

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET**

TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2026

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors N Clarke (Chair), A Brennan (Vice-Chair), R Inglis, R Upton, D Virdi
and J Wheeler

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors Om, Phillips and J Walker

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
S Soar	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

54 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

55 Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 January 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2026 were agreed as a true
record and signed by the Chair.

56 Citizens' Questions

The following questions were submitted to Councillor Upton.

Question from Stewart Holmes

"The report notes a clear concentration of HMOs in West Bridgford and
recognises potential local amenity impacts, yet concludes there is insufficient
evidence to implement an Article 4 Direction. Given national guidance that
Article 4 Directions should be targeted to the smallest appropriate area to
protect local amenity, why is a geographically targeted Article 4 not being
considered as a preventative measure, rather than relying solely on complaint
numbers?"

Councillor Upton advised that whilst Article 4 Directions should apply to the
'smallest geographical area possible', the National Planning Policy Framework

(NPPF) also required that Article 4 implementation should be limited to situations where an Article 4 Direction was necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of an area. There was insufficient evidence to justify the implementation of an Article 4 Direction, be that Borough-wide or area specific.

Question from Simon Pett

“How will the proposed “continued monitoring” differ from monitoring already undertaken, and what would trigger a change in policy rather than further delay?”

Councillor Upton advised that using the evidence used to inform the Cabinet report as a baseline, monitoring of planning applications, complaints received and licensing records would be undertaken. The recommendation asked for the Communities Scrutiny Group to review the further monitoring at July’s meeting. The Council was committed to actively monitoring the evidence.

Question from Tim Bull

“How does the Cabinet recommendation align with Full Council’s unanimous decision in September to explore an Article 4, and what alternative policy tools are being proposed if Article 4 is ruled out?”

Councillor Upton advised that at the Full Council meeting in September 2025, a motion was debated about a perception that the authority was experiencing an increase in small Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) falling within Planning Use Class C4. Councillors directed officers to investigate and collate an evidence base, to look at whether there was a case for introducing an Article 4 Direction across the Borough. The Cabinet report presented the evidence base and recommended to Cabinet that there was insufficient evidence to meet the legal threshold to justify an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights for HMOs. Planning permission was required to create large HMOs of 7+ occupants. Other regulatory tools which could be enacted if required, on a case-by-case basis, included the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Disorder Act 2014.

Question from Paul Smith

“Given resident concerns about the Council’s ability to effectively oversee and regulate HMOs once permitted development rights are exercised, how can Cabinet provide assurance that existing licensing and enforcement arrangements are sufficient, particularly when changes of use to small HMOs occur without any requirement for planning approval or public consultation?”

Councillor Upton advised that smaller HMOs still had to comply with relevant housing fitness standards and other relevant legislation the same as any other private rented sector property and the Council would investigate any complaints that were made about such properties such as noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour, poor living standards etc. Mandatory licensing of HMOs came into force in 2006 (Housing Act 2006) and applied to properties of three storeys or more with five or more people making up two or more separate households living in them. Licences could last up to five years and would have conditions

attached to them that must be complied with. All licensed HMOs were routinely inspected to ensure they met all necessary statutory requirements. Licensing was intended to make sure that landlords of HMOs were:

- fit and proper people, or employ managers who were;
- each HMO was safe and suitable for occupation by the number of people allowed under the licence;
- the standard of management of the HMO was adequate;
- high risk HMOs could be identified and targeted for improvement; and
- HMOs were not overcrowded.

There are currently 200 licensed HMOs with the following mandatory conditions, which applied to every licence:

- a valid current gas safety certificate, which was renewed annually;
- proof that all electrical appliances and furniture were kept in a safe condition;
- proof that all smoke alarms were correctly positioned, installed and maintained;
- each occupier must have a written statement of the terms on which they occupy the property, for example, a tenancy agreement;
- minimum sleeping room sizes; and
- waste disposal arrangements.

Question from Nouredine Mechoui

“The case studies cited in the report acted once HMO impacts were already severe. Is the Council content to wait for comparable levels of harm locally before intervening, rather than acting earlier to prevent escalation?”

Councillor Upton advised that NPPF also required that Article 4 implementation should be limited to situations where an Article 4 Direction was necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of an area. There was insufficient evidence to justify the implementation of an Article 4 Direction, be that Borough-wide or area specific.

Question from Sundeep Soor

“Without an Article 4 Direction in place, how does the Council intend to prevent the incremental loss of family housing and manage the cumulative impact of additional HMOs in areas already experiencing high concentrations, given that permitted development removes any requirement for planning scrutiny or local decision-making?”

Councillor Upton advised that the NPPF made it clear that any Article 4 Direction must be supported by evidence that HMOs were impacting negatively on the local amenity of an area. It was the view of the Council that this threshold had not yet been met. The Council was also mindful of the variety of Rushcliffe residents requiring housing, including low income individuals or young professionals who could only afford HMO accommodation. Cabinet was recommending that the matter was kept under review and further scrutiny took place by the Communities Scrutiny Group at July's meeting, to respond to

further changes in this area.

Question from P Baker

“What specific level or type of evidence would officers require to recommend an Article 4 in future, and how will members know when that threshold has been reached?”

Councillor Upton advised that NPPF and the associated guidance did not stipulate a threshold or what specific evidence was required to justify an Article 4 Direction; however, the Framework did stipulate that the implementation of Article 4 Directions must be based on ‘robust evidence’, this was why the Cabinet recommendation was to keep this matter under review and scrutinise it further.

Question from Sue Jeffery

“Does the Council accept that formal complaint numbers may significantly under-represent impacts on local amenity, particularly where residents feel complaints are ineffective or are reluctant to pursue them?”

Councillor Upton advised that the Council regulated HMOs through licensing and reviewed properties on a regular basis, to ensure that complaints and any disturbance to the local community was kept to a minimum, in line with local authorities across the country. There was insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an Article 4 Direction, given the known numbers of HMOs, complaints received and issues identified through licensing and reviews of properties. Nevertheless, there were other regulatory tools which could be enacted including the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Disorder Act 2014.

Question from Natasha Walker

“Given that the report identifies areas with concentrated HMOs and acknowledges resident concerns, how does Cabinet justify delaying action until impacts become severe, and what alternative measures are being considered to proactively protect local amenity and community cohesion in the meantime?”

Councillor Upton advised that the Council regulated HMOs through licensing and reviewed properties on a regular basis to ensure that complaints and any disturbance to the local community was kept to a minimum, in line with local authorities across the country. Smaller HMOs still had to comply with relevant housing fitness standards and other relevant legislation, the same as any other private rented sector property and the Council would investigate any complaints that were made about such properties such as noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour, poor living standards etc. Mandatory licensing of HMOs came into force in 2006 (Housing Act 2006) and applied to properties of three storeys or more with five or more people making up two or more separate households living in them. Licences could last up to five years and would have conditions attached to them that must be complied with. All licensed HMOs were routinely inspected to ensure they met all necessary statutory requirements. Licensing was intended to make sure that landlords of HMOs were:

- fit and proper people, or employ managers who were;
- each HMO was safe and suitable for occupation by the number of people allowed under the licence;
- the standard of management of the HMO was adequate;
- high risk HMOs could be identified and targeted for improvement; and
- HMOs were not overcrowded.

There are currently 200 licensed HMOs with the following mandatory conditions, which applied to every licence:

- a valid current gas safety certificate, which was renewed annually;
- proof that all electrical appliances and furniture were kept in a safe condition;
- proof that all smoke alarms were correctly positioned, installed and maintained;
- each occupier must have a written statement of the terms on which they occupy the property, for example, a tenancy agreement;
- minimum sleeping room sizes; and
- waste disposal arrangements.

Question from Gary Sellick

“Over what timescale will monitoring take place before the issue is formally reconsidered, and will findings be reported back to Full Council?”

Councillor Upton advised that the recommendation was for Communities Scrutiny Group to review the further monitoring at July’s meeting. The Council was committed to actively monitoring the evidence.

Question from Tak Pang

“Has a non-immediate Article 4 Direction with a 12-month notice period, which avoids compensation liability been fully assessed as a proportionate and lower-risk option?”

Councillor Upton advised that the implementation of an Article 4 Direction must be based on evidence. If evidence justified the implementation of an Article 4 Direction, local authorities must then decide if a non-immediate or immediate Article 4 Direction would be most appropriate. Whether immediate or non-immediate, an Article 4 Direction must be supported by ‘robust evidence’ and applied in a measured and targeted way, in order to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and the Planning Policy Guidance.

57 **Opposition Group Leaders' Questions**

Question from Councillor J Walker to Councillor Viridi.

“An expected benefit of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and the creation of a new unitary authority is that there will no longer be a situation where one tier of Local Government has responsibility for collecting Council Tax on behalf of all tiers of Local Government in that area. Thus, eliminating

the confusion, of different administrations from different councils serving the same area, making their own budgetary claims in isolation, which is currently the case on page 8, paragraph 4.2 a) of this Cabinet agenda, which states: "Rushcliffe faces a 2.46% reduction in its core spending power."

Can the Portfolio Holder for Finance confirm that this statement does not take into account the shared uplift that residents of Rushcliffe could benefit from through the 30% increase to the County Council tax budget this year?"

Councillor Viridi advised that the premise of this question was fundamentally flawed, as LGR had not happened, with no legislation passed, and no decision taken on when or how Council Tax might be harmonised, which could take years, and Rushcliffe remained a separate, legal authority, with its own statutory responsibilities. The figures quoted in the report were published by the Labour Government, and Councillor Viridi advised that it was categorically wrong to conflate Rushcliffe's financial position with Nottinghamshire County Council. He stated that what the County Council had received was irrelevant to Rushcliffe in respect of its core spending power, in the same way as for the City Council, as they each had different responsibilities. Councillor Viridi stated that the suggestion that Rushcliffe's residents benefitted from a County Council uplift when assessing this Council's financial settlement was incorrect and misunderstood how Local Government finance worked. Any sleight of hand was in attempting to mask a poor settlement for district councils by pointing to uplifts elsewhere in the system. Councillor Viridi referred to the budget briefings, when the Council's Section 151 was clear that funding was being redistributed based on demand and deprivation, and as a result, upper tier authorities had fared better than district councils, including Rushcliffe. Councillor Viridi advised that even the County Council's position was not simple, as any additional funding came alongside significant financial pressures, and to suggest that this Council was better off, as a result of this settlement was misleading. Conflating County Council finances with Borough Council finances was confusing for residents and he stated that you could not spend County Council money in a Borough Council budget.

Councillor Walker asked a supplementary question.

"Radcliffe on Trent has three members of that ward who sit on this Cabinet, and it will be getting a £1m Masterplan, while villages like Ruddington, East Leake and West Bridgford are left fighting for the scraps. Can the Portfolio Holder for Finance please explain the logic behind this increased spending on Radcliffe on Trent and would he commit similar spending amounts to larger communities in Rushcliffe, such as Ruddington, East Leake and West Bridgford?"

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that there was no time to answer the question as the five minutes allocated had been used.

Question from Councillor Phillips to Councillor Upton.

"It may be that the analysis work undertaken so far across the wider Borough does not yet warrant a Borough-wide Article 4 Direction. As it is the current Government's aim to remove all asylum seekers from hotels they will all need

to be housed somewhere. We all recognise the ease on how HMOs under permitted development can be obtained, and the need to look at an Article 4 Direction to take control of inappropriate HMO locations. In September 2025, at Full Council a motion was submitted to look into an Article 4 Direction and we all unanimously voted in favour of this; however, we did not have chance to debate because we ran out of time and went straight to the vote.

Do you not agree that an Article 4 Direction just within the heavily populated West Bridgford areas would give the Council better control over inappropriate development and HMO locations?"

Councillor Upton advised that the legislation set out that the implementation of an Article 4 Directive must be evidence led, and the review had shown that there was no evidence to support the making of a Direction. Cabinet was also clear that the motion was not about asylum seekers but the occurrence of a concentration of HMOs having an adverse effect on the amenity of an area, as per the legislation. Councillor Upton stated that HMOs accommodated a variety of people, often providing an affordable place to live as part of the whole housing system. Unintended consequences must also be considered, including limiting the supply of HMO housing for low income people or young professionals and HMOs moving to neighbouring areas where permitted development was still available. He recognised that this was an important matter to consider and keep under review, which was why Communities Scrutiny Group would be asked to scrutinise the matter.

Councillor Phillips asked a supplementary question.

"In my ward, if we had an Article 4 Direction in place, it would have prevented a four bed property being converted into a six-bed HMO, used to house single, male asylum seekers on a quiet cul-de-sac of eight other family properties, and just meters away from a children's play area. If we had the Article 4 in place, it would have ensured the full planning application would have been carried out and would you not agree that there is evidence there to support an Article 4 Direction?"

Councillor Upton stated that he understood those comments and that with an Article 4 in place it would have required a planning application. That application would have been treated using the normal process, and unless there was any adverse material planning consideration, then you could not assume that it would not have become an HMO.

58 2026/2027 Budget and Financial Strategy

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Governance, Councillor Viridi presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services outlining the Council's proposed budget for 2026/27, the five-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and accompanying information detailed in the report.

Councillor Viridi stated that this had been a challenging budget to prepare, due to significant, large scale, systemic changes to Local Government finance. He notified Cabinet of a minor technical correction in the report, the Band D

Council Tax figure referred to in paragraph 4.2 c) and the MTFS Annex should read £161.77 rather than £161.76, and this would be corrected in the report to Full Council. He confirmed that this did not change the substance of the budget.

Councillor Virdi advised that this budget demonstrated the Council's financial resilience, and despite ongoing reductions in Government funding, including some late changes he would refer to later, it was noted that Council Tax would be frozen, a strong financial position would be maintained, with a balanced budget across the five-year period, as the Council remained debt free. Cabinet was reminded that Rushcliffe continued to have the lowest Council Tax in Nottinghamshire and remained amongst the lowest quartile in the country, which Councillor Virdi felt everyone should be proud of. This was being achieved whilst the Council continued to deliver high quality services and to invest in its people and place, with the budget supporting a £24m Capital Programme, which was focused on supporting the vulnerable, improving communities and leisure facilities, enabling economic growth and reducing the Council's carbon footprint. It was noted that the Council retained projected earmarked reserves of around £25m, providing resilience going forward, particularly with Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) on the horizon. He referred to the Council's Transformation and Efficiency Plan, which highlighted how the Council continued to innovate whilst living within its means.

Councillor Virdi referred to key points in the report, as detailed in paragraph 4.2, and advised that this was the first multi-year settlement in over a decade, providing a three-year financial framework. However, Rushcliffe had seen a 2.25% reduction in core spending power, with Business Rates undergoing a national reset, which had significantly impacted the Council, details of which were highlighted in paragraph 4.2 b). Councillor Virdi confirmed that until recently, the budget was based on the provisional settlement; however, there had been a late, material change, following the final Local Government finance settlement, which was issued yesterday, and was referenced in the Addendum circulated at the meeting. The Government had changed the treatment of Business Rates pooling gains, reallocating a significant portion towards upper tier authorities, which particularly affected councils, including Rushcliffe that were members of the Business Rates Pool in 2025-2026. In 2026-2027, the Government was recognising the lateness of this change and would be providing a one-off transitional grant of £0.484m; however, from 2027, there would be an additional cost of around £1.2m, with detailed analysis set out in paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the Addendum. He confirmed that the report to Full Council would be updated to reflect those changes. Taking this change and other late policy decisions into account, the overall MTFS showed a commutative deficit of £0.815m over five years. Councillor Virdi stated that this deficit was manageable, and the Council remained stable and able to set a responsible budget, whilst recommending a freeze on Council Tax, which reflected the strength of the Council's financial position, and the continued pressure residents faced.

In respect of Special Expenses, Councillor Virdi advised that there would only be a modest increase, which, he as a West Bridgford Councillor felt provided excellent value for money, supporting a vibrant events programme. The Council remained committed to economic growth, and whilst it was

disappointing that the New Homes Bonus (NHB) was no longer received, that had been anticipated and planned within the MTFS.

Councillor Virdi acknowledged the risks and uncertainties that remained, including the impact of national policy changes to Simpler Recycling as detailed in paragraph 4.2 k), inflation, and LGR remained the most significant strategic risks; however, the Council was well prepared and would remain vigilant.

Councillor Virdi highlighted two late policy changes, which were detailed in the Addendum. The first related to the second homes premium, and that Cabinet had expressed concerns regarding its effectiveness for bringing second homes back into use, and it would be recommending that this Policy was ceased. Secondly, it was proposed to explore a Council Tax discount for residents who were terminally ill, with £40k being committed per annum, with a scrutiny review to assess the risk demand and an appropriate scheme.

In summary, Councillor Virdi stated that this was a strong and responsible budget, delivered in exceptionally difficult and fast-moving circumstances, it balanced prudence with compassion, investment with restraint and resilience with realism. Councillor Virdi concluded by thanking the Director – Finance and Corporate Services and the Finance Team for their exceptionally hard work and professionalism in producing this budget during very challenging times and dealing with late national changes.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor J Wheeler welcomed the freeze in Council Tax despite the pressures being faced, inflation and cost of living remained high, and he felt that it was important to support residents. The Council continued to invest millions of pounds in its fantastic facilities and services and ensuring that empty homes were being brought back into use. In welcoming the proposal to support the terminally ill, Councillor Wheeler felt that it was important to carefully and sensitively look at the proposal, to ensure an appropriate and timely delivery. In respect of second homes premium, Councillor Wheeler agreed that whilst this had been an appropriate action before, it was noted that there had been some negative impact, and it was important to review ways of how to encourage homeowners to bring empty properties back into use. He reiterated Councillor Virdi's comments regarding the West Bridgford Special Expenses and welcomed the continued investment in facilities and events over the last year. He concluded by echoing thanks to officers for their continued hard work.

The Leader echoed Councillor Virdi's comments that this was an extremely well run Council, being debt free and prudently managed. He referred to the two additional policy changes and felt that this showed that the Council did listen to residents' concerns and that it could react accordingly, due to its stable financial position. He also echoed the thanks given to the Director – Finance and Corporate Services and his team for their continued hard work.

It was RESOLVED that Cabinet RECOMMENDS to Council that it:

- a) adopts the budget setting report and associated financial strategies 2026/27 to 2030/31 and appendices (attached Annex), including the

summarised Special Expenses budget at Appendix 1, Budget Summary at Appendix 2, use of Reserves at Appendix 4, Transformation and Efficiency Plan at Appendix 5, core spending power at Appendix 6 and Report of the Nottinghamshire Finance Officers on the Business Rates Pool at Appendix 7;

- b) adopts the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 3;
- c) adopts the Capital and Investment Strategy at Appendix 9;
- d) sets Rushcliffe's 2026/27 Council Tax for a Band D property at £161.76 (no increase from 2025/26, a freeze for one year);
- e) sets the Special Expenses for 2026/27 for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth, resulting in the following Band D Council Tax levels for the Special Expense Areas:
 - i. West Bridgford £67.40 (£64.84 in 2025/26)
 - ii. Keyworth £3.35 (£3.21 in 2025/26)
 - iii. Ruddington £3.40 (£3.14 in 2025/26); and
- f) adopts the Pay Policy Statement at Appendix 8; and delegates authority to the Director – Finance and Corporate Services to make any minor amendments to the MTFs once the final Local Government Finance Settlement is received and advise the Finance Portfolio Holder accordingly, to be reported to Full Council.

59 **Article 4 Direction - Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor Upton, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the Article 4 Direction – Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMOs).

Councillor Upton referred to the Council meeting on 18 September 2025, when this issue had been debated, and he referred to the subsequent work by officers to investigate and collate evidence, including any adverse effects on local amenities or well-being, to see if there was a case for introducing an Article 4 Direction, as detailed in paragraph 1.2 of the report.

Councillor Upton advised that at the present time, there was insufficient evidence to meet the legal threshold to justify an Article 4 Direction, and whilst understanding the emotion, and the call by some to have tougher HMO regulations in Rushcliffe, there was not enough evidence to support that. Councillor Upton stated that the report outlined the investigations that had taken place, together with details of an Article 4 Direction, as highlighted in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4. Councillor Upton confirmed that an Article 4 Direction would not prevent development, it would require a planning application to be made, and unless there were compelling, adverse material considerations, as set out in planning legislation, it was likely that many would be approved. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required that an Article 4 Direction should only be used when there was robust evidence and applied to the smallest possible geographical area. Councillor Upton outlined the number of

licensed and potential unlicensed HMOs in Rushcliffe, as detailed in paragraph 4.10, which amounted to around 361, together with details of complaints received in 2024 and 2025, as referred to in paragraph 4.12. It was noted that levels of complaint were very low. Councillor Upton referred to some unintended consequences of introducing an Article 4 Direction, such as reducing the availability of lower cost accommodation for young professionals, students and those on a lower income.

Councillor Upton concluded by stating that most HMOs in Rushcliffe had not given rise to any complaints and there was no evidence to link them with anti-social behaviour. However, the situation might change, and it was therefore recommended that the following additional recommendation c) be agreed:

- c) that Cabinet requests that the matter is referred to Communities Scrutiny Group at the July meeting to scrutinise the following key lines of enquiry:
- Is there a robust evidence base demonstrating harm or risk of harm?
 - What are the likely impacts – intended and unintended – of introducing an Article 4 Direction to remove or restrict permitted development rights for HMOs?
 - Is making a Direction proportionate, enforceable and aligned with local and national policy?

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Inglis advised that he had presented the original motion at Council, which had resulted in this investigation. He referred to the subsequent report, which confirmed that the legal requirements for robust evidence currently did not exist, and therefore an Article 4 Direction could not be justified. He was pleased that monitoring would continue and that the issue would be scrutinised, with the focus on West Bridgford, where the current density was highest and action would be taken, if any trigger point was reached. However, Councillor Inglis noted that the vast majority of HMOs did not give rise to complaints, and any that did had been successfully addressed by the Council. Councillor Inglis referred to Councillor Phillip's supplementary question earlier in the meeting and clarified that an Article 4 Direction simply ensured that a property met the NPPF requirements in material planning matters and it had no control over who occupied a property.

Councillor Wheeler reiterated that having an Article 4 Direction would not prevent a property being converted into a HMO, it would require an additional stage, with the processing of a planning application. The Council had to follow national planning policies and if residents wanted changes to be made to those policies, they should lobby their MPs. He felt that it was important to have transparent decision making and be clear with people that a property could be changed into a HMO and there was no control over who could live in it.

Councillor Brennan stated that many people hoped that an Article 4 Direction would prevent asylum seekers living in their area; however, it was not designed to do that. For smaller HMOs under an Article 4 Direction, applying for planning permission, would not give any say on who would live in that property. The only way that the Council could have some kind of preventative measures was if

there was a change in Government policy.

The Leader agreed that evidence was required to introduce an Article 4 Direction and that any real changes had to be driven by changes to Government policy. The Leader stated that it was his intention to write to the Government, to request that it considered changing legislation to allow councils to make their own, local decisions.

It was RESOLVED that Cabinet:

- a) confirms that there is insufficient evidence to meet the legal threshold to justify an Article 4 Direction to remove or restrict permitted development rights for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) in the Borough;
- b) requests that the number of HMOs and complaints received continues to be monitored; and
- c) requests that the matter is referred to Communities Scrutiny Group at the July meeting to scrutinise the following key lines of enquiry:
 - Is there a robust evidence base demonstrating harm or risk of harm?
 - What are the likely impacts – intended and unintended – of introducing an Article 4 Direction to remove or restrict permitted development rights for HMOs?
 - Is making a Direction proportionate, enforceable and aligned with local and national policy?

The meeting closed at 7.57 pm.

CHAIR