

Helen Graham

From: Mark Hoyle
Sent: 17 July 2012 07:23
To: Helen Graham; Stuart Sambrook
Subject: FW: hyndburn landlords

FYI

Mark A. Hoyle
Head of Regeneration and Housing
20 Cannon Street
Accrington BB5 1NJ
Tel. 01254 380662
Mobile 07776257370

From: Mark Hoyle
Sent: 17 July 2012 07:22
To: 'john & helen'
Cc: 'accrington@tandp.wanadoo.co.uk'; 'Paul Brown @ Eafield & Maple'
Subject: RE: hyndburn landlords

Dear John/Paul/Steve

I refer to your email of the 8th July 2012 and my acknowledgement of the 10th July 2012.

I am sure by now that you appreciate that the Council acknowledges Hyndburn Landlords as a key stakeholder. We have now met on numerous occasions and achieved what I believe consensus, if not agreement, on some key issues in relation to defining low housing demand for the purposes of selective licensing i.e.

- The indicators (or factors/criteria) for deciding if an area is suffering from, or likely to become, an area of low housing demand (with possibly the exception of the private rented sector indicator, albeit analysis of this indicator shows that it has minimum impact on the outcome);
- The data set, data sources, timescales and values to be considered for low housing demand purposes;
- Possible areas of low housing demand and appropriate areas for comparison.

As your correspondence eludes, the legislation and guidance for selective licensing falls short at specifying any specific point at which low demand occurs, probably to reflect local market conditions and circumstances.

I hope that we can achieve a consensus on this last point, but I am sure that you will acknowledge that it must be done on the basis of the evidence and taking into account the view of all the stakeholders who may be affected by the draft scheme. This was the basis for Hyndburn Landlords successfully securing a judicial review of the former scheme. We have taken extensive steps to consult all persons who are likely to be affected by the proposed designation and we are currently concluding our analysis of the very significant representations made.

With hindsight, I should have confirmed with you the three specific areas to which your email refers which you indicate were not considered in the draft proposal. I am not aware that we are proposing to introduce selective licensing outside of the consultation area. This is a matter that I suggest we clarify when we meet later this week. I will also take you through our methodology and our current position in relation to low housing demand.

I would like to thank you for sharing your latest thoughts on the areas that you propose (subject to endorsement by your members) which we can consider and discuss with you when we meet later this week. I also wish to reassure you of the Council's commitment to trying to achieve a consensus with Hyndburn Landlords, subject to the views of other stakeholders who have responded to the consultation.

Kind regards,
Mark

Mark A. Hoyle
Head of Regeneration and Housing
20 Cannon Street
Accrington BB5 1NJ
Tel. 01254 380662
Mobile 07776257370

From: Mark Hoyle
Sent: 10 July 2012 13:01
To: 'john & helen'
Cc: accrington@tandp.wanadoo.co.uk; 'Paul Brown @ Eafield & Maple'
Subject: RE: hyndburn landlords

John / Paul / Steve,

Thank you for your email and for bringing your disappointment to my attention.

I will be happy to clarify the Council's position and therefore I will write to you again before we meet next week to respond to the points that you raise and therefore provide the opportunity to discuss the contents of your email in more detail and the Council's response.

Kind regards,
Mark

Mark A. Hoyle
Head of Regeneration and Housing
20 Cannon Street
Accrington BB5 1NJ
Tel. 01254 380662
Mobile 07776257370

From: john & helen [mailto:johnandhelenbaron@maisonmenthon.com]
Sent: 08 July 2012 20:34
To: Mark Hoyle
Cc: accrington@tandp.wanadoo.co.uk; 'Paul Brown @ Eafield & Maple'
Subject: hyndburn landlords

Mark,

We were very disappointed with the Council's stance following Wednesday's meeting. It may well be that some of the statements were "off the cuff" and without too much consideration, and therefore we are requesting that you clarify some of the remarks made.

Looking at the HBC traffic light system, we do not think that there is any disagreement with regard to those areas coloured red. In totalling the indices they are way below the rest of the properties in the Borough. The issue, as you have previously alluded to, is where do we draw the line?

However, we were surprised when you claimed that the streets coloured orange were what you would consider to be low demand. Whilst we accept we all have opinions as to where the line should be drawn, out of the 7 areas listed, 3 of them were areas that the Council did not consider to be low demand in their own submission in January. Furthermore, nobody within the Council's appointed stakeholder group considered them to be low demand either. These areas have not been amended or analysed, (unlike Peel which has been the focus of disagreement), yet suddenly they become areas of low demand seemingly because it has been shown that proposed initial areas for licensing were in fact better than or equal to what the Council had initially thought.

You will recall that at the very outset of these series of our meetings we had requested that the Council define what their idea of low demand was. The only answer we have ever received is that it is a complex issue with no single factor being a main indicator. We have tried to engage openly with the Council and have stated individual criteria which we believe may indicate low demand. The Council have often said “we don’t agree” to these figures but have never said what their own criteria would be. It is against this background that your remarks seemingly look like you are preparing to move the goalposts, which would be totally unacceptable in any discussion / consultation.

In addition, the Council has still not discussed any of their intentions with HL. Based on your remarks, even after all these meetings there is clearly no agreement on what constitutes low demand and it is starting to appear that the Council are looking to make things fit, rather than approach the situation with an open mind.

We would appreciate some reassurance these matters above.

Finally, we recall that you initially stated that “we just want an agreement”. We are willing to make that agreement, but at this stage we have not been given a proposal to consider, bar the initial Council paper which has been shown to mask some large discrepancies. However, in order to move matters forward, and to clarify where Hyndburn Landlords stand, we make the following proposal (based on the evidence discussed to date) which we are prepared to recommend to our members and support the Council on:

The following areas should be licensed:

Woodnook - Nelson Street

Woodnook - Clement Street

Burnley Road without Addison Street

Washington Street Town Centre and Midland Street

Spring Hill - Sharples Street

Scaitcliffe - Major Street

Church Kirk

We would also consider that Spring Hill – Craven St possibly should be licensed

On the current subdivision, we believe that the areas listed as Clarendon St and later should not be licensed, although by removing Avenue Parade and Water St and placing them in the Lodge St area, the statistics on the Clarendon St area may fall, in which case there may well be a persuasive argument for licensing on that area.

For clarification, those areas which do not suffer from low demand and do not require licensing are as follows:

Burnley Road Addison Street up

West Accrington

Scaitcliffe - Pendle Street

Lodge Street triangle

Great Harwood Town Centre

Steiner Street

Clayton

Roegreave Road

Christchurch

Waterloo West

Waterloo East

Hodder / Spencer Street

Rhyddings Street

Great Harwood

We would also make the observation that these proposals are broadly in line with those stated by members of the Councils own appointed stakeholder group, the only notable exception being the view of Maundy Relief on the Peel area.

Regards

John Baron

Paul Brown

Steve Thompson

