaning its not worth renting anymore!” .* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| As stated above, the proposed licence fee for landlords applying online is £1,100 for non-accredited landlords and £950 for members of the Leeds Rental Standard. Over a 5 year term, this equates to £18.33 per month / £4.23 per week for non-accredited landlords and £15.83 per month / £3.65 per week for accredited landlords.  Whilst it is acknowledged that the licence cost will impact some landlords, the relatively low weekly cost should be balanced against the potential impact of the positive changes that any scheme aims to achieve which includes for example -   * A lower turnover of tenancies - and therefore reduced business costs for the private rented sector - as tenants choose to stay in a Selective Licensing area and make their rented property their home  |  | | --- | | * Properties in areas designated for Selective Licensing becoming more attractive to tenants as they are licensed and achieve certain standards.   The proposed licence conditions consolidate what a landlord should already be doing regardless of whether there is Selective Licensing or not. Good, compliant landlords should not need to spend significant sums of money in order to meet licence conditions.  Selective Licensing does not include compliance with Part 1 of the Housing Act 2004. The cost to ensure that a property meets the legal minimum standard is one which a landlord has to bear regardless of any licensing scheme. | |

## 1.1.12 Theme: Selective licensing is a tax and/or a money-making scheme for the Council

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents believed that Selective Licensing is a tax and was being considered as a means to raise revenue for the Council. Here are some of the comments;   * *“The scheme is clearly a way to generate money which will be coming from the tenants pocket”* * *“it's just another stealth tax”* * *“Focus on council budgets and stop wasting council staff time. It smacks of another money raising venture by LCC using the excuse of improving housing”* * *“I think the council has neither the funds nor the manpower to manage the PRS so is using this for revenue generation”.* * *“Its been seen in other areas as a money making exercise such as croydon and other areas”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Whilst the Housing Act 2004 allows councils to charge a licence fee to cover the cost of Selective Licensing, it does not allow them to make a financial gain.  The Government’s Regulatory Impact Assessment, attached to SI 2006/373 [www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/373/memorandum/contents](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/373/memorandum/contents) on Selective Licensing makes it clear that fees cannot be used to raise extra revenue for the local authority. Any surplus at the end of the scheme must be refunded to the applicants.  Overall, the costs of any scheme to landlords and the landlords’ objections to paying this cost, has been taken into consideration and should be balanced against the strong evidence of high levels of deprivation in the area together with the evidence of how any scheme will operate; it’s intended aims to improve and benefit the area and residents of the private rented sector, all of which have been incorporated into the business case. |

# 1.2 Properties owned by the public sector

## 1.2.1 Theme: Homes owned by the Council and housing associations should be subject to Selective Licensing

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made about Selective Licensing and houses operated by the  Council and housing associations. Here are some;   * “*You should clamp down on the housing associations and council first”.* * *“why aren’t housing associations made to pay also to help shoulder the costs”* * *“you would be better trying to regulate the RSLs and the councils arms length stock”* * *You should be going into housing association properties also - the likes of Federated properties whilst they may have good housing standards, these managed properties are filled with the most un-desirable tenants causing ASB and chaos to families in neighbouring properties.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Section 79(3) of the Housing Act 2004 exempts socially let properties (both Local Authority  and Housing Association tenancies) from Selective Licensing. There are other exemptions too, they’re detailed in The Selective Licensing of Houses (Specified Exemptions) (England) Order 2006 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made> |

## 1.2.2 Theme: Conditions in Council homes

|  |
| --- |
| A number of respondents referred to conditions in Leeds City Council’s housing stock. Here are some of the comments made;   * “*Most cases of poor living conditions are from council estate rather than private landlords”.* * *“The council houses themselves are not preserved to the standards they expect private landlords to adhere to”.* * *“There is double standards on the matter”.* * *“You treat private landlords like garbage whilst at the same time offer awful properties yourself as a council. Your council ones are poorly maintained and criticize private landlords”.* * *“Leeds city council should sort out their own housing stock before touching any private landlords!!!”* * *“It is generally a good idea as everyone should have access to quality housing. Let's face it, LCC isn't exactly providing the best quality housing”.* * *“Council estate and council owned properties are largely used to host people of low income and /or seeking asylum. The improvement of living conditions of those properties need to be addressed as the tenants often don't have the choice where to live, as opposed to private rentals”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Social landlords are regulated by local and national bodies including the Regulator of Social Housing, The Housing Ombudsman, Local Authority Building Control, Building Safety Regulator and the Health & Safety Executive.  The Council recognises that it has a significant portfolio in the proposed area and has a part to play in contributing to improvements in the area. By having an increased presence in the area, the Council will be better equipped to identify issues and link up with partners to ensure that its tenants receive support and help as part of any Selective Licensing scheme. This would help the Council to ensure that its properties are well managed and that they do not contribute to wider issues in the area. It would also help its officers deal with issues arising from the behaviour of the Council’s tenants. |

# 1.3 Exemptions

## 1.3.1 Theme: Exemption for private social landlords

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents expressed the view that landlords working in partnership with the Council should be exempt from Selective Licensing and/or any licence fee. Here are some of the comments:   * *“I believe that supported housing providers should be exempt from the fee”.* * *“This will impact significantly on our development and planned maintenance programme, reducing our ability to acquire and retrofit housing for people across the city who are in dire need of affordable, warm, and secure homes. It seems odd to me that the city is giving us grants to improve homes with one hand, whilst taking away with the other”.* * *“I don’t believe landlords that partner with Leeds Housing already for tenants and already go through thorough checks should be subject to selective licensing as duplicating regulation and charging those already meeting all the standards set and checked”.* * *“There needs to be careful consideration of specified groups of private landlords who should be exempt from the Selective Licensing registration because they are already effectively registered through the Private Sector Lettings Scheme and have had their properties formally assessed and checked already by Housing Options staff.”* * *“landlords that are members of NRLA and Leeds Rental standard and already work with Leeds Housing Options to place tenants with relevant checks carried out”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council recognises that housing providers play an important role in addressing the housing needs across the city. However, any exemptions from Selective Licensing can only be considered in accordance with the parameters set out in the relevant legislation.  Exemptions to Selective Licensing are specified in The Selective Licensing of Houses  (Specified Exemptions) (England) Order 2006 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made>  Further to the above, there is no scope within the list of exemptions specifically for landlords working in partnership with the council. It would therefore be inappropriate for the Council to waive any licence fee for such providers. As stated above however, a fee discount of £150 per licence application is available for members of the Leeds Rental Standard subject to them meeting qualifying criteria. |

## 1.3.2 Theme: Exemption for modern and purpose-built developments

|  |
| --- |
| A significant number of comments were made in relation to new-build, recent developments and developments that the respondent considered to be of a higher standard than most in the proposed Selective Licensing area. Many respondents felt that they should be exempt if their properties were of a good standard. There were also several respondents that commented on developments that are subject to high costs and where they were a leaseholder. Here are some examples -   * *“I understand the idea for selecting an "area" but this should be flexible to "exclude" specific streets/roads where the housing stock is more modern & therefore unlikely to be a factor in the proposed outcomes of the licensing scheme……. I believe that more modern properties within the area should be excluded”* * *“……Apartments are for professional tenants working and under service charges so these already deal with main maintenance and tenant issues so not necessary as does not add any value to the area!”* * *Echo Central already has a comprehensive lease in place which obligates Leaseholders to ensure the buildings are maintained to an appropriate standard.* * *“This proposal should be limited to landlords who hold the freehold and can improve their properties and not leaseholders in the proposed area.”* * *“Please remove new build well run properties from this scheme”* * “*Over the last 5 years I have been subject to an increase in service charge beyond measure and liable for fire safety works running into thousands.”* * *“We already paying £1000's each year to a block maintenance fund which pays for services, maintenance, cleaning, improvements etc.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Exemptions for Selective Licensing are detailed in The Selective Licensing of Houses  (Specified Exemptions) (England) Order 2006[*http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made*](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made)  New build, recently renovated properties and those developments subject to costs such as service charges cannot be exempted from Selective Licensing as this is not provided for in the legislation.  The Housing Act 2004 sets out who can be the Licence Holder and states that the proposed Licence Holder must be a Fit and Proper Person *and* the most appropriate person to be the Licence Holder. Usually the most appropriate person to be the Licence Holder is the person having control of the property. In relation to freeholders where a long lease has been granted, in most case it’s unlikely for them to have control of a property therefore it would be appropriate for someone else i.e. the leaseholder or their agent to be a Licence Holder. |

# 1.4 Deprivation factors and Selective Licensing

## 1.4.1 Theme: Anti-social behaviour and crime

|  |
| --- |
| A lot of comments were made by landlords and agents about the use of Selective Licensing to deal with issues such as anti-social behaviour (ASB) and crime. Many centred on the role of a landlord/agent. Here are some of the comments;   * *“what can landlords do about "anti-social" behaviour by tenants?”* * *“The Council is expecting landlords to act as police in renting their properties. Landlords have contractual controls with tenants over what is and is not permitted but landlords cannot police what tenants do. Landlords cannot enforce anti- social behaviour - why doesn’t the council do something about this instead of shifting the burden all the time.”* * *“The existing SL has not stopped riots and bad area such as in Harehills”* * *“I hope some of the revenue will be allocated to strengthening the ASB teams.”* * *“anti social behavior that's in the overall area is a police matter”* * *“These areas suffer from high levels of Cannabis use, it's the smell that runs through the streets on a morning, long replacing the traditional smell of egg and bacon. With this comes the dealers, they tear around on high powered e-bikes, wearing dark clothes and balaclavas, or often disguised as food delivery people, its police on the streets that these streets need, and not even more costs added to their already high rents.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The expectation is that Licence Holders and named Property Managers proactively manage their tenancies and act upon any complaints of ASB they may receive. This includes cooperating with any investigation carried out by Leeds City Council and other agencies.  A House of Commons Briefing Paper\* has identified that tenant referencing has a significant impact on ASB. Not only does it provide landlords with additional support to help ensure that they have good tenants but it gets the message through to tenants who have caused ASB in the past that they need to behave better in the future otherwise it will seriously compromise their housing choices.  Guidance on how to comply with the proposed condition relating to ASB (and indeed all  other licence conditions) will be available for Licence Holders and managers. At the same  time, officers from the Selective Licensing team, with the support of partner agencies,  will be able to assist those who find themselves having to deal with ASB caused by their tenants or that is affecting their tenants.  Intensive working in the area, together with closer working with Council services and  partner agencies, will bring about improved intelligence and the better targeting of  resources. ASB problems highlighted by the community and other stakeholders would be  dealt with quicker and in partnership. This should contribute to the intended aim of a long  term improvement in the area.  Experience from the previous Selective Licensing schemes in parts of Beeston and Harehills found that crossing the thresholds and working in the areas allowed officers to work with partners and share intelligence to support and address wider determinants of deprivation, including dealing with anti-social behaviour and criminality.  Further information concerning the delivery and outcomes of the previous Selective Licensing schemes are available in the report provided for Scrutiny Board whichcan be accessed via the link:  <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605>  \* House of Commons Library Briefing Paper Number 4636, 13 March 2019, Selective licensing of private rented housing in England and Wales |

## 1.4.2 Theme: The connection between deprivation and Selective Licensing

|  |
| --- |
| There were a wide range of comments made in relation to deprivation in general and in relation to specific factors that cause or contribute to deprivation. A number of respondents commented on the connection between Selective Licensing and deprivation. Here are some of the comments made in relation to deprivation and some of the factors (NB. crime and anti-social behaviour have been considered under a separate heading, see 1.4.1 above):  Deprivation   * *“Selelctive licensing will not improve depravation ! This is a social issue and it is not caused by landlords.”* * *“We own houses in Armley – “its an impoverished area, low income, low education, lots of prople on benefits. How will selective licencing improve this?”* * *“I have a property in a Selective Licensing area and it has had no effect on deprivation, only to avoid subletting in large houses.”*   Employment status of adults   * *“The majority of landlords in the area abide by the regulations. I cannot see how this will improve employment apart from at the council through the administration of such a scheme”* * *“Why should landlords be held responsible for "employment" in an area?”* * *“I don't feel you've drawn a rational line from poor quality private lets to impact on employment and wider wellbeing.”* * *“The areas are lower income because the housing is lower cost.”*   Health   * *“I don't see how Selective Licensing would have make a difference to lower income households or increase life expectancy.”* * *“Why should the Council address health issues only with private tenants? Do owner-occupiers and social tenants not have health issues?”* * *“Raising money through Selective Licensing will not increase life expectancy, that is utter rubbish”*   Access to education, training and other services   * *“How will it improve employment or education? Not linked at all to this measure.”* * *“Access to education and training will only improve if your intention is to divert the excess money from the landlord scheme to these areas. Revealing your true intentions.”* * *“The people they are renting to don't have the educational / employment opportunities. While housing is a factor is a small one”* * *“To tackle deprivation you need to improve education levels and provide a good support network to those in need.”*   Housing conditions   * *“Housing is one element of deprivation, and it isn’t just for Landlords to ensure that housing is maintained at a safe and suitable standard.”* * *“The problems in the areas you are proposing are of a social demographic nature and not down to the quality of the housing stock in the area.”* * *“Minor improvements to a house will not change a persons behaviour or integration within society, Drug use in the areas are at an all time high. The issues are bigger than housing.”* * *“Selective licensing will not resolve most of the aims/objectives of the scheme - but it is at least a starting point to begin addressing some of the worst housing stock & bring it up to a safe standard for tenants.”*   The physical environment   * *“You only have to walk/drive through these areas to see that some of these are run down.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| It is evident from the feedback that there is wide ranging opinion regarding the role of Selective Licensing in relation to issues of deprivation.  Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 allows a council to designate an area for Selective Licensing however, to do so, they must first be able to demonstrate that the area satisfies one of six conditions relating to either low housing demand; significant and persistent Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB); poor housing conditions; high level of deprivation; high levels of migration or high levels of crime. The proposal for Selective Licensing in parts of east, south and west Leeds is based on the high level of deprivation across the area.  In accordance with guidance published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government\*, the Council has considered the following factors in comparison to other similar neighbourhoods in the local authority area:   * the employment status of adults * the average income of households * the health of households * the availability and ease of access to education, training and other services for households * housing conditions * the physical environment * levels of crime   The area proposed for Selective Licensing suffers from a significantly higher level of deprivation than other comparable areas of the city. Within the proposed Selective Licensing boundary, there are a number of areas that are in the lowest 1% of the most deprived areas in the country.  Selective Licensing should not be seen as a measure in isolation as the solution to address issues of deprivation. Together with other complementary measures and initiatives and as part of a wider strategy, Selective Licensing would allow the Council and partners to address the complex range of issues that are evident in the area and improve housing management and conditions in the private rented sector due to the licence conditions, and the fact that licence holders must be a fit and proper person to hold a licence.  By visiting licensed properties, officers would not only check that they were safe to live in and managed properly but would also identify individuals who may need help and advice with issues such as access to training and employment; budgeting and debt management; their health and support around the home. Officers would be able to make referrals to relevant agencies and act as a link between occupants and other council departments e.g. the Cleaner Neighbourhoods Team and the Leeds Anti-Social Behaviour Team and to external agencies including the police and the third sector.  \* Selective licensing in the private rented sector: a guide for local authorities. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. December 2024. |

# 1.5 The proposed area

## 1.5.1 Theme: Which areas are included in the scheme?

|  |
| --- |
| One respondent questioned if flats in a particular area were included in the scheme while another queried what the area was. Here are those comments:   * *“Are the flats in ………. included in this scheme”* * *“What is the area? It is not well defined”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed Selective Licensing area covers parts of Armley, Beeston, Holbeck, Cross Green, East End Park, Hunslet and Harehills.  A fully interactive map of the proposed area together with an indicative street list was available (and remain available) during the consultation period on the councils website, [www.leeds.gov.uk/slconsultation](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/slconsultation) The paper questionnaire for landlords and agents also contained a map.  Any dwelling that falls within the boundary of the proposed area is included within the scheme.  We would advise anyone to contact us should they wish to check if a property is likely to be affected by the proposal. The contact details are as follows;  Tel. 0113 3782889  Email: ESWselective.licensing@leeds.gov.uk |

## 1.5.2 Theme: Why have you chosen this area?

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents questioned why the area had been chosen. A variety of different views were put forward with comments on the size of the scheme and views on the area that should be included or excluded. There were also suggestions of having a city-wide Selective Licensing scheme. Here are some of the comments:  Size of scheme:   * *“You should concentrate on much smaller areas, where there are "pockets" of poor housing and "poor behaviour" by residents.”* * *“I would hope costs would reduce if the scheme were City wide.”* * *“This is supposed to a targeted strategy and under this new proposal looks more like a blanket policy”* * *“Only fair and right if all rented properties have a license, because otherwise good landlords and properties within the above areas are penalised.”* * *“If it is implemented then it should target the whole city rather than BAME and working class areas.”*   Areas to include   * *“Armley needs investment and TLC. this will ensure everyone is working to teh same standards.”* * *“I have seen worst places in Seacroft, Gipton, Halton moor, whinmoor So why miss them out”* * *“You should make sure headingley is covered as well.”* * *“It would make more sense to charge landlords in wealthier parts of the city and then if they increase rent on their properties their tenants would be more able to absorb the cost”* * *“Crime is highest in the University student areas if Hyde Park woodhouse and Burley and yet these are not included in then proposed scheme.”*   Areas to exclude   * *“Armley is nothing like Harehills and Beeston. It is vastly better in many ways.”* * *“Kepler terrace is a street away from the current zone LS8 5EH, it has tenants on the street which are good people who all work, why are they in the selective license area?”* * *“Holbeck, Harehills and Beeston Hill should be exempt. These had licensing and intensive approaches.”* * *“Some areas yes but in Ecclesburns it is not a problem.”* * *“Buller Close, LS9 6JT is bery nice close with relatively new houses”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed area for Selective Licensing covers parts of Armley, Beeston, Holbeck, Cross Green, East End Park, Hunslet and Harehills. Approval was given by the Council’s Executive Board in March 2024 for officers to investigate whether or not there is a business case for a Selective Licensing scheme in the area.    Selective Licensing is a legislative tool that can be used by local authorities to address  specific problems in a particular area, subject to qualifying criteria (which is laid out in legislation and guidance) being met.  The proposed area is strategically important for the council with ‘The Best City Ambition’ setting out the overall vision for the future of Leeds and for it to deliver on ‘The Leeds Housing Strategy (2022-2027) which sets out the city’s housing ambitions and how the city will work together to meet these over the next 5 years.  As detailed under other themed headings (see 1.4.2 and 1.5.5), the area proposed for Selective Licensing has a high proportion of private rented housing and suffers from a high level of deprivation than other comparable areas.  Other areas of the city are also subject to interventions which may include the potential for Selective Licensing in the future or other initiatives depending on the area concerned. The Council always reserves the right to consider its options, this includes considering Selective  Licensing for other parts of the city.  City-wide Selective Licensing schemes cannot deal with specific local problems. Whilst some local authorities in the UK have introduced city–wide schemes, the Government generally does not support the use of licensing across an entire local authority area. |

## 1.5.3 Theme: It will have a negative effect on the area / on property values

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents raised concerns over the potential negative effects of any Selective Licensing designation. Here are some of the comments;   * *“There are many properties, such as Echo Central) in this are which are professionally managed to very high standard. The imposition of an additional scheme will provide no further improvement of standards. It would impose additional costs for landlords and have a detrimental effect on property values”* * *“Adding an extra layer of regulation offers no benefit while imposing significant costs on landlords, which could ultimately decrease property values and deter investors.”* * *“The scheme will likely be seen as a negative by future buy-to let investors looking to purchase properties at Echo Central because there appears to be little to no tangible benefits to these developments and significant additional expenditure is required by landlords.”* * *“The proposed postcode affecting the Aire Building at cross green Lane unfairly penalises us and this will discourage any landlords to want to invest in the region and maintain the building due to unsustainable rising costs”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council acknowledges that Selective Licensing may lead to a negative perception of the area. However as a scheme progresses, perceptions change and confidence in an area grows. The aims of the scheme are to lead to long term improvement in housing management and conditions in the area, contributing to a reduction in the level of deprivation in the area. This potentially will contribute to a long-term improvement of the area.   |  | | --- | | Housing markets are complex with a number of different factors affecting why people invest. As any scheme is implemented and the sector improves, it may be that landlords are keen to invest in a well-regulated market which is not being undermined by poor housing standards. | |

## 1.5.4 Theme: It will move problems to other areas

|  |
| --- |
| There were a few respondents commenting on how Selective Licensing will move the problems to other areas. Here are two of the comments:   * *“Creating 'Selective Licensing Areas (SLA)' simply moves the problem, with 'bad' landlords being encouraged to sell up in the SLA to set-up in an area adjacent to the SLA”.* * *“I think you're just moving the problem elsewhere”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| There is always the potential for any landlord or tenant to move from one area to another. This already occurs and will continue to occur regardless of whether Selective Licensing is introduced or not.  Selective Licensing can increase the likelihood of displacement occurring as it highlights an area and as a result resources are directed to the area to address issues such as poor housing conditions and management; crime; ASB; environmental issues etc. This in itself can lead to both landlords and tenants moving and potentially taking the issues to locations outside of any area designated for Selective Licensing.  There are other rental markets in the city that may be affected by displacement from the area. This would need to be monitored by the Council to determine if there are any issues as a result, and subsequently managed. Any displacement would need to be identified and appropriately managed as part of any Selective Licensing delivery approach. This potential risk is identified in the business plan however all risks should be balanced against the evidence of the need for action to be taken to improve the issues related to private sector housing in the area.  In addition to Selective Licensing (which would allow for a dedicated officer resource in the proposed area) the Council has further resources in place to deal with city-wide issues.  During the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills, the Council became aware of a small number of landlords choosing to sell their properties. This was the result of them being subject to investigations by the Selective Licensing team and them making the decision to leave the rental market completely. |

## 1.5.5 Theme: There are not many rental properties in the area

|  |
| --- |
| One respondent (from a riverside housing development in Hunslet) commented *“A large percentage of the community is owner occupied and it’s ridiculous to think it should be classified as such.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The latest Selective Licensing guidance\* states “nationally the private rented sector currently makes up 19% of the total housing stock in England. The actual number of Private rented properties in a given area may be more or less than this, and if it is more than 19%, the area can be considered as having a high proportion or privately rented properties”.  Using 2021 Census data, the proportion of privately rented stock across Leeds is 21.8%.  The proportion of privately rented stock in the proposed Selective Licensing area, using the same data, is 38.9%.  The proportion of privately rented stock in Leeds has grown by 3.9% from 17.9% in 2011 to 21.8% in 2021.  The growth in the proportion of privately rented stock in the proposed Selective Licensing area has outpaced the growth of Leeds at 7.4%. It has increased from 31.5% in 2011 to 38.9% 2021.  \*Selective licensing in the private rented sector: a guide for local authorities. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. December 2024. |

## 1.5.6 Theme: Make changes to the proposed boundary

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents made reference to specific developments saying they should not be included in the proposed Selective Licensing area. Here are some example comments:   * *“The climate innovation district on the other side of East Street (A61), (which was also approved as part of the regeneration of South and East Leeds) is not included in the proposed scheme. It is unclear why Echo Central, Bouverie Court and X1 Aire are not categorised the same as the adjacent Climate Innovation District development”.* * “*The H2010 estate is a well looked after area which in fact is mostly self managed without any council interaction. I pay ground rent in order to maintain the estates for its roads, parks, lights and scenery*”. * “*Hunslet the oval (hunslet green) and hunslet riverside ( off Goodman street) and railway street (phoenix apartment block city centre) are affluent areas. Mainly educated working professionals. No issues with anti social behaviour. None of these areas are considered 'deprived'*”. * *“Saxton in Leeds is a reputable apartment complex and seems to be included due to location rather than any actual issue subject to the scheme*”. * *“How can Leeds City Council justify introducing this Scheme in Holbeck after injecting such a large*  *amount of public money into the Holbeck Repair Scheme.”* * “*there are some newer build blocks, for example Echos and Aire which have had significant monies spent on them already and where their counterparts in the Eco zone over the road are not included. This appears strange given the emphasis should be on dealing with issues in the older part of the housing stock*”.   Some respondents (as part of the survey feedback and emails received by the service) proposed changes to the boundary. One of the respondents said:   * *“Echo Central is on the boundary line of (just inside) the scheme and similar apartment blocks directly opposite (in the climate innovation district) are not included in the scheme. To provide a boundary that is ‘logical, continuous and has a clear demarcation’, which is consistent with the adjacent development, the line could be amended to exclude Echo Central from the scheme. I would suggest that this could be achieved relatively easily by moving the boundary line to Cross Green Lane.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed selective licensing area is displayed in an interactive map that is accessible on the council consultation webpage and is accessible via the link: <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/consultations-and-feedback/selective-licensing-consultation>  In proposing the Selective Licensing boundary, many factors were considered including:   * Quantitative and qualitative data (local and national) regarding factors relevant to deprivation * Legislation/guidance * Council strategy/policy * Local knowledge * Lessons from previous schemes * The need for a boundary that is logical, continuous and with a clear demarcation.     The proposed area has natural/clear boundaries such as rivers, train lines, roads, walkways, distinctive land areas, etc which mean that displacement into local neighbourhoods is likely to be minimised.  Further to the representations made, the boundary (shown as a solid black line on the map) is currently under review by council officers. Any recommendations concerning the boundary will be presented to the Council’s Executive Board as part of the business case.  The decision as to whether to approve or reject any new Selective Licensing scheme based on the councils recommendations will be made by the Council’s Executive Board and it will follow the Council’s governance procedure and process. |

# 1.6 The proposal for Selective Licensing and the previous schemes

## 1.6.1 Theme: Decision already made

|  |
| --- |
| A number of responses were made with the view that a decision had already been made and with the suggestion that the consultation and decision-making process does not take account of the feedback. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Quite frankly this doesn't feel like a consultation, it feels like the decision has already been made and the questions have been designed to justify the decision.”* * *“This consultation is a sham, you will not listen to anyone's views, you have already decided to go ahead with it but you have to go through this process.”* * *“No councillors attended the consultation event in Hunslet - this is poor show. It feels like a money making scheme but if legally challenged it will cost LCC.”* * *“Don’t you think that it is completely ridiculeus, that by luck we find out that a scheme is supposed to be implemented completely unnecessairily on our estate?”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council takes its duty to consult very seriously and endeavours to do so in a thorough and fair manner. The consultation undertaken by the Council for Selective Licensing was extensive with out of home adverts on buses, social media and radio as well as drop-in events at community hubs; taking the community bus out into the area and engagement with partners and stakeholders. The consultation followed a similar process as the consultation for the previous schemes, which was regarded by a First Tier Tribunal Judge as going *‘above what might ordinarily be expected of a Local Authority in bringing a new scheme to the attention of landlords, tenants and the general public’* and therefore is, in the Council’s opinion, in excess of what would be legally required to be undertaken for any designation to be considered.  The purpose of a consultation is to gain feedback from different groups and individuals who will most likely have differing opinions on the proposal. A consultation is not a vote.  The Council will consider any representations made during the consultation however the decision as to whether to approve or reject any new Selective Licensing scheme will be made by the Council’s Executive Board and it will follow the Council’s governance procedure and process. The decision will be based on the business case which sets out the relevant criteria the Council is required to satisfy in order to designate an area as subject to Selective Licensing and which will include the consultation responses.  Any decision made by the Council can be subjected to judicial review by any party irrespective of whether they are for or against the outcome of the decision on whether or not to designate any Selective Licensing scheme. |

## 1.6.2 Theme: Harehills and Beeston have already had Selective Licensing. What has been achieved?

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made in relation to the outcomes of the previous Selective Licensing schemes. Some of the responses referred to information provided by the Council on their website, <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/consultations-and-feedback/selective-licensing-consultation> and made available at drop in sessions held as part of the consultation. Specific reference appears to have been made to the following information that was provided: *“Inspections of properties in the two areas have found that 85% were not compliant”.*  Many of the comments questioned the need to have a Selective Licensing scheme in areas that had previously been subject to Selective Licensing. Some respondents wanted further detail on what the money from the previous schemes was spent on. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Beeston and harehills have already been done. What is the need to do it again in the same areas”* * *“The 2 schemes due to end January 2025 your aim was to visit all properties this was not achieved and only 1500 out of the 6200 properties have been improved. I feel you should continue to work for the Beeston and Harehills residents and Landlords who have already paid for a license before starting another selective licensing area.”* * *“A fuller evaluation is required on how the investment is distributed and what improvements resulted directly from that investment”* * *What have you been doing in Beeston and Harehills, why is only 15% of the properties compliant with selective licencing - from what I have read this has been operating for 5 years! What have you been doing with all that money!”* * *“Concerned that only 15% compliant and how much action is being taken to tackle the other 85%, can the council cope with a larger area?..... Will LCC have sufficient manpower to handle the increased area. Will the legal system be able to manage the increased prosecutions?”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills came into effect on 6 January 2020. This followed the decision of the Council’s Executive Board to designate the areas in June 2019. Both business cases were based on high levels of deprivation and aimed to address housing conditions as well as wider issues of deprivation in each area, such as crime and antisocial behaviour (ASB). By crossing the threshold of licensed properties and working with partners, it also aimed to help those with wider needs.  A report for the Council’s Scrutiny Board produced on the 20th February 2025 provided an update on the outcomes of the two schemes:  During the life of the scheme there have been approximately 2,500 licensed houses in Beeston and 4,000 in Harehills. This figure has varied slightly but generally the numbers have remained the same during the life of the designations.  As a result of Selective Licensing, 6,721 inspections, visits and revisits have occurred, 3,429 in Beeston and 3,292 in Harehills, with 2,978 different properties being visited overall. Inspections have revealed 85% of properties have not been legally compliant when considering issues relating to Part 1 (housing hazards) and/or Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 (compliance with the selective licensing provisions). The schemes have highlighted the poor housing conditions found in the areas. Unfortunately, whilst most landlords licensed their homes and improved them a number failed to do so, resulting over 400 civil penalty notices being issued and over 2,900 legal notices issued by officers.  As a result of Selective Licensing there have been 1,430 homes improved following the removal of hazards with further ongoing visits to follow up on outstanding work and ensure it is completed, which has resulted in 6,023 people benefiting from better quality homes.  In addition to addressing housing standards the aim was also to support wider determinants of deprivation. In terms of antisocial behaviour (ASB) and crime the scheme allowed the targeting of criminality in the private rented sector (PRS) with over 500 cannabis farms found and support for Police and wider partners operations such Operation Braylock, Barrowberry and Baseend targeting the use of the PRS by criminals.  By crossing the threshold officers worked with partners to address wider issues and support people with their health, improve finances and access to services making over 1,936 referrals to partners as well as supporting individuals following visits with partners to address needs.  Whilst progress was undoubtedly made in the areas, the schemes were interrupted by the COVID 19 pandemic from March 2020 which limited the Council’s ability to process licence applications and inspect homes for a significant period. The Council’s decision to support the PRS with not chasing the licence fees during the first lockdown further delayed the issuing and enforcement of licences  In the business cases for the previous licensing schemes covering parts of Beeston and Harehills, the fee was based on a fully costed estimate of the predicted resources needed to administer and deliver the scheme over a 5 year term. The licence fee was used to cover the costs associated with administering and delivering the scheme. This included the cost of implementation i.e. receiving, logging and acknowledging licence applications; determining applications; preparing and issuing draft and final licences together with the required accompanying paperwork; varying and revoking licences; maintaining a public register; identifying unlicensed properties and inspecting licensed properties to ensure compliance with licence conditions together with all resultant follow up/enforcement action associated with selective licensing. All of the fee income that was generated was spent on the delivery on the Selective Licensing schemes and there was no surplus when the schemes ended.  Further information concerning the delivery and outcomes of the Selective Licensing schemes are available in the report provided for Scrutiny Board whichcan be accessed via the link:  <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605> |

## 1.6.3 Theme: My house was not inspected in the previous scheme

|  |
| --- |
| A number of comments were made about the lack of inspections carried out during the previous Selective Licensing schemes covering parts of Beeston and Harehills. Here are some of them:   * *“I have had no inspection in this 5 years”.* * *“My property has never been inspected to my knowledge. I hope my fee went to good use though and has ensured the properties needing this support have been addressed”.* * *“I try to be a very good landlord, getting things fix quickly for my tenants, complying with licence etc, but, the council have never inspected the property or offered advice”.* * *“what's the point doing the selective licencing when it's only been done last year because of covid.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The previous Selective Licensing schemes covering parts of Beeston and Harehills came to an end on 5 January 2025. When the areas were designated, the aim was to visit all licensed properties within the 5-year period. Unfortunately, as detailed in the report for Scrutiny Board produced on the 20th February 2025, this did not occur for a number of reasons:  *“Unfortunately, no one could have foreseen the pandemic which impacted the world as of March 2020. This impacted all Council services not just the delivery of Selective Licensing. This meant that all licence applications had to be determined remotely during these periods given the restrictions of access to the office. A new process of remote working had to be developed and agreed with Information Governance colleagues to allow the applications to be processed. This lengthened the licencing process as a result.*  *As part of the help given to people and businesses during the pandemic in March 2020 the Council agreed to delay the collection of the licence fee until the Autumn of that year to support the sector. This delayed the issuing of licences as no licence could be approved until both parts of the fee had been received.*  *The restrictions and lockdowns over the period of the pandemic meant that it was not possible to proactively inspect properties. Whilst officers still addressed issues where complaints were received or where it was possible to do so without compromising public safety, these were in smaller numbers compared to what was planned over the same period. It was not until the service recommenced activities post the pandemic in January 2022 that a proactive inspection regime was able to restart. The Council had costs to cover associated with the delivery of the scheme.*  *As part of the consultation, Leeds Landlords Against Licensing submitted their objections to the introduction of Selective Licensing. They stated that 75% of all homes meet the required standard. This has not been the case, with 85% of homes failing to meet the legal requirement placed upon landlords when renting their homes, namely either Part 3 and/or Part 1. Addressing the non-compliance as well as the level of formal actions against landlords who failed to licence their homes has also impacted on the Council’s ability to inspect all homes in the schemes within the 5-year period.”*  Further information concerning the delivery and outcomes of the previous Selective Licensing schemes are available in the report provided for Scrutiny Board whichcan be accessed via the following link:  <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605> |

## 1.6.4 Theme: Conditions of the previous scheme

|  |
| --- |
| Some of the comments made by respondents related to the conditions contained within the licence for the previous schemes in Beeston and Harehills and on the delivery of those schemes. Here are some of the comments;   * *“I think you should reconsider some of the standards which seemed over detailed and cost money - eh we special at were asked to put a cupboard under sink to “store the bleach” I don’t think that adds to overall properly standards . We also had to raise our stair banisters by 10mm - which was very costly”* * *“Your compliance statistics imply widespread poor quality houses. All of our properties needed something doing to meet Licence conditions - mainly banister heights, railings down both sides of front steps and the fitting of fire doors. I agree that these were safety improvements but I don't see them as an indication of poor quality houses.”* * *“You haven’t visited the houses you were meant to only the problem ones so the percentage is absolutely meaningless”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The licence conditions associated with the previous Selective Licensing schemes for parts of Beeston and Harehills were drafted in accordance with legislation and took into account recent case law. Once drafted, they were shared with various landlord associations for feedback. None had any comments in relation to the legality or enforceability of the conditions - all believed them to be legal and enforceable regardless of their formal responses to the Selective Licensing consultation. Guidance on complying with the licence conditions was published on the Council’s website and was available in printed format.  The properties visited as part of the previous Selective Licensing schemes were generally targeted proactively (either on a street-by-street basis or through working with agents) or reactively in response to complaints and intelligence-led work. Some visits formed part of co-ordinated work with partners to coincide with other initiatives such as street walks led by Housing Leeds or Police targeted action as part of the Clear, Hold, Build project in Harehills.  The statistics published as part of the consultation are from the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills. 85% of the properties inspected were not compliant, either with breaches of licence conditions and/or property standards.  The licence conditions for the proposed Selective Licensing scheme have been reviewed and updated since the previous schemes ended. The Council believes the proposed conditions are appropriate to ensure Licence Holders are proactive in managing their properties effectively, both in protecting the health, safety and welfare of tenants and in ensuring that incidents of ASB by their tenants are dealt with effectively.  The Council recognises that there is a balance to be struck in the licence conditions being  overly prescriptive and providing general conditions which are open to interpretation. It will  seek to provide support and guidance on its website to assist Licence Holders in these responsibilities.  It should be noted that whilst Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 (the Act) is concerned with the requirements of Selective Licensing in a designated area, all landlords have ongoing responsibilities to protect the health, safety and welfare of their tenants in accordance with the requirements of Part 1 of the Act. |

## 1.6.5 Theme: Selective licensing doesn’t work

|  |
| --- |
| There were a range of comments from respondents as to why Selective Licensing does not or will not work with some commenting on the previous schemes. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Selective licensing doesn't work. Society will remain the same, teenage prostitutes still exist in Beeston, drug users still sit on other peoples walls off their heads, and crime still occurs where ever you live car crime and burglary happens everywhere almost every day. Selective licensing hasn't changed anything where it already exists.”* * *“Bad landlords exist, this doesn’t stop them.”* * *“There simply are not the personnel or the resources to cover ALL private tenants / landlords and their properties.”* * *“I have previously had properties in the cross green selective licensing area and in my experience, other than taking a fee for the license , nothing has ever been done from a council standpoint on inspections of the property or keeping up appearances of the area and this was in a 10 year period.”* * *“Selective Licensing does NOT tackle any of the problems outlined above, as proven in other areas in the country which already has such scheme in place.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council believes that Selective Licensing is a powerful tool that can contribute to  helping achieve the city’s strategic housing objective for everyone to live in good quality, affordable homes within clean and well cared for places    The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health and the Chartered Institute of Housing  jointly published A licence to rent in January 2019. 27 Selective Licensing schemes running in 20 Councils were analysed. The schemes were found not to generate ‘quick wins’, that it may take several years before tangible outcomes are achieved. Many of the schemes  studied however were delivering significant benefits including improved property and management standards, better opportunities to engage with local landlords and reductions  in anti-social behaviour.  The above themes within this section discuss the outcomes from the previous schemes for Beeston and Harehills. Additional information is also available on the Council’s website, [www.leeds.gov.uk/slconsultation](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/slconsultation)  The proposed scheme will allow the Council to put dedicated resources into areas suffering from significant deprivation in the city. |

## 1.6.6 Theme: What about those landlords that don’t sign up to the scheme / comply with conditions?

|  |
| --- |
| Many comments were made in relation to landlords that either do not sign up to the scheme or fail to comply with the Selective Licensing requirements. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Good landlords providing good homes for people are not the ones that should be paying for this. What are you doing about the ones who are not signing up for the schemes?”* * *“what are the petalites for landlords who have let dangerous properties.”* * *“If you believe the landlords will pay you are sadly deluded.”* * *“There is no mention of the horrendous fines that and are being imposed again all part of revenue”* * *“It is vital that the funds raised by license scheme are not just wasted in bureaucracy, but result in bad landlords being convicted and poor behaving/antisocial tenants being rectified.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Any landlord that does not apply for a Selective Licence if required to do so or fails to comply with the conditions of their licence if issued will be liable for prosecution or a civil penalty up to £30,000 per offence.  As part of the strategy to deliver Selective Licensing, the Council will utilise a dedicated resource to find those properties that are being operated without a licence as well as assessing compliance with the conditions where licences have been issued.  Further information concerning enforcement action taken as part of the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeson and Harehills can be found in the report provided for Scrutiny Board whichcan be accessed via the link:  <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605> |

## 1.6.7 Theme: Discrimination and barriers to services

|  |
| --- |
| There were a few comments that questioned if the proposed scheme was discriminatory. Some respondents suggested support should be made available in relation to the delivery of the proposed scheme. Here are some of the comments:   * “*Are older people and or Asian people being targeted”* * *“It disproportionately targets BAME and working class communities; and holds them to a higher standard as opposed to those from white and middle/ upper class communities.”* * *“Introducing selective licensing will encourage people's prejudice against those already deprived areas and divide communities*.” * *“If you want things to work the people in these post code areas may not speak and or read english. You need to use mediators who can work between LCC and people in the area. Older people cannot use technology there needs to be a support system for these people. Not just attack, work with people. Experience of people working on the phones and dealing with people isn’t enough to be able to help”* * *“also suggest help at hubs with online apps ?? maybe something that’s considered given our preference for online applications?”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposal for Selective Licensing has regard to the Housing Act 2004 and Government guidance\* which requires the Council to consider deprivation factors (see theme 1.4.2 for further details). As part of a number of strategies developed by the Council, Selective Licensing aims to tackle inequalities facing the area.  Locality working is a crucial way of helping people facing barriers as it creates an opportunity for Council officers to engage with the community and link up with partners to support those with service needs. Officers are experienced in dealing with situations where language barriers can present challenges and will utilise in-house resources that are available including multilingual officers. The Council also provides information and guidance online with options to access in different languages.  Landlords who do not wish to complete a Selective Licence application online have the option to submit a paper application (see theme 1.1.7).  Support and guidance for landlords and agents will be made available by the Council including guidance documents and contact options via phone and email. However, it is ultimately the legal responsibility of a landlord/agent to comply with any legal obligations which may include the requirement to apply for a Selective Licence and to comply with licence conditions if operating in an area where Selective Licensing is introduced.  \*Selective licensing in the private rented sector: a guide for local authorities. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. December 2024. |

# 1.7 Alternatives to Selective Licensing

## 1.7.1 Theme: The Council should use its existing powers

|  |
| --- |
| A number of respondents made comments about the powers already available to the Council. There were also a number of comments suggesting the Council should react to complaints as an alternative to Selective Licensing. Here are some of the comments:   * *“I think the council should react to complaints. My experience is that tenants will always complain if necessary. You must have a list of private rented properties. You could check them periodically or contact the tenants periodically”* * *“You need to tackle rogue landlords and bad tenants directly with laws you already have”* * *“The council has enough powers as it is.”* * *“Renting out properties is already a regulated market with checks provided by legislation to ensure properties are safe, energy efficient and renters have rights to address issues.”* * *“A reactive approach is the fair and effective solution. If tenants don't complain it is because they don't know their rights. A simple periodic leaflet campaign initiated by the council could solve this problem and it would cover the WHOLE region, not just the selected areas.”* * *“I'm very surprised that the council is pursuing such a scheme. It should use its efforts more effectively to enforce current rules and regulations, or introduce new ones if insufficient”* * *“You already have the powers under HHSRS to do what needs to be done.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| |  | | --- | | The Council already has a complaints service in place. Property inspections may be carried out following a complaint or a referral from a partner or enforcement agency concerning unsatisfactory housing or overcrowded conditions. Further information, which includes the contact details for the Private Sector Housing Service as well as guidance, advice and letter templates for tenants can be found on our website:  <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/help-for-private-tenants> In addition to containing information for tenants, the website also contains information for landlords and agents. This can be found at  <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/information-for-landlords>  There is legislation, and there are powers available, for example the Housing Act 2004 (and associated regulations), the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949, for dealing with poor management and poor housing conditions. This legislation however is primarily reactive and can largely only be used once problems have arisen. Selective Licensing however requires licence holders to be proactive in managing their properties and tenancies and it offers further powers to a Local Authority to ensure that the licence holder is a fit and proper person and that satisfactory management arrangements are in place. All of this, together with the fact that Selective Licensing enables access to licensed properties, combined with working in partnerships with others, will help to tackle the deprivation and inequalities in the area which our evidence has revealed.  Having a purely reactive approach, by relying on complaints, would mean that many property conditions and management issues are left undiscovered and therefore not  Addressed. Indeed, it is often the case that tenants do not report poor conditions to the local authority. This can be for a number of reasons including not being aware of their rights and the help available and the fear of retaliatory action e.g. being asked to leave their rented home or having their rent increased. The introduction of any new legislation is not within the power of the Council, it is at the discretion of parliamentary procedures.  The Private Sector Housing enforcement policy provides further details on the duties and discretionary powers available to the Council through a range of legislation to take enforcement action to address issues arising at privately owned accommodation:  <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/information-for-landlords/private-sector-housing-enforcement-policy> | |

## 1.7.2 Theme: Street-by-street and/or a neighborhood approach

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents commented on the Leeds Neighbourhood Approach (LNA) that was previously used in parts of Harehills, Armley and Holbeck. One respondent felt that that scheme was more effective in improving standards. There were also comments that suggested adopting a street-by-street or a similar targeted approach. Here are some examples of the comments:   * *“The neighbourhood approach in Holbeck was really effective for us - as we had good quality inspections and help with understanding the safety improvements we needed to do. In Beeston we just paid the licence fee but received no inspection or advice. It has left me feeling the Neighbourhood approach is much more effective at improving standards and that the Licence scheme is just a money gathering exercise.”* * *“Holbeck has had an intensive neighbourhood approach with every house visited and conditions improved. Not sure how this can be improved upon.”* * *“Street by Street approach is because you do not have the resource in money or staff to properly implement. I agree with purely reactive approach”* * *“SL should be considered property by property rather than a blanket are selection.”* * *“A simple door to door approach asking if each house was privately owned or rented done every couple of years ahould ensure no property falls through the cracks.”* * *“There are probably streets that are well known in different areas that should be targeted eg the ………… had a big problem with drug dealers a few years back.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The LNA was a resource intensive initiative undertaken by the Council. Starting in Harehills in 2013 it adopted a street-by-street approach with the objective of improving housing standards and dealing with empty properties in a small, defined area. Whilst the Council recognises the benefits of this and similar approaches, it would not be a viable option given the size of the area proposed for Selective Licensing; the time and resources that the Council would need to input into the initiative and the scale of the property conditions anticipated following the findings of the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills.  Should the proposed Selective Licensing scheme go ahead, areas would be targeted both proactively and reactively. |

## 1.7.3 Theme: Voluntary registration and self-regulation

|  |
| --- |
| There were a few respondents who suggested a voluntary registration scheme and self- regulation. A number made comments about the Leeds Rental Standard. Here are some of the comments:   * *“What is the Leeds rental Standard?”* * *“A voluntary scheme that improves relationships between landlords and councils, and encourages better management standards.”* * *“I was unaware of any other schemes such as the Leeds rental standard as our property is managed by an agent. I would've made landlords in the area aware of the scheme and made them be a part of it, and if they refuse then begin legal proceedings against them, rather than a blanket licence requirement for everyone in the area.”* * *“It is better if nationally we have to join an organisation like the NRLA, to adhere to being a better form of Landlord, without the threat of fines.”* * *“The supposed "discount" is highly misleading because one needs to pay a yearly membership fee of at least £99... to be part of the mentioned standard”* * *“There needs to be code of conduct for private landlords”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| For a number of years, the Council operated an accreditation scheme for landlords in Leeds. Unfortunately, whilst very successful in some markets (namely the student market) it was not successful across the city. Very few landlords outside the student market joined.  The Leeds Rental Standard (LRS) was developed as a voluntary scheme where members commit to self-regulating with the opportunity to resolve tenant complaints without Council involvement.  LRS is not administered by the Council. The Council supports and partly funds it in partnership with other accrediting organisations. By joining the scheme, landlords can benefit from a number of incentives including lower regulatory fees and access to guidance and training. Indeed, the fee structure proposed for Selective Licensing includes a discount for members of LRS. Further information on the LRS can be found on their website, <http://www.leedsrentalstandard.org.uk/>  Landlord take up of the LRS as a self-regulation option, has been low in the proposed area when compared with other areas of the city.  There is currently no provision to mandate a requirement to join a voluntary accreditation scheme or for roll it to be rolled out by the Government as part of the Renters Reform Bill.  Whilst the Council is aware that other accreditation schemes exist, the proposed discount on the licence fee is only available for those landlords who are confirmed members of the LRS.  LRS, self-regulation and other voluntary schemes alone will not tackle the high level of deprivation in the proposed area. |

## 1.7.4 Theme: Renters Re-form Bill / National landlord database

|  |
| --- |
| There were several comments that referred to other measures that the Government is looking to introduce nationally, some of the comments are below:   * *“The Renters Reform Bill includes proposals, which look very likely, for a national private rented property database which will include a compliance check of safety certificates and safety standards, which will make Selective Licensing completely unnecessary”* * *“The government is bringing out a mandatory landlord register. So you can find all the rented properties this way.”* * *“There is talk of a national landlord database so it seems little point in local councils such as leeds having a separate local licence - a lack of joined up thinking.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Renters’ Right Bill was introduced in the UK Parliament on 11 September 2024 and has not yet been enacted into legislation. It aims to significantly overhaul the private rented sector in England offering greater protection and security for tenants. Key provisions include abolishing “no fault” evictions (section 21) and introducing a new “Decent Homes Standard”. Other provisions include the creation of a digital Private Rented Sector database and a new ombudsman service.  Guidance by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (updated 16th January 2025)\* states *“Create a Private Rented Sector Database to help landlords understand their legal obligations and demonstrate compliance (giving good landlords confidence in their position), alongside providing better information to tenants to make informed decisions when entering into a tenancy agreement. It will also support local councils – helping them target enforcement activity where it is needed most. Landlords will need to be registered on the database in order to use certain possession grounds.”*  If measures such as the ‘Private Rented Sector Database’ are enacted into legislation, it will potentially be a useful tool for the local authority. It is not anticipated that the measures introduced would be a basis to not introduce a Selective Licensing scheme in Leeds. Any developments in legislation and guidance will be monitored.  \*Guide to the Renters’ Rights Bill. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. January 2025. |

## 1.7.5 Theme: Licensing & houses in multiple occupation

|  |
| --- |
| Some comments were made in relation to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) in the proposed area. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Poor quality homes tend to be let to poor quality tenants and the area has suffered over the decades. However I think it is the HMO's in the area that are really bad and not the single lets.”* * *“I agree in part with this but as a landlord wanting to rent to 3 people, the HMO restriction is cumbersome when 3 friends simply want to house share and need a large property. It is not about putting loads of strangers in a house together.”* * *“You are charging landlords who already pay other licenses (e.g. HMO licenses)”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| A rented property may be classed as an HMO if it is rented out to at least 3 tenants forming more than one household and any of the toilet, bathroom or kitchen facilities are shared. An HMO must have a ‘Mandatory’ licence if it is occupied by 5 or more people.  An HMO that is operating within a designated Selective Licensing area would require a licence either under the Selective Licensing scheme where there are less than 5 occupants or a mandatory HMO licence where there are 5 *or more* occupants. A Licence Holder with a mandatory HMO licence would not be required to simultaneously hold a Selective Licence for the same accommodation.  Further information and guidance on landlord responsibilities for HMO’s can be found on our website: <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/information-for-landlords> |

## 1.7.6 Theme: Support good landlords and take targeted action

|  |
| --- |
| Many respondents expressed the view that Selective Licensing should not apply  to good landlords. Instead they suggested targeting specific landlords, specific properties or adopting other methodology. Here are some of the comments:   * *“You are punishing those landlords who abide with the current rules”* * *“It should only apply to those who have neglected properties”* * *“landlords with multiple properties and those who have had complaints should be charged”* * *“Quite often these schemes penalise the good landlords and tenants and do nothing to tackle to rouge ones.”* * *“Identify the bad landlords and check all their properties”* * *“The scheme could be better targetted by age/ EPC rating/ income of occupants/ number of occupants per room etc etc.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council’s Private Sector Housing Service has been carrying out a range of proactive  and reactive housing inspections for a number of years and will continue to do so  regardless of Selective Licensing or not. Whilst addressing conditions and tackling under- performing landlords and agents in the private rented sector, the activity does not address  the wider issues in the area nor does it address property and tenancy management by the sector.  Selective Licensing, together with other complementary measures and initiatives as part of  a wider strategy, would allow the Council and partners to work with landlords and agents  to address the complex range of issues that are evident in the area and improve housing conditions in the private rented sector.  The legislation is clear that Selective Licensing applies to all “houses” (as defined in sections 79 and 99 of the Housing Act 2004) unless they are specifically exempted in law. The Council does not have the power to over-write the law and create its own exemptions or licence landlords as opposed to properties.  Should the area be designated for Selective Licensing, inspections will be carried out during the term of a licence to ensure compliance with licence conditions. In cases where there is evidence of non-compliance, enforcement action will be considered.  As discussed in 1.7.4 above, the Council supports and partly funds the Leeds Rental Standard in partnership with the other accrediting organisations. By joining the scheme, landlords can benefit from a number of incentives including lower regulatory fees. Furthermore, various guidance documents are provided by the Council and published on its website to support landlords including for example the following;   * the Council website <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/business/privately-rented-property> In addition to containing guidance and standards pertaining to the private rented sector, the website also contains links to other organisations eg. the police and Gas Safe. * e-newsletters/landlord bulletins |

## 1.7.7 Theme: Deal with tenants/residents not landlords

|  |
| --- |
| A number of respondents suggested the Council focuses its activity on tenants rather  than landlords. Here are some of the comments;   * *“Teach tenants how to clean and ventilate properties.”* * *“Deal with the bad tenants. They bring the areas down. You’ve tried this for years in Harehills but nothing has changed”* * *“I don't think that the desired outcomes can or should be pursued by licensing landlords. They should be addressed directly with residents, whether tenants or owner occupiers.”* * *“What then are the protections for the landlords of poor tenants?”* * *“there are some truly awful tenants and that’s a harder problem to deal with. They know the laws and use it to their advantage to avoid paying rent and sometimes destroy a property. That’s part of bigger social problems of poverty, addiction and/or a lack of education.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council and partners already have various initiatives and schemes in place across the city to support and educate tenants/residents by offering various outreach services to support individuals, groups and communities. At the same time, various resources are available online and in the Council’s public buildings. The Council and partners will continue to make helpful information available to all parties (landlords, residents and tenants) on matters that may benefit them such as energy initiatives, updated guidance etc.  It is recognised that sometimes tenants can cause problems. Regardless of whether there is a Selective Licensing scheme in place, landlords are still likely to experience similar challenges in terms of managing their tenancies and the impact of their behaviour. The Council will seek to provide support and guidance through its officers and on its website to assist Licence Holders in these responsibilities. This is the link to the Council’s website providing guidance and advice concerning landlord responsibilities: <https://www.gov.uk/renting-out-a-property>  Selective Licensing would give the Council the opportunity to gain access to all licensed houses in the area and therefore engage with tenants. At the same time, the intensive locality working would allow the Council to better engage with the community. This would  help ensure that all stakeholders were aware of their obligations and rights and also ensure that their needs were being met. It will also;   * provide residents with the opportunity to speak with Council officers about any issues they may have in the area, and * allow for more effective joint working (and closer working) between different Council services and with partner organisations and the third sector.   This combined approach and the ability to access and support tenants will also benefit landlords in dealing with any issues they may have with tenants.  Guidance on how to comply with the proposed licence condition relating to ASB (and indeed all other conditions) will be available for Licence Holders and property managers. At the same time, officers from the Selective Licensing team, with the support of partner agencies,  will be able to assist Licence Holders who find themselves having to deal with ASB  caused by their tenants or that is affecting their tenants. |

## 1.7.8 Theme: Invest more and build more houses

|  |
| --- |
| *Some respondents suggested more houses should be built and in some cases made reference to building more council houses. Some made comments that the Council needs to invest more in the areas and facilitate grants. Here are some of those comments:*   * *“There isn't any council homes, there is a shortage of houses, please create more houses”* * *“if the council was really wanting to do something for private renters it would build more houses”* * *“Leeds city council needs to invest more in these areas and create better spaces for the community and improve the standards of the education for these communities.”* * *“Deprivation is caused by many factors in society and cannot be solved just by more legislation in housing. Things that may help: better schooling, after school facilities in communities, opportunities for jobs and apprenticeships, mentoring, funding events or supporting charitable organizations that help a community etc.”* * *“I hope that there will be good support available to help improve the energy efficiency of homes. I think good insulation, windows and heating would help tackle damp and help keep costs down for tennents. Also I would like to see support and encouragement to adapt housing for disabled tennents. One of my tennents is disabled and I have had grab rails added to my property. Before doing this it was hard to find any local support on how best to approach this with a tenant”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council does recognise the importance of building more houses and other measures as part of its wider housing strategy and the Council’s three pillars of the Best City Ambition. Building new houses however as an alternative to Selective Licensing will not impact the condition and management of houses in the private rented sector nor will it help reduce the high level of deprivation that is evident across the area.  Further information on the Leeds housing strategy and the ambitions are available at:  <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/housing-strategy/leeds-housing-strategy/current-strategy>  Offering grants, investing in the infrastructure, better schooling/after school facilities, apprenticeship projects, etc and energy efficiency measures as an alternative to Selective Licensing would require a level of funding which, given the Council’s current financial position, would be unrealistic and would also require the input of other organisations/bodies which are outside of the Council’s control. Such initiatives alongside Selective Licensing would help reduce the level of deprivation across the area. |

## 1.7.9 Theme: Use other resources to tackle issues

|  |
| --- |
| Various ideas were suggested to tackle issues in the proposed area. Some of the ideas included:   * *“it should if anything be charged in high council tax areas and based on the value of the property. That money could then be used to support those in financial difficulty.”* * *“Perhaps the government or local government should fund some of these improvements or subsidise the costs of EICR or other requirements.”* * *“can housing benefit not be paid to landlords? or only paid on condition that property is suitable. The problem is exploitation of lower income people / families”* * *“Find other ways to make landlords compliant eg check their EICR, gas safety checks etc - all of which are required for rental properties but don't add licences. Self regulation and spot checks of EICR, gas safety etc”* * *“go on rightmove look for houses for sale with tenants in situ - look at the photos and you would be able to identify loads to inspect”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Many of the suggestions would not provide an effective method of achieving the objective of Selective Licensing i.e. reducing deprivation across the area. In many cases, the suggestions are either not coherent with legislation; they have funding/resource implications and practicalities as to their delivery as part of or as an alternative to the Selective Licensing scheme.  In relation to the above suggestions, for example:   * Council Tax is costed and used to fund vital Council services. Imposing an additional levy on higher banded houses across the city to support those in financial difficulty is not appropriate nor within the Council’s power to do so. Additionally, it would not impact conditions of privately rented properties nor would it reduce the level of deprivation across the area. * It would be inappropriate for public funds to be used to contribute to improvements to privately rented properties or to subsidise the safety checks that are required by legislation. These are business costs (overheads) that a landlord has to absorb. In any event, such measures in isolation would not achieve the objective of Selective Licensing, i.e. reducing the level of deprivation across the area. * The payment of housing benefit payments to landlords is not within the Council’s powers. In any event, it is not considered an alternative to Selective Licensing as it would not tackle deprivation in the area. * Current legislation already provides for a local authority to check safety certificates and in Leeds there is a self-regulation scheme however take up outside of the student market is low (see 1.7.3 above). In isolation, these alternatives would not reduce the high level of deprivation across the area. As part of any Selective Licensing scheme, Licence Holders would be required to provide copies of their safety certificates to the Council. Landlords are always encouraged to become members of a recognised accreditation scheme. Carrying out online searches in isolation to identify rented houses for sale with tenants in-situ is not considered an alternative to Selective Licensing as it would not reduce the level of deprivation across the area. This would form part of the delivery of any scheme should the proposal for Selective Licensing go ahead. |

## 1.7.10 Theme: The Council should focus on specific issues in the area

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents made comments on specific issues. Here are some of those comments:   * *“How is giving more money to the council going to change anything. The area is really deprived of local amenities and transport links of anything”* * *“Issues with crime and environment in these areas is a far bigger issue than just individual poorly maintained rental properties. It feels like it’s just an excuse to blame private landlords yet again rather than address the issue of lack of housing, empty housing and poorly maintained housing.”* * *“More funding to address ASB. This could come from fees levied on Landlords for the selective licensing scheme. Ultimately Landlords would benefit from this as well as tenants and other residents.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The fee income from any Selective Licensing designation in east, south and west Leeds would provide for a dedicated resource of officers who would administer and deliver the scheme. In doing so, they would work in partnership with others e.g. housing providers, other Council services and enforcement agencies as well as the third sector, to not only impact the condition and management of privately rented properties within the boundary but to also help reduce the level of deprivation in the area.  Licence fee income cannot be used to provide tangible benefits i.e. infrastructure and new homes in the area nor officers in other service areas/organisations.  Private landlords and agents are not being blamed for criminality and environmental issues in the proposed area. Unfortunately however there is a small minority who are implicit in crime, for example in April 2025, 3 agents operating in the Harehills area of the city were sentenced over their part in a multi-million pound cannabis growing operation in 75 residential properties. More information can be found on the Police website, <https://www.westyorkshire.police.uk/news-appeals/three-men-sentenced-ps45m-leeds-cannabis-farm-investigation>  The Council believes that Selective Licensing, together with other complementary measures and initiatives as part of a wider strategy, would allow it and partners to address the complex range of issues that are evident in the proposed licensing area and to improve housing conditions in the private rented sector. However, it is considered that the proposals made would not have the outcome that Selective Licensing could achieve. |

## 1.7.11 Theme: Work with and regulate managing agents

|  |
| --- |
| There were some respondents that made comments and suggestions in relation to agents. Comments and suggestions included regulating agents, targeting agents, working with agents, taking lighter touch action or allowing exemptions for agents. Here are some of the comments:   * *“Our agents conduct regular inspections and promptly address issues raised then, or at other times, by tenants. Have you considered how many rental properties in the area are managed by agents? Have you done any research into whether these agents are competent? Should you consider whether properties managed by competent agents should be exempt from any scheme, and therefore concentrate on self-managed properties and an initially educational approach with landlords?”* * *“Make landlords register with an agent or prosecute them”.* * *“Have you considered liaising directly with the main agents in the area for alternative plans”.* * *“The real issues lie with poorly managed estate agencies and landlords using unprofessional agencies in order to manage properties”.* * *“If properties are rented through registered letting agents, surely those properties are compliant with the legislation you are seeking to check”.* * *“You could offer a light touch for those using reputable letting agencies for a start e.g. ask us to provide details of our property, letting agent and tenant. Contact the letting agent regarding all legal checks have been done and any complaints, ring the tenant and ask if they are happy with the property”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Whilst the Council recognises that landlords may benefit from using reputable managing agents, there is no legal basis to exempt landlords that choose to use an agent or to compel landlords to register with an agent. It should not be assumed that the engagement of an agent would negate an owner, Licence Holder or other relevant person from their legal responsibilities including compliance with any Selective Licensing requirements.  Exemptions for Selective Licensing are detailed in The Selective Licensing of Houses  (Specified Exemptions) (England) Order 2006[*http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made*](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/370/made)  Agents were consulted as part of the consultation that has taken place. It is not viable to concentrate on self-managed properties alone or to liaise with landlords as an alternative. Any managing agent that takes the role of Property Manager and is named on a licence (subject to a Fit and Proper Person test in accordance with the Housing Act 2004) would be accountable to comply with and adhere to the conditions of a Selective Licence. |

## 1.7.12. Partnership working

|  |
| --- |
| Some respondents made comments in relation to partnership working to help tackle housing issues and deprivation. Here are examples of comments:   * *“I think other agencies should b Involved to improve peoples lives finance health wellbeing and reduce crime alcahol and drug problems . These cannot be attribut d to landlords. Although I agree landlords have a responsibility to provide well maintained accommodation.”* * *“Work with landlord associations to promote best practices and self-regulation within the industry. This can help raise standards without the need for heavy-handed regulation.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council, in its Private Sector Housing Service Enforcement Policy, already recognises  the partnership approach to improving the private rented sector. Indeed, the policy  identifies a staged approach to enforcement, the first stage being the opportunity to work  informally with landlords, agents, owners and service users by providing a range of  information, support and guidance.  Selective Licensing would allow the Council to work in partnership with other agencies and support Licence Holders to address issues relating to the environment, crime and ASB. By working with the Police, immigration and other Council services eg. the Leeds Anti-Social Behaviour Team, properties involved in criminality such as those used for cannabis grows and drug dealing can be targeted.  By crossing the threshold of people’s homes, the scheme would also allow the Council to work in partnership with agencies and residents to address their needs in relation to issues such as income, employment, health and access to services.  Examples of casework from the previous Selective Licensing schemes are available in a report for Scrutiny Board produced on the 20th February 2025. The report, which provided an update on the outcomes of the schemes, can be accessed via the link:  <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605>  As discussed above in 1.7.3, the Council already supports and partly funds the Leeds Rental Standard scheme in partnership with the other accrediting organisations. |

# 1.8 Miscellaneous Feedback

In addition to the above-themed comments received fromlandlords and agents during the consultation period, the Council also received some specific feedback.

The text in *italics* within the shaded rows below has been extracted directly from the completed questionnaires and the proformas filled out at the drop-in events. The Council’s response to the feedback follows.

|  |
| --- |
| *“This is confusing as last time this was raised, it was all about deprivation. Other areas like Hunslet, Holbeck and Cross Green "had no business case" yet hey presto, now the council is running out of time and funds, these areas now have a business case, when they have gotten better on the index of multiple deprivation.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Other areas of the city were not considered as part of the business case for the previous Selective Licensing schemes in Beeston and Harehills. |
| *“We are disappointed to see that when we are tidying the garden at the properties that other rental properties in Harehills are not tidy and wonder if the enforcement of the licence rules are being made and checks are being made by Leeds Council on things like the external tidiness?”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| A licence condition in the previous Selective Licensing scheme for both Beeston and Harehills related to property management. In relation to the exterior of a licensed property, the condition stated: *“To ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, that the exterior of the property (including any boundary walls, gates and yards) is maintained in reasonable decorative order and in a good state of repair, that the exterior is free from graffiti and fly posters, and that gardens are maintained in a reasonably clean and tidy condition.”*  The property management condition features in the licence conditions proposed for Selective Licensing in east, south and west Leeds.  Checks were made by officers to determine compliance with licence conditions and in a number of cases, the Council has issued civil penalties to Licence Holders and named Property Managers for breaches of this licence condition. |
| *“One of the objects of the previous selective licensing scheme operating in Richmond Hill, where I own and manage properties was to reduce anti-social behaviour. This proposed outcome is conspicuously absent from the current proposals.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposal for Selective Licensing scheme in east, south and west Leeds is on the basis of high levels of deprivation which is one of the six criteria for which a business case can be considered. The other criteria include anti-social behaviour; low housing demand; poor housing conditions; high levels of migration and high levels of crime. |
| *“A more robust solution would be to register the landlord, rather than the property. Failure by the landlord to meet the required standards could then trigger a review of the landlord's portfolio”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| When a Selective Licensing area is designated, Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004 provides for houses to be licensed by local housing authorities. It is not an option in the legislation to register the landlord rather than the property. However, any landlord that applies for a licence in accordance with the Act must be a ‘fit and proper person(s)’. |
| *“action should be taken to control short term holiday lets (airbnb)”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Whilst there may be situations where interventions are required and referrals can be made to the appropriate enforcement team/body, the requirement to licence short term holiday lets falls outside of the scope of Selective Licensing and the Housing Act 2004. |
| *“training via NRLA and are members of various accreditation schemes should give us status*  *as professionals”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| Training via the NRLA and membership of various accreditation schemes may be used to help demonstrate professionalism. A fee discount is proposed for landlords that are members of the Leeds Rental Standard subject to them meeting qualifying criteria. |
| *“The council should provide more support in assisting tenants to relocate when the selective licensing team request that disruptive work is carried out in the rental property they live in”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| In exceptional circumstances, support mechanisms are in place with the option to make referrals to Housing Options for a Homelessness Assessment if needed. However, the expectation is that landlords should be providing accommodation that is safe and well managed and any significant breaches would therefore be considered in accordance with the Private Sector Housing enforcement policy. |
| *“Selective licensing has been in place since 2020 in Harehills and Beeston and by your own admission it has not worked. In such circumstances the Secretary of State should refuse the application on the grounds of the policy being ineffective”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The Council has not suggested that the previous Selective Licensing schemes have not worked. Further details on the outcomes of the Beeston and Harehills schemes is available in a report published for the Council’s Scrutiny Board on the 20th February 2025. The report is accessible to the public via the link: <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1091&MId=12605>  The decision to declare the previous Selective Licensing schemes was not required to be made by the Secretary of State. In relation to the current proposal, the decision on whether or not to designate parts of east, south and west Leeds for Selective Licensing will be made by the Council’s Executive Board in due course.  With effect from 23 December 2024, local housing authorities are no longer required to obtain confirmation from the Secretary of State before implementing a Selective Licensing scheme of any size, provided certain conditions are met. |
| *“Landlords who do not keep their properties in good condition and /or are happy to overcrowd properties ,for profit should always be fined and in some cases have properties taken away is compulsory purchase without compensation.”* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The use of compulsory purchase orders without compensation is outside the scope of Selective Licensing. The Council’s enforcement policy sets out the regulatory enforcement options available to the Council. The policy can be accessed on the Council’s website via the link:  <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/housing/information-for-landlords/private-sector-housing-enforcement-policy> |
| *“Private rented property and landlords like everybody else have rights I have the opinion here my opinion looks to me that the council is trying to take control of private property my opinion that is an infringement of an individual rights that would be taken on legal advise”.* |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The proposed Selective Licensing scheme has taken account of legislation, government guidance and relevant case law. It is not the objective of Selective Licensing to take control of private property. It will be the responsibility of any Licence Holder (and any other responsible person named on a licence) to adhere to and comply with licence conditions. |
| *“in a free market, tenants enter into their tenancy agreements upon their free will and upon viewing the lodgings in prior, and all tenancy agreements are bounded legally where tenants have their rights (and responsibilities*” |
| **LCC Response:** |
| A free market does not absolve legal responsibilities. If Selective Licensing is introduced, the tenant should expect that their landlord (and/or relevant person) to apply for a licence as required and abide by the licence conditions if issued. |
| “*Licensing forms require a named individual – this means that, should that individual leave the business, we are required to re-apply for all licenses associated with that individual*”. |
| **LCC Response:** |
| In accordance with the Housing Act 2004, the proposed Licence Holder is required to be *“a fit and proper person to be the licence holder, and is, out of all of the persons reasonably available to be the licence holder in respect of the house, the most appropriate person to be the licence holder”*. However, the Licence Holder does not only have to be a named individual as a company can apply to be named as the Licence Holder. Should the proposed area be designated for Selective Licensing, guidance on making a licence application would be available. |
| Maybe a trial area before such a large area? |
| **LCC Response:** |
| The statutory procedure for designating selective licencing does not allow for a ‘trial area’ to be implemented prior to any intended area. This would mean that the Council would have to follow the full statutory process in respect of the trial area and again for any intended area. This would not be an efficient or effective use of resources. In addition, the Council has experience of delivering Selective licensing schemes (see 1.6.2) which demonstrate the potential outcomes of a Selective licensing scheme and also means that the Council already has systems in place to be able to deal with the administration of a scheme of this size, should it be approved. |