

HMO, PBSA, Co-Living Amenity Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Initial Consultation (18 January – 1 March 2021)

Summary of Consultation Responses

The Council received 65 representations to the consultation. The representations were submitted by a wide range of stakeholders including neighbourhood planning groups, residents' associations, landlords, landlords' associations and representatives, letting agents, developers, consultants and architects.

The comments have been broken down into 7 categories:

- General comments – 145 comments in total
- Introductory sections – 13 comments in total
- Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) – 196 comments in total
- Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) – 134 comments in total
- Co-Living – 20 comments in total*
- Appendices – 5 comments in total
- No comment – 6 (not shown in table)

Each of the representations has been analysed in detail and the following tables highlight and summarise the points that were raised. Where representations made similar (sometimes identical) comments on specific issues, these comments have been collated and summarised to avoid repetition.

For each of the comments, the table sets out the Council's initial response to the comment raised and the proposed action to be taken in response.

*** Please note that the Council is considering the removal of the Co-living section of the draft SPD to enable further consideration of co-living as a concept and the appropriate policy response. The representations made in respect of co-living have nevertheless been acknowledged and responded to, should the Council wish to consider providing guidance on co-living at a future time.**

General Comments

General Comments		
Comment	Initial Response	Proposed Action
Timing of the consultation is inappropriate given the constraints of the Covid-19 pandemic.	The Council's Local Development Scheme directs the timescales of preparation of Local Development Documents (LDDs), including the draft SPD. Council services have continued to operate throughout the pandemic, as have planning consultations, and consulting during that time is consistent with that approach. The draft SPD was considered by Development Plan Panel in December 2020, alongside an engagement plan, and was endorsed for consultation. Consultation was undertaken in line with the Interim Statement of Community Involvement (https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/interim-sci) which was updated in January 2021 to enable effective consultation during the restrictions arising from the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. There will be a further round of consultation on the draft SPD in due course.	None. Consultation met legislative requirements and Interim SCI.
The length of the consultation period is too short to allow for considered responses to be made.	The length of the consultation is consistent with other SPD consultations, in line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Council's Interim Statement of Community Involvement: https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/interim-sci	None. Consultation met legislative requirements and Interim SCI.
The draft SPD covers 3 distinct housing markets which should be dealt with separately and consulted on separately.	The Council considers that covering the different forms of accommodation is appropriate given the nature of the accommodation, crossover between markets, Core Strategy Policy H9 being the overarching strategic policy, and making efficient use of limited Council resources.	Clarify how the markets for HMO and PBSA and Co-Living* are linked within the SPD and explain why they are captured within the same document.
There is no evidence of poor standards and therefore the SPD is not required.	The Council has taken a strategic decision to seek to drive up standards in all sectors, including HMOs, PBSAs and to establish standards for co-living developments, in line with	Clarify the justification and reasoning for the preparation of the SPD.

Appendix 1

	<p>Best Council Plan ambitions. One of the Council's Key Pillars is Health and Wellbeing and Housing is known to be a key determinant of health. The SPD is therefore contextualised within a broader approach and ambition of the Council.</p> <p>In addition, in February 2021, the Environment, Housing and Communities scrutiny board report considered a paper on private sector housing conditions and the quality of accommodation, noting at para 3.10 that space continues to be a major issue within the HMO sector.</p>	
<p>The aspiration to improve living standards within the SPD is supported and the detrimental impact of poor quality accommodation on health and wellbeing is recognised.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None. This comment supports the Council's approach.</p>
<p>Landlords have not been adequately consulted or encouraged to respond to the consultation. This could undermine the relationship that the student PRS sector has with the Council. A letter should have been sent to all landlords on the HMO register.</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken in line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Council's Interim Statement of Community Involvement: https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/interim-sci</p> <p>In addition, landlords and their representatives, such as Unipol, the Leeds Property Association and the National Residential Landlords Association (NRLA) were targeted as part of the consultation period. It would not be resource effective for the Council to write to all 3,000+ landlords on the HMO Register.</p>	<p>None. Consultation met legislative requirements and Interim SCI.</p>
<p>Social media should have been used to promote the SPD consultation.</p>	<p>Social media was used to promote the consultation. See consultation report for full details of consultation methods.</p>	<p>Continue to make use of social media to promote pre-adoption publicity on the draft SPD in due course.</p>
<p>The Council should hold follow up meetings with each of the three sectors.</p>	<p>The Council has continued to engage (informally) with representatives of each of the sectors as part of the work to progress the SPD.</p>	<p>Continue to engage with representatives of the sectors as part of the</p>

Appendix 1

		upcoming consultation period.
There is a need to ensure that all residents in Leeds have a high standard of accommodation.	Noted.	None. This comment agrees with the Council's approach.
The SPD will limit the supply of student housing.	The SPD acknowledges that introducing space standards may reduce the amount of bedrooms that can be accommodated within HMOs, however this will be minimal and the need for a high standard of accommodation for all residents, including HMO tenants, is a priority for the Council.	None. The Council does not consider that the SPD will significantly inhibit the supply of student housing.
Space and amenity standards for these types of accommodation should reflect existing size requirements for flats and houses.	The proposed SPD standards do reflect existing size requirements for typical residential dwellings, as set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards, which are part of the Development Plan for Leeds through Core Strategy Policy H9.	Clarify the relationship between Nationally Described Space Standards and standards proposed through the SPD.
There appears to be an assumption that all students are single, whereas many may well be married and/or have children that will have specific housing needs – PBSA may not be suitable but they may potentially reside in HMOs or Co-living developments.	Noted. The vast majority of the student population in Leeds will make use of single-person rooms however the need to provide a wider range is acknowledged.	Consider the opportunity for widening the scope of the standards proposed through the SPD to cover 2-person / family accommodation
The SPD distracts from wider Council aspirations regarding carbon reduction which will already be costly for landlords and ultimately tenants.	The SPD is part of the Council's approach to driving up housing quality in the city, in line with Best Council Plan ambitions.	None. The preparation of the SPD is in support of the Council's ambition to drive up housing quality across all sectors.
The standards in the SPD do not apply to owner-occupied housing.	Development providing new housing (C3 – residential dwelling houses) is required to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards, which are part of the Development Plan for Leeds through Core Strategy Policy H9.	Clarify the role of Policy H9 within the introductory text to the draft SPD.
There are references to management in relation to each of the three types of accommodation, but not all under a specific	Not all of the management elements described are within the scope of the SPD but it is acknowledged that having a distinct "management" section for each of the different types	Consolidate management considerations for each of the types of accommodation

Appendix 1

<p>Management heading. Management of HMOs is particularly important in respect of waste organisation, keeping gardens tidy and properties well-maintained. Management of PBSA should include those as well as arrangements for deliveries, beginning and end of term local disruption and congestion, guidance to student residents on being good neighbours. Management proposals should be included as part of a planning application, backed up by planning obligation agreements. A section on management for each type should be expanded to give guidance on all the issues that should be included in a management agreement.</p>	<p>of accommodation would be beneficial, signposting to other areas of planning policy and guidance as appropriate.</p>	<p>into a “management” section, signposting to other planning policy and guidance as appropriate.</p>
<p>The SPD should also make reference to the need to take account of applicable policies and guidance in relevant Neighbourhood Plans and/or Conservation Areas</p>	<p>The need for cross-referencing is recognised.</p>	<p>Provide reference to neighbourhood plans and Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans as appropriate.</p>
<p>The SPD is unsound for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not justified by appropriate evidence • It is not guidance but in fact seeks to set overly prescriptive standards • It will undermine the delivery of LCC’s vision of providing for the City’s housing needs in sustainable locations 	<p>SPDs are not required to satisfy the tests of soundness. The Council considers that the SPD is based on appropriate evidence.</p> <p>The weight to be attached to the SPD as a material consideration is clarified within the document.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the SPD will undermine delivery, rather will improve quality and drive up standards.</p>	<p>Consider clarity of references to SPD status and clarify the justification and reasoning for the preparation of the SPD.</p>
<p>The SPD should be justified by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need • Viability • Timing 	<p>Need and justification for the SPD is set out in the document. Viability testing is not a requirement of SPD preparation. Timing is considered to be appropriate.</p>	<p>Clarify the justification and reasoning for the preparation of the SPD.</p>

Appendix 1

<p>There should be a transition period for the application of the policy to allow for market adjustment which will allow developers to factor in the cost of space standards into future land acquisitions.</p>	<p>As the SPD progresses towards adoption by the Council, it will attract more weight in the decision-making process, giving a de-facto transitional period.</p>	<p>None. There is a de-facto transitional period as the SPD progresses and attracts further weight.</p>
<p>The Core Strategy Selective Review commits the Council to preparing guidance, rather than the prescriptive standards set out in the SPD.</p>	<p>The SPD does provide guidance.</p>	<p>Consider clarity of references to SPD status.</p>
<p>As City Centre retailing contracts and central office buildings become vacant, many cities have found that conversion to student accommodation has stopped high levels of vacant buildings and dereliction: these risks are high in Leeds and these standards would stop that productive evolution.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that the SPD would provide an impediment to city centre delivery, rather will serve to improve the quality of accommodation.</p>	<p>None. The Council does not consider that the SPD will inhibit delivery.</p>
<p>The proposed standards show limited understanding of the student market, the needs of students or what is possible within the existing housing stock in inner Leeds.</p>	<p>The Council has developed a thorough understanding of the PBSA market, in recent years, which has enabled and supported the development of the draft SPD.</p>	<p>None. The Council has a sound understanding of the student market and is committed to continuing to work with stakeholders.</p>
<p>At present, the majority of PBSA is used to house primarily first year and international, students, but this will have to change to house returning students. At present rents (...) in PBSA are approximately 50% higher than in off-street housing – so future affordability is important.</p>	<p>Affordability is not within the scope of the SPD, although the Council recognises this is an important consideration for many students. As part of the Local Plan Update 2 (due to commence in line with the Local Development Scheme), the Council may consider an update to affordable housing policy depending on the scope of the plan.</p>	<p>None. Affordability is not within the scope of the SPD, though there is an acknowledged need to consider affordability issues more broadly.</p>
<p>The consultation document is based on inappropriate background material. Recognised material is available and has been produced by Unipol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2020/08/06/student-accommodation-the-facts/ • https://www.unipol.org.uk/getmedia/ead8ba2b-d770-4127-83e2- 	<p>Additional evidence base material is helpful.</p>	<p>Review additional evidence base material as appropriate.</p>

Appendix 1

0dc93835e2d8/AccommodationCostSurvey_2018_FullReport_WEB.PDF.aspx		
<p>This SPD should be more explicit about how it relates to other SPDs and other Policies of the statutory Development Plan. If necessary, further consultation should be offered in respect of these revisions in due course.</p>	<p>Further consultation will take place on the draft SPD in due course.</p>	<p>Clarify how SPD relates to other SPDs and the Development Plan for Leeds.</p>

Introductory Sections

Introductory Sections		
Comment	Response	Proposed Action
Clarity needed on how Best Council Plan objectives relate to the objectives of the SPD.	The wording does contextualise the ambition of the SPD in relation to Best Council Plan objectives in Section 3.2 Leeds City Council Priorities.	Clarify how the objectives of the SPD relate to the Best Council Plan Objectives.
The references to the historical background of space and design standards provide useful context and demonstrate how their importance has been overlooked.	Noted.	None. This comment supports the Council's approach.
The SPD should aim to have better than "good" standards of accommodation.	The draft SPD seeks to achieve a balance between what is desirable and what is achievable and deliverable. At present, there are many properties that may fall well below the definition of 'good' and if, through the SPD, the standards in some of those properties can achieve that benchmark, this would be a significant improvement. The proposed standards within the SPD are minima and they do not prevent proposals from exceeding those standards.	Clarify the role of the standards as "minima" within the draft SPD.
The development plan for Leeds section contains contradictory/confusing information as point 5.22 states "development of student accommodation and houses in multiple occupation will not be subject to the space standards as set out in the Table. Instead, such development should reflect the NDSS with appropriate adjustments to address the particular characteristics of these types of development". However, point 6.1 states "HMOs are not subject to the NDSS requirements in Core Strategy Policy H9".	The NDSS requirements do not apply to HMOs, as noted in Policy H9 of the Core Strategy. However, the Core Strategy establishes an appropriate methodology regarding using the NDSS as a starting point, with "appropriate adjustments". It is not within the scope of the SPD to amend wording with the Leeds Core Strategy.	Review and clarify references to the Core Strategy as appropriate.
Para 5.2.2.should clarify that NDSS requirements in Policy H9 do not apply to co-living developments.	Noted.	Consider and clarify relationship between NDSS and co-living developments.*

Appendix 1

<p>Para 4.3 should acknowledge the fact that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan “unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Clarify reference as appropriate.</p>
--	---------------	--

Houses in Multiple Occupation

Houses in Multiple Occupation		
Comment	Response	Proposed Action
<p>Clarity is needed on when the SPD will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are HMOs created through permitted development rights exempt? • Will the SPD be taken into account for certificates of lawful use? • It should be made clear that the standards apply to changes of use and conversions to HMOs and that “new HMOs” do not just include new build schemes (paras 2.2.3 and 7.1.2). 	<p>The guidance within the SPD will apply to full or outline planning applications for new HMO accommodation, new PBSA developments and new Co-Living developments.</p> <p>As the SPD progresses, it will gain more weight in the determination of planning applications. However, the SPD will only have full weight in decision making when it has been formally adopted.</p> <p>The SPD will not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ new HMO Licensing Applications, as this is dealt with under separate legislation; or ○ applications for Certificates of Lawful Development for HMOs, as these applications serve to regularise the lawful use of an existing HMO, rather than new HMO accommodation; or ○ HMOs created through Permitted Development Rights. 	<p>Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply.</p>
<p>HMO standards are unnecessary as legislation and powers already exist to allow local authorities to enforce higher standards such as the Housing Act 2004, Homes Fitness for Habitation Act 2018, and other related legislation.</p>	<p>The Housing Act 2004 and other relevant legislation enable the Council to enforce against hazards which can lead to harm, in effect a “minimum”. This does not reflect the Council’s aspirations for all residents in Leeds to have access to a good standard of accommodation, regardless of type or tenure. The SPD supports this to be achieved through the planning process.</p>	<p>Clarify the Council’s aspirations regarding housing quality as set out within the Best Council Plan.</p>
<p>The SPD standards would restrict the supply of HMO accommodation which could lead to a</p>	<p>The SPD acknowledges that this may have a minor impact on bedroom availability in future HMO developments. It is</p>	<p>None. The Council does not consider that the SPD will</p>

Appendix 1

spread in HMOs across a wider area and would be unsustainable. This would have a detrimental impact on the local economy.	not within the scope of the SPD to retrospectively enforce standards to HMOs that already benefit from planning permission. In this way, the SPD would have no impact on existing HMO supply.	significantly inhibit the supply of student housing.
Students do not spend all of their time in their student houses and the SPD standards should take this into account.	The SPD acknowledges that students may use their accommodation differently to long-term residents. However, not all HMO tenants are students and the SPD has no scope to distinguish between the two.	None. The Council cannot distinguish between different forms of HMO provision through the SPD.
Clarity is needed on bathroom sizes / en-suite sizes, the need for a 'drying / dressing zone' and there should be a requirement for a 'family' bathroom. Up to 8 and 11+ should include a separate toilet.	Bathroom sizes/requirements have been informed by the HQI system.	Reconsider and clarify bathroom size requirements in SPD.
The bathroom requirements are insufficient for the expected occupancy levels, should accommodate a mix of bathrooms and shower rooms, and take gender into account.	Bathroom sizes/requirements have been informed by the HQI system.	Reconsider and clarify bathroom size requirements in SPD.
The tables on bathroom and WC sizes are unclear – the suggested floor areas seem to be excessive.	Bathroom sizes/requirements have been informed by the HQI system.	Reconsider and clarify bathroom size requirements in SPD.
The shared facility requirements should be cumulative to account for variances in room sizes (e.g. the living room may be slightly smaller, but the kitchen might be slightly larger). The SPD should also account for spaces that are significantly larger than the required standards or where there two amenity spaces which could meet or exceed the standards.	Noted.	Consider opportunities for capturing "global space" as part of provision of shared spaces.
The standards should include some flexibility and account for potential off-setting within the amenity space.	Noted.	Consider opportunities for capturing "global space" as part of provision of shared spaces.
The standards should take into account the global amenity space provided and use a	Noted.	Consider opportunities for capturing "global space" as

Appendix 1

whole house approach rather than on a room-by-room basis.		part of provision of shared spaces.
The room size requirements are too detailed. Facilities should be judged on a space and layout perspective rather than on a prescriptive number, taking into account quality, amenity and finish.	Noted.	Consider level of prescription appropriate to SPD guidance and opportunities for capturing quality aspirations alongside space.
The additional 1sqm per person for shared facilities is inconsistent with the figures in the table.	It is considered that for HMOs with high occupancies it is unlikely that all residents will use the space at the same time, and so the 1sqm additional requirement is felt to be proportionate.	Consider and clarify shared space provision expectations and justifications.
The communal/shared facilities sizes are too large, HMO communal space does not need to be larger as tenants will use the facilities at different times of day and will spend more time in bedrooms. The requirements would affect commercial viability and could lead to a reduction in larger HMOs which would lead to a shortage of student accommodation.	The SPD recognises that not all HMO residents are likely to use shared facilities at the same time, and that this likelihood decreases as occupancy is increased. However, it is still necessary to provide sufficient space within shared facilities to ensure appropriate provision for residents. The SPD does not apply retrospectively to HMOs that benefit from planning permission and therefore the existing stock of HMOs is unlikely to decrease as a result of the SPD.	Consider and clarify shared space provision expectations and justifications.
The bed-sitting room requirements do not take into account the age and the size of the likely HMO stock.	Noted.	Consider room size requirements against likely stock.
The size standards (in general) are unachievable in much of the older housing stock.	Noted.	Consider room size requirements against likely stock.
The minimum bedroom size of 7.5sqm for a single or 11sqm for a double is unjustified when the minimum bedroom size HMO Licensing guidance is 6.51 sqm	Licensing requirements represent the absolute minimum. This does not reflect the Council's aspirations for all residents in Leeds to have access to a good standard of accommodation, regardless of type or tenure. The SPD supports this to be achieved through the planning process.	None. The SPD is not related to licensing requirements.
The definition of a single room and double room is confusing. Does a single room mean	The HMO Licensing process is separate to the SPD preparation. Anticipated occupancy (persons) will need to	Clarify occupancy expectations.

Appendix 1

<p>that it contains a single bed only? Does it become a double room when it contains a double bed, even though it is occupied by a single person? In 5+ beds HMOs, the occupancy is determined by the License granted/issued by LCC not by bedroom sizes nor size of beds.</p>	<p>be set out at planning application stage, as it is with Policy H9 of the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p>Light standards may be difficult to achieve within existing housing stock and guidance is needed on how this will be implemented. This is particularly the case for potential historic buildings so there is a need to clarify that window enlargement / raising window heights is not appropriate in all circumstances.</p>	<p>The SPD does recognise that solutions may not be appropriate in all circumstances.</p>	<p>Clarify flexibility regarding light standards for historic buildings and recognise that solutions may not be appropriate in all circumstances.</p>
<p>Light and outlook requirements are too vague and difficult to determine. Clarity is needed on how “good” is to be interpreted. The SPD should encourage the best use of available sunlight.</p>	<p>The need for clarity is recognised.</p>	<p>Clarify expectations regarding light and outlook interpretation.</p>
<p>The guidance should make clear that where measures to address light are not appropriate then the use of a room as living accommodation would not be acceptable.</p>	<p>This is a consideration within the draft SPD.</p>	<p>Consider clarifying habitability of rooms regarding light and outlook.</p>
<p>Evidence is needed to support ventilation requirements.</p>	<p>Ventilation requirements are linked to existing Building Regulations requirements.</p>	<p>None. Ventilation requirements would exist irrespective of the SPD and the document provides signposting as needed.</p>
<p>The light requirements should acknowledge the potential benefits of roof windows.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Consider clarifying benefits of roof windows, noting that this solution may not be appropriate in all circumstances.</p>

Appendix 1

<p>The minimum bedroom sizes are inadequate for study / leisure activity to take place within the room</p>	<p>The proposed sizes seek to accommodate the various living functions within bedrooms.</p>	<p>Consider study/leisure activity within rooms.</p>
<p>The SPD should also include standards for outdoor communal spaces, including the number of bins / bin storage and car parking arrangements – determined by the number of occupants</p>	<p>This may extend beyond the scope of the SPD however signposting to other policy and guidance may be appropriate.</p>	<p>Consider signposting to other policy and guidance as appropriate.</p>
<p>The requirement for bedrooms to be no more than 1 floor away from bedrooms is unjustified and does not take into account the configuration of the stock (e.g. HMOs are likely to be across more than 1 floor).</p>	<p>This guidance is intended to ensure that residents do not need to travel long distances with hot food. The need to align to existing guidance relating to availability of dining space within 1 floor is recognised.</p>	<p>Clarify 1-storey requirement application to where no dining space is provided.</p>
<p>The requirement for additional kitchens may cause fire hazards and require additional fire protection measures and would be unworkable in terms of the electricity supply.</p>	<p>It was not the intention of the draft SPD to introduce new kitchens on upper floors (where dining space is provided).</p>	<p>Clarify 1-storey requirement application to where no dining space is provided.</p>
<p>The impact of HMOs in local neighbourhoods should be taken into account.</p>	<p>Impacts are covered within Core Strategy Policy H6 and the HMO Practice Note: https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-permission/how-we-decide-on-planning-permission-for-hmos. Signposting to other policy and guidance may be appropriate.</p>	<p>Consider signposting to existing policy and guidance as appropriate.</p>
<p>Every tenant within a HMO should have their own living room / bedroom, separate kitchen and a separate bathroom to allow residents' privacy. The requirement to share facilities is inappropriate and Leeds should be seeking higher standards.</p>	<p>HMOs are recognised as an important part of the housing market, both for students and for those on low incomes. To mandate private accommodation on the scale as suggested would take HMOs from a C4/sui generis into a C3 dwelling use, at which point the NDSS requirements would apply. The aim of the SPD is to support higher quality HMO provision, recognising the role that they play in the Leeds housing market.</p>	<p>None. The Council recognises the function of HMOs as a tenure within overall housing provision in Leeds.</p>
<p>There should be a presumption of refusal in areas with large amounts of HMOs.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the SPD. The Council has existing policy in place, including Core Strategy Policy H6, the Article 4 Direction Area and the HMO practice note: https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-</p>	<p>Consider signposting to existing policy and guidance as appropriate.</p>

Appendix 1

	permission/how-we-decide-on-planning-permission-for-hmos . Signposting to other policy and guidance may be appropriate.	
The requirements of the SPD will have a detrimental impact on the affordability of HMO accommodation and could lead to 'pricing out' of students which would not complement the Vision for Leeds to be open and fair. The option of a smaller/cheaper room within a HMO offers groups to share the affordability of the HMO whilst retaining a choice over where to live. The potential impact on affordability due to the need for larger rooms may remove choice within the student market, particularly as much of the PBSA accommodation is unaffordable.	The Council considers that rent levels for HMO accommodation are determined on tenant affordability. It is not considered that the SPD will have a direct impact on existing HMO affordability in Leeds as the SPD cannot apply retrospectively to HMOs that already benefit from planning permission.	None. Affordability is not within the scope of the SPD, though there is an acknowledged need to consider affordability issues more broadly.
Leeds City Council is using the SPD to discourage new HMOs.	The Council recognises that HMOs are an important part of the housing market, for students, those on low incomes and those wishing to share, perhaps because they are new to the city. The aim of the SPD is to support higher quality HMO provision, recognising the role that they play in the Leeds housing market.	None. The Council recognises the function of HMOs as a tenure within overall housing provision in Leeds.
The HMO Licensing team are using (or are intending to use) the standards within the SPD to justify refusal of licensing applications.	The draft SPD does not relate to HMO licensing applications.	Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply.
Clarity is needed on the distinction between guidance being prepared by the Private Sector Housing team and the provisions with the SPD.	The progression of the two pieces of guidance are complementary but are not directly linked. The guidance prepared by the Private Sector Housing team relates to the enforcement of HHSRS, the draft SPD relates to the determination of future planning applications for HMO accommodation.	Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply and how the SPD relates to other LCC guidance.
To ensure existing HMOs comply with the SPD requirements would be costly for landlords and could lead to an increase in vacancies.	The SPD cannot apply retrospectively to HMOs that already benefit from planning permission.	Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply.

Appendix 1

The SPD should not be used to retrospectively enforce standards.	The SPD cannot be used to retrospectively enforce standards on HMOs that already benefit from planning permission.	Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply.
Any en-suite shower rooms should be externally ventilated through windows/extractor fans.	Noted.	Consider clarifying ventilation requirements for en-suite shower rooms.
The implementation of the standards would represent an unwarranted cost for landlords due to lost bedsaces (which would lead to lost income), plus potential alteration costs.	The SPD cannot apply retrospectively to HMOs that already benefit from planning permission.	Clarify within the HMO section as to when the proposed HMO standards will / won't apply.
The SPD should have regard to the future use of such buildings should there be conversions away from HMO use.	The Council's policy approach through Core Strategy Policy H6 (and existing Permitted Development Rights) support flexibility regarding future uses of HMOs, for example conversion to family accommodation.	None. Existing policy provides a framework for consideration of conversion away from HMO uses.
Whilst there are some negative impacts of HMOs, they also bring benefits to the area and to the students themselves.	Noted.	None. The Council recognises the function of HMOs as a tenure within overall housing provision in Leeds.
The outdoor amenity requirement is unrealistic for the older terraced housing stock.	Noted.	Consider clarifying outdoor amenity considerations.
Outdoor amenity space should be required.	The SPD does clarify that outdoor amenity provision is expected.	Consider clarifying outdoor amenity considerations.
The section on how/where the guidance applies would be better at the beginning of the section.	Noted.	Consider repositioning section on when/how the guidance will apply within revised draft SPD.
Social housing standards are not appropriate for HMO accommodation.	The Council has taken a strategic decision to drive up housing quality in all sectors and has used available evidence from different sectors to determine appropriate standards.	Clarify methodology and use of varying inputs to support proposed standards.
There are differences within the HMO market itself – e.g. student HMOs and others. A specific standard should be used for each	The SPD cannot distinguish between different sub-sectors within the HMO market as there is no Use Class Order distinction between student/non-student HMOs.	Consider recognition of different sub-sectors within HMO market in introductory

Appendix 1

individual sector which adequately takes into consideration the different requirements of each group.		sections, acknowledging quality within student sector. Re-iterate that SPD cannot distinguish between student/non-student HMOs.
The Unipol and LUU Rate Your Landlord scheme demonstrates high levels of satisfaction in the student housing sector, suggesting that there is no need for the SPD.	Not all HMO tenants are students and the Council recognises the importance of Unipol/LUU standards in the providing assurance in the student sector. The SPD cannot distinguish between different sub-sectors within the HMO market as there is no Use Class Order distinction between student/non-student HMOs.	Consider recognition of different sub-sectors within HMO market in introductory sections, acknowledging quality within student sector. Re-iterate that SPD cannot distinguish between student/non-student HMOs.
References and justification should be provided to demonstrate how current HMO standards are not being met, and why HHSRS powers are inadequate to deal with the current problems.	The Council considers that HHSRS represents a “minimum” which would need to be enforced against if a hazard was identified. This does not reflect the Council’s aspirations for all residents in Leeds to have access to a good standard of accommodation, regardless of type or tenure. The SPD supports this to be achieved through the planning process.	None. HHSRS and its implementation are separate to the draft SPD which serves a different purpose.
The HMO section does not have a clear methodology as to how the standards have been arrived at.	The methodology is set out in the SPD.	Revisit and clarify methodology.
Some students prefer to have smaller rooms which are 1) more affordable and 2) offer choice.	This should not undermine the standard of living – the proposed standards should apply irrespective of affordability.	None. Affordability should not automatically lead to smaller room sizes.
There is no minimum size detailed for open plan kitchen/living/dining spaces which are increasingly common in HMOs	Noted.	Consider and clarify open plan spaces as appropriate.
It is unclear within the SPD whether there will be a judgement on what is ‘usable space’ which is important as many properties have attic bedrooms with sloping ceilings.	Noted.	Clarify definitions of useable space consistent with NDSS definitions.
The en-suite bathroom requirements are unachievable in HMOs. Many landlords have added these following the influence of PBSA	Noted.	Consider bathroom requirements (e.g. bathroom

Appendix 1

<p>and this is popular, but this would likely decrease if standards were introduced as they would render both the bedroom and en suite too small in the majority of properties.</p>		<p>“pods”) which have a smaller floorspace requirement.</p>
<p>We welcome the proposals with regard to future new HMO developments and alterations to existing HMO properties. The measures in SPD would benefit both tenants and neighbours in the future.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None. This comment supports the Council’s approach.</p>
<p>Many student HMOs (approx. 80%) are registered with a recognised accreditation scheme which already helps to provide higher standards and accountability.</p>	<p>Not all HMO tenants are students and the Council recognises the importance of Unipol/LUU standards in the providing assurance in the student sector. The SPD cannot distinguish between different sub-sectors within the HMO market as there is no Use Class Order distinction between student/non-student HMOs.</p>	<p>Consider recognition of different sub-sectors within HMO market in introductory sections, acknowledging quality within student sector. Re-iterate that SPD cannot distinguish between student/non-student HMOs.</p>
<p>The improvement of light penetration in basements would be supported to avoid inappropriate use of basements in certain property types.</p>	<p>Section 7.4 sets out the approach to light in HMOs and seeks to ensure that all habitable rooms have access to a good level of natural daylight. Para 7.4.3 clarifies that basement or other subterranean accommodation is often difficult to accommodate and where this is proposed it is particularly important that sufficient light penetration is achieved.</p>	<p>Clarify further the expectations for light penetration into basements/subterranean accommodation.</p>

Purpose Built Student Accommodation

Purpose Built Student Accommodation		
Comment	Response	Proposed Action
As a minimum, PBSA bedspaces should provide enough space for a bed, storage, work space, food preparation, bathroom, and socialising space. The wider building should provide communal space to allow for social interaction.	The draft SPD sets out how this provision is to be achieved and the distribution of private/shared space within a PBSA scheme.	None. The SPD sets this out.
The SPD should detail how communal space should be laid out or provided (e.g. a mix of different types of communal space) which should also include external communal areas.	The draft SPD sets out how this provision is to be achieved and the distribution of communal space within a PBSA scheme.	Clarify that PBSA developments should provide a mix of communal spaces which serve different functions.
Communal space should be adequately ventilated.	Section 9.7 sets out ventilation standards for PBSA schemes, which would include communal space.	None. Ventilation requirements cover communal space.
The SPD should cross-reference the Tall Buildings SPD in relation to PBSA.	Noted.	Provide cross-reference to Tall Buildings SPD in relation to PBSAs.
The SPD references the emerging Leeds Transport SPD, however these do not take into account the 'car-free' characteristics of PBSA development. There should be a recognition of the impact that this has e.g. greater use of taxis, delivery vehicles, with the requirement for specific highways arrangements to accommodate this.	Traffic impacts of PBSA are not within the scope of the SPD. Further clarification of transport/traffic expectations should be pursued through the ongoing work to update and re-publish the draft Leeds Transport SPD.	None. Pass on information to Highways service regarding transport/traffic issues in relation to PBSA.
PBSA management plans should have a beginning / end of term plan for arrivals and departures, to avoid congestion.	Traffic impacts are not within scope of the SPD. Further clarification of transport/traffic expectations should be pursued through the ongoing work to update and re-publish the draft Leeds Transport SPD.	None. Pass on information to Highways service regarding transport/traffic issues in relation to PBSA.
The typology of student accommodation and variety of room offer has developed beyond the	The SPD cannot preclude particular forms of provision from coming forward, however it is recognised that it should	Clarify how the standards in the SPD would apply to

Appendix 1

<p>cluster and studio offering. Two and three bed apartments have been developed with one and two bathrooms respectively which represents a gap in the current SPD guidance and would make bringing schemes of this nature forward difficult in future.</p>	<p>provide guidance that is flexible enough to suit different circumstances.</p>	<p>different forms of provision, e.g. 2/3 bed apartments.</p>
<p>The SPD should not reference Building Regulations numerical values which may be subject to change – it should say that Building Regulations requirements should be delivered.</p>	<p>The need for future-proofing is recognised.</p>	<p>Seek to future-proof references to Building Regs to help ensure that the SPD does not become out of date.</p>
<p>Proposed cluster and studio bathroom size is in excess of standard arrangements which adequately provide a WC, basin, shower and storage. This should be more flexible and recognise schemes that have delivered smaller than the proposed standard.</p>	<p>The use of standard-sized PBSA bathroom “pods” is recognised.</p>	<p>Revise proposed bathroom size standards in recognition of standard size pods that have been delivered in Leeds. Consider bathroom requirements (e.g. bathroom “pods”) which have a smaller floorspace requirement.</p>
<p>Accessible room and studio sizes are governed by the Building Regulations requirements so should be silent on a number.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Re-consider approach to Accessible Room and Studio Sizes in PBSA to provide consistency with Building Regulations.</p>
<p>18sqm studio apartments can be delivered to suit the requirements of one person. A minimum of 20sqm could be accepted however it could add undue burden to scheme viability to increase beyond this.</p>	<p>The SPD takes a range-based approach to PBSA room sizes to allow for flexibility in provision, recognising the importance of having access to high quality communal spaces alongside bedroom spaces.</p>	<p>None. The proposed standards have inherent flexibility.</p>
<p>Shared internal spaces for PBSA are higher than necessary and do not account for kitchen and furniture provision within the space. A more proportionate approach would be a</p>	<p>The proposed standards for shared spaces in PBSA developments are considered to be sufficient to provide good quality living space for students.</p>	<p>Clarify methodology for shared spaces in PBSA developments.</p>

Appendix 1

combination of space standard (4-5sqm) with furniture provision.		
The 10sqm distance requirement would limit the cluster flat arrangement and does not take into account the layout of flats. This should be more flexible in recognition that this distance could be easily exceeded beyond 4-bed cluster flats (or due to the constraints of an existing building). This does not impact on amenity/wellbeing and should state that is 'desirable' rather than a requirement.	The main objective is to ensure that residents do not need to travel long distances with hot food for health and safety reasons. The need for flexibility which provides for delivery is recognised.	Clarify expectation for distances to rooms.
The target of 1sqm general communal space is excessive and does not reflect the accepted standards set out in the appendices. The need for the space depends on the ratio of cluster / studios and depends on the functionality of the space provided.	The 1sqm general communal space requirement reflects the quality of schemes accepted and expected in Leeds. The need for shared amenity space exists irrespective of studio/cluster provision to provide opportunities for socialising.	Clarify methodology for general communal space requirement.
Light standards - there are inevitable compromises to be made on city centre schemes.	This is recognised and the SPD provides a flexible approach recognising the particularities of City Centre schemes.	Clarify the need for flexibility regarding light in City Centre.
Reference to the 25 degree rule should be clarified.	Noted.	Clarify references to 25/45 degree rule.
It is difficult to provide external amenity space on city centre schemes and the 25% total floor area requirement is unrealistic , excessive and unachievable. This should be balanced within overall amenity provision. A sqm/bedspace requirement may be more appropriate.	This expectation is a starting point and this would need to be consistent with Policies G4 and G5.	Consider revision to external amenity space requirements and balance within overall provision.
The range based approach is supported, however the ability to achieve the prescriptive space standards may vary on a site-by-site basis and will need to have regard to existing built development and take into account the specific constraints of potentially sensitive development sites (e.g. heritage). The SPD	The range based approach is by definition flexible. All applications will be judged on their own merits and there will be a need for flexibility to address particular site constraints or considerations.	Consider introduction of flexibility for particular site constraints (where exceptions are necessary).

Appendix 1

<p>should therefore incorporate a greater degree of flexibility in applying the standards and be more responsive to the specific site circumstances. Para 9.3.4 should therefore be amended to acknowledge the application of the standards should be achieved in most circumstances, however there may be some exceptions (where it is not feasible or viable). Applications should be judged on their merits and demonstrate a high standard of living can be achieved.</p>		
<p>In respect of communal space the SPD should incorporate a greater degree of flexibility, recognising that site-specific constraints may constrain the ability of a development to fully comply with the standards in full. Applications should be judged on their merits and demonstrate a high standard of living can be achieved.</p>	<p>The range based approach is by definition flexible. All applications will be judged on their own merits and there will be a need for flexibility to address particular site constraints or considerations.</p>	<p>Consider introduction of flexibility for particular site constraints (where exceptions are necessary).</p>
<p>The requirement for cluster flats not to be more than 8 bed spaces should provide for a more flexible approach provided that they can achieve a good standard of amenity.</p>	<p>Larger cluster flats are not considered to provide a good level of amenity or contribute positive to health and wellbeing however the need to provide flexibility is recognised.</p>	<p>Reconsider approach to size of cluster flat arrangements.</p>
<p>PBSA developers have been looking at how best to deliver more affordable student accommodation (which is currently quite unaffordable) – high standards for room sizes will result in increased construction costs / fewer bedroom units which will lead to higher rents. This could put potential developers off from progressing further projects in Leeds as it may lead to under-occupancy.</p>	<p>Affordability is recognised as a key concern and part of the Local Plan Update 2 (due to commence in line with the Local Development Scheme), the Council may consider an update to affordable housing policy depending on the scope of the plan.</p>	<p>None. Affordability is an important consideration but is outside of the scope of the draft SPD.</p>
<p>PBSA developments in Leeds in recent years already achieve a high standard of amenity.</p>	<p>This is recognised and the standards proposed in the draft SPD seek to reflect this.</p>	<p>Recognise the quality of developments in Leeds and</p>

Appendix 1

		their influence on proposed standards.
The PBSA should focus solely on the PBSA development business model and which has negative financial impacts on the city as a whole, by introducing a 50% Council Tax for the PBSA sector.	Not within the scope of the SPD.	None. Not within the scope of the draft SPD.
The section on how/where the guidance applies would be better at the beginning of the section.	Noted.	Consider formatting / ordering of SPD regarding when guidance does / does not apply.
The standards should be based on a firm figure at the higher end of the range, then negotiated lower. The requirement for 'a demonstrably high standard' to justify a lower size may create a loophole.	The draft SPD sets out an expectation for developments to achieve the mid- to upper sizes of the range at Para 9.3.4	Reconsider the wording regarding upper ends of the ranges and clarify implementation.
The communal space should be large enough to accommodate all of the students at the same time. Many layouts do not suggest this is the case and the possibility for all occupants to meet together in the same space contributes to mental wellbeing.	There is a balance to be struck within the standards so as not to compromise deliverability (and the draft SPD is grounded in schemes delivered / permitted in Leeds) and the need to provide amenity.	Reconsider communal space requirements to ensure they are sufficient for residents.
It should not be possible for the general communal space to be provided all in the same block unless there are special circumstances (e.g. smaller blocks on the same site due to site constraints). There should be no physical or psychological barriers to the use of the communal space by all residents. It should be conveniently located for all residents, close to rooms or the main routes through the building, not at the end of dead-end corridors.	This is an important consideration and the need to provide a range of communal spaces across the scheme is recognised.	Ensure clarity of expectations around communal space delivery across a PBSA scheme.
External amenity space should be a requirement and "good" should be defined in terms of quality and amenity. The external	Noted.	Reconsider approach to external amenity space and clarify definitions.

Appendix 1

amenity space should be a variety of external spaces and should avoid overshadowed areas. Noise impacts should be taken into account.		
The size requirements could adversely impact on scheme viability	The requirements are derived from delivered / permitted schemes in Leeds and are therefore considered to be deliverable.	None. The proposed SPD is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on viability.
The mix of cluster and studio accommodation is supported.	Noted.	None. This comment supports the Council's approach.
The numerical requirement for accessible rooms should be avoided as the 1/20 requirement does not experience the anticipated level of uptake. The focus should be on the flexibility / adaptability of rooms as required. A balanced approach based on market need and mixed provision for students should be encouraged.	The requirement for accessible bedrooms reflects the Building Regulations requirement. Accessibility is a key priority for Leeds.	Consider adaptability regarding accessible room provision in line with Building Regulations expectations.
It is important to note that 2.2 sqm bathroom pods are commonly used in the UK and work very well in respect of customer experience.	The use of standard-sized PBSA bathroom "pods" is recognised.	Revise proposed bathroom size standards in recognition of standard size pods that have been delivered in Leeds. Consider bathroom requirements (e.g. bathroom "pods") which have a smaller floorspace requirement.
Clarity is needed on how quality and finish will be assessed within the determination of applications.	Each case will be assessed on its own merits but the need for definition is recognised.	Clarify expectations regarding quality and finish.
Shared kitchen/living/dining spaces needs re-considering in terms of the amount of facilities provided (i.e. the jump from 1 oven/hob/sink to 2).	This warrants further consideration with providers.	Explore and consider shared kitchen/living/dining space requirements and facilities provided.

Appendix 1

Clarity is needed on how appropriate furniture provision is to be assessed within the determination of applications. Unclear whether this is justified.	Noted.	Consider explanation of furniture requirements if necessary.
1sqm general communal space is reasonable. It is clearly an important factor of the balance of space outside the individual bedroom that contributes to the balance of overall provision.	Noted.	None. This comment supports the Council's approach.
Overlooking / privacy requirements should be judged on a case-by-case basis.	The need for flexibility is recognised.	Consider flexibility regarding outlook / privacy requirements to support a case-by-case approach in line with key principles.
Consideration should be given to how future flexibility of buildings would be conditioned at planning stage.	This is considered at 9.8.1.	Consider clarifying future adaptability.
It is unclear how the appendices data has been analysed and used to establish the space standards proposed in the draft SPD	Noted.	Clarify methodology.
There is no direct link between the appendices data and the minimum space ranges for the size of bedrooms (and bathrooms) promoted in the draft SPD. Many of the schemes contain bedrooms, shared space, communal space or a combination of all which fall below the standards in the SPD which lacks justification.	Noted.	Clarify methodology.
There is no assessment of the viability of adopting new space standards for PBSA or reference to viability considerations – leading to a risk that developments will become unviable if required to comply with the standards. This will compromise deliverability of student accommodation (particularly affordable student accommodation). It is	The proposed standards are derived from completed / permitted schemes which demonstrate that they are viable and deliverable.	None. The proposed SPD is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on viability.

Appendix 1

important for the city to have a range of student housing stock that meets all needs.		
The range-based approach in the room sizes means it is unclear to the development industry what is expected in PBSA schemes.	Para 9.3.4 explains the approach to the range.	Clarify range-based approach further.
The provisions within the SPD will impact on the sector's ability to deliver affordable student accommodation and undermine the Council's vision by failing to provide an appropriate mix, tenure and type of housing to meet the range of needs in the city. It will also undermine Leeds' position at the heart of the city region by undermining the economy through restricting PBSA development. It would also undermine the city centre's growth by reducing commercial, leisure and cultural vibrancy and undermine the promotion of a diverse, enterprising and competitive economy supported by a skilled workforce, by failing to meet the projected growth in student population in the city.	The proposed standards are derived from completed / permitted schemes which demonstrate that they are viable and deliverable.	None. The proposed SPD is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on viability.
There is a recognised increasing demand for student accommodation, within the context of a constrained supply of HMO accommodation (due to Article 4), growth can be anticipated in the PBSA sector. Should the provisions in the SPD affect the viability or deliverability of new PBSA schemes – developers will look to develop elsewhere.	The proposed standards are derived from completed / permitted schemes which demonstrate that they are viable and deliverable.	None. The proposed SPD is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on viability.
The SPD doesn't recognise that students will also have access to on campus facilities and socialising space.	The function of on campus facilities and socialising space is different to that within a PBSA scheme and the need for on-site communal space has been crystallised through the Covid-19 pandemic and subsequent lockdowns.	Recognise the function of on-campus communal space and the need for on-site communal space.

Appendix 1

<p>The SPD standards are based on existing PBSA developments suggesting that the market is self-regulating.</p>	<p>The SPD will help to avoid protracted negotiations on schemes in future by establishing a clear benchmark.</p>	<p>None. The SPD sets clear expectations to be used to help determine future planning applications.</p>
<p>A way to improve PBSA affordability is to have larger flats (more than 8 bedrooms) which the SPD will significantly constrain. The suggestion that these are unacceptable is not justified.</p>	<p>Larger cluster flats are not considered to provide a good level of amenity or contribute positive to health and wellbeing however the need to provide flexibility is recognised.</p>	<p>Reconsider approach to size of cluster flat arrangements.</p>
<p>It is not clear whether outdoor communal space would count to the 1sqm requirement.</p>	<p>The outdoor amenity space does not contribute to the communal space requirement.</p>	<p>Clarify that the 1sqm does not include any outdoor communal space.</p>
<p>The standards are particularly difficult to achieve in smaller schemes where margins are tight. This will result in more larger-scale buildings, with a loss of variety and human-scale design that is suitable to its local context. Larger scale buildings are also more difficult to manage and to create a sense of community with tenants.</p>	<p>The analysis used to support the SPD includes a wide range of scheme sizes.</p>	<p>Consider impact on smaller schemes.</p>
<p>Large communal spaces add cost and increase rents – which again would lead to less affordable PBSA in the city.</p>	<p>The proposed standards are derived from completed / permitted schemes which demonstrate that they are viable and deliverable.</p>	<p>None. The proposed SPD is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on viability. Affordability of PBSA developments is outside of the scope of the SPD.</p>
<p>The assertion that PBSA developments should be mixed across cluster flats and studios is unsubstantiated. The focus should be on the design of communal space and the management of the building. Different types of students live in studio flats (post graduate and international students) and cluster flats (first year students) – the SPD should leave this choice to developers and not force a mix.</p>	<p>The need for a healthy mix has arisen from discussions with the universities. Mix and avoidance of large blocks of studios is considered to have an impact on health and wellbeing and ultimately the amenity provided within the scheme.</p>	<p>Consider approach to mix.</p>

Appendix 1

<p>It is not clear why the SPD provides guidance on mix within PBSA when the focus of the SPD is on space, light and amenity standards.</p>	<p>The need for a healthy mix has arisen from discussions with the universities. Mix and avoidance of large blocks of studios is considered to have an impact on health and wellbeing and ultimately the amenity provided within the scheme.</p>	<p>Consider approach to mix.</p>
<p>The requirement to provide accessible bedrooms is supported, however the requirement to fit out a bedroom is not supported. Equally, the location of some PBSA can be less desirable for students with wheelchairs given the distance or route to/from their place of study, and this can also affect take-up. The use of the phrase “...<i>should be provided as required by tenants within PBSA developments...</i>” is therefore encouraged in the final version of the SPD.</p>	<p>The requirement for accessible bedrooms reflects the Building Regulations requirement. Accessibility is a key priority for Leeds.</p>	<p>Consider adaptability regarding accessible room provision.</p>
<p>2.2sqm bedroom pods are commonly used in the UK and work very well.</p>	<p>The use of standard-sized PBSA bathroom “pods” is recognised.</p>	<p>Revise proposed bathroom size standards in recognition of standard size pods that have been delivered in Leeds. Consider bathroom requirements (e.g. bathroom “pods”) which have a smaller floorspace requirement.</p>
<p>The studio requirement should allow for a slightly smaller option (16sqm) which would allow greater flexibility in providing a range of affordable options within schemes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Consider expanding the range.</p>
<p>The kitchen sizes set out at this Section are generally oversized at the smaller cluster end. Typically the market allows for 5 sqm per bedroom in a cluster. Therefore a minimum of 15 sqm for a three bed cluster, 20 sqm for a 4 bed cluster and so on. The local planning</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Revisit shared kitchen sizes and ensure consistency with schemes in Leeds.</p>

Appendix 1

authority either revise the minimum sizes or should provide further justification of the sizes set out, with reference to the range of schemes that already operate in Leeds.		
The SPD must cater for the broad range of providers and their individual needs, and the needs of the educational institutions who often instruct the delivery of these schemes.	Leeds universities have been consulted as part of the preparation of the SPD. Each scheme will be treated on a case by case basis.	Continue to engage with the universities as appropriate.
It's clear from the schemes that have been delivered or are coming forward in the Arena District in Leeds City Centre (e.g. Symons House, The Merrion Project, Commerce House, Altus House and White Rose View) that a mix of studios and cluster flats will be delivered across the market as each provider is catering for a certain market or need. However, requiring each individual scheme to deliver a mix of cluster flats and studios is unreasonable in our view and will inhibit delivery of certain schemes in the future.	Mix and avoidance of large blocks of studios is considered to have an impact on health and wellbeing and ultimately the amenity provided within the scheme.	Consider approach to mix.
The appropriate bathroom size is 2sqm and mirrors the bathroom pods that many PBSA providers use. A 3.4sqm requirement will diminish the quality of the remaining space within a cluster bedroom or studio.	The use of standard-sized PBSA bathroom "pods" is recognised.	Revise proposed bathroom size standards in recognition of standard size pods that have been delivered in Leeds. Consider bathroom requirements (e.g. bathroom "pods") which have a smaller floorspace requirement.
Recommended amendments to PBSA sizes:	Noted.	Re-consider bedroom sizes and how they relate to schemes that have been delivered in Leeds.

Appendix 1

Room Type	Bedroom Size	Bathroom Size (accounted for within room size)		
Cluster Bedroom Standard Room	14.5 – 11 sqm – 14sqm	3.4sqm – 2sqm		
Cluster Bedroom Accessible Room	18 – 22sqm	4.8sqm		
Studio	20 – 28sqm	3.4sqm – 2sqm		
Accessible Studio	22 – 30sqm	4.8sqm		
<p>The requirement for no more than 8 beds in a cluster flats runs contrary to the intention of the SPD which is to facilitate social interaction.</p>			<p>Larger cluster flats are not considered to provide a good level of amenity or contribute positive to health and wellbeing however the need to provide flexibility is recognised.</p>	<p>Reconsider approach to size of cluster flat arrangements.</p>
<p>It is not appropriate to require all student accommodation to provide a communal room. Student accommodation varies depending on factors such as its location, the number of bed spaces provided and the age of students residing in the property. Different types of student accommodation meet different housing needs and whilst communal rooms are often provided in student accommodation, they are not always necessary to meet students' accommodation needs. It is not considered appropriate to require smaller scale schemes, particularly those involving conversions of listed buildings, to comply with the requirement to provide 1sqm of communal space per bedspace.</p>			<p>The Council considers the provision of shared communal space to be critical to the overall function of PBSA developments, to supporting interaction between students and reducing the risk of isolation.</p>	<p>None. Shared space is an important amenity consideration irrespective of studio/cluster arrangement, particularly in terms of facilitating and supporting social interaction.</p>
<p>Therefore, the requirement to have communal space in all schemes seems unreasonable, and it is requested that a flexible approach to communal space is taken within the SPD so that each proposal can be assessed on a case</p>			<p>The Council considers the provision of shared communal space to be critical to the overall function of PBSA developments, to supporting interaction between students and reducing the risk of isolation.</p>	<p>None. Shared space is an important amenity consideration irrespective of studio/cluster arrangement, particularly in terms of</p>

Appendix 1

<p>by case basis, based on their location, tenant profile etc.</p>		<p>facilitating and supporting social interaction.</p>
<p>It's not considered appropriate to refer to guidance for a completely different type of development. Therefore, we request paragraphs 9.4.3 and 9.4.4 are removed and daylighting is assessed through the methodology and principles of a more robust methodology such as the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) guide "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice (BR 209) by P Littlefair (12-Sep-2011)", or that this section is omitted entirely.</p>	<p>The approach to light is flexible for PBSA schemes taking into account particular site circumstances but the basic principles of having sufficient daylight penetration remain the same.</p>	<p>Re-consider methodology with regards to light penetration.</p>
<p>All PBSA will be required to comply with the standards set out via Building Regulations regardless of what is in the SPD.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Confirm links to Building Regulations.</p>
<p>The requirement for planning obligations for communal space management is unreasonable and would not meet the tests for planning obligations set out in Para 56 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider this to be the case given that management plans are a key to ensuring the proper operation of PBSA developments, which includes communal spaces.</p>	<p>None. Management plans are a common feature of PBSA permissions.</p>

Co-Living*

* Please note that the Council is considering the removal of the Co-living section of the draft SPD to enable further consideration of co-living as a concept and the appropriate policy response. The representations made in respect of co-living have nevertheless been acknowledged and responded to, should the Council wish to consider providing guidance on co-living at a future time.

Co-Living Developments*		
Comment	Response	Proposed Action
Co-living bedspaces should be large enough to allow residents privacy. It is inappropriate that facilities are shared.	Co-living is a new form of accommodation which promotes the sharing of facilities as part of the overall approach to delivery. By definition, elements of living are shared.	None. The Council is providing guidance for a new form of accommodation.
Roof terraces are not recommended in residential areas due to potential adverse noise impacts.	Noted.	Consider noise impacts.
The additional storage requirement for co-living bed spaces is unjustified.	Given that co-living rooms are likely to be residents' main residence then there is a clear need for additional storage. For PBSA developments students (generally) have a family home which will provide storage opportunities.	None. Storage will be an important feature of co-living developments as they will likely be the main residence for occupants.
The approach to shared kitchens is unjustified and only represents one approach to delivery. There are other models which include larger, more centrally located communal provision. The SPD should not be prescriptive and should encourage innovation.	For amenity purposes the Council considers the provision of shared kitchens on each floor a necessity to support effective management and to ensure residents who want to cook in shared kitchens but eat in their own rooms do not have to travel long distances with hot food.	Consider distances to shared kitchens.
It is be difficult to provide external amenity space on city centre schemes and the 25% total floor area requirement is unrealistic. This should be balanced within overall amenity provision.	Noted. This expectation is a starting point and this would need to be consistent with Policies G4 and G5.	Consider revision to external amenity space requirements and balance within overall provision.
The section on how/where the guidance applies would be better at the beginning of the section.	Noted.	Consider formatting / ordering of SPD regarding when guidance does / does not apply.

Appendix 1

<p>The SPD is setting the standard, so they do not need to be “much” lower than NDSS standards, though they may be lower.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out a rationale and methodology for co-living spaces.</p>	<p>Consider methodology and NDSS benchmarking.</p>
<p>It should be made clear that unless all of the facilities listed are communally provided, the scheme would be a C3 residential scheme and the NDSS would apply.</p>	<p>The definition of co-living developments remains a point of debate and the SPD points towards a workable definition. However, if the co-living bed spaces contain all of the communal facilities and are capable of functioning as self-contained dwellings, then usual policy requirements for C3 dwellings would apply, including NDSS.</p>	<p>Clarify requirements for shared living approach.</p>
<p>It would be useful here to create graph showing balance between studio and communal spaces – anything ‘above the line’ is OK but not below.</p>	<p>There may be scope to use diagrams.</p>	<p>Consider use of diagrams or illustrative material.</p>
<p>Like PBSAs, Co-living schemes’ Use Class is <i>sui generis</i>. It is right to point out that planning permission will be needed for conversion to C3 (unless government policy changes yet again), but for long term sustainability reasons it should be a requirement for both types of development that their construction ensures they can be converted to C3 relatively easily and without major demolition and rebuilding. Applicants should be required to demonstrate how that could be done.</p>	<p>The draft SPD seeks to support future adaptability of these developments.</p>	<p>None. This is covered within the draft SPD.</p>
<p>The Council should avoid introducing standards that would inhibit innovation.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that standards inhibit innovation, rather clarify expectations for quality.</p>	<p>None. The draft SPD provides guidance on amenity standards and does not stifle innovation.</p>
<p>The SPD should recognise that co-living does not just allow for shorter tenancy periods, many tenants will stay for longer periods of time. It is not the case that co-living is a temporary living accommodation, as the whole ethos focusses on building community. Shorter</p>	<p>The draft SPD recognises the typical operation of co-living developments which acts as an intermediate form of accommodation.</p>	<p>None. It is common for co-living developments to have a maximum stay.</p>

Appendix 1

periods of less than 6 months will impact on operating costs.		
At paragraph 11.2.3 the Council notes that “ <i>The presence of the following facilities would help to confirm co-living use</i> ”. It would be helpful if the language were clarified by the local planning authority. Not all co-living schemes will provide concierge / communal workspaces and / or gyms for example, and many do not include room cleaning.	The draft SPD points towards a workable definition and identifies factors that would help to confirm a co-living use. It does not mandate all of those factors on the list.	None. The co-living model is recognised as a fluid model which varies between different operators. The SPD therefore recognises that flexibility.
The interrelationship between private rooms and shared amenity in terms of size and facilities is important, and that this should be judged on a case-by-case basis. The SPD should also note that the location of the building will influence the necessity or otherwise of some of these facilities – for example, a centrally located offer will benefit from a range of facilities nearby and therefore providing them within the building will not be viable.	There is a clear inter-dependency and it is important that the SPD supports a positive relationship between bedspaces and shared spaces. Appropriate locations for proposed co-living schemes is not within the scope of the SPD.	Clarify importance of relationship between shared spaces and bed spaces.
The minimum unit sizes requirement is not supported as this would restrict the market through delivering innovative design across a building, and the ability to offer affordable price points.	There is a balance to be struck and the draft SPD advocates a range based approach which includes flexibility. Affordability should not be used as a justification for smaller bedspaces.	None. Minimum room sizes are necessary to provide amenity.
If a minimum size is required, the starting point should be 14sqm as is the case in schemes already operational across the UK.	The Council does not consider a 14sqm unit size would be appropriate for a co-living bedspace.	None. The proposed space standards are appropriate.
The whole premise of co-living is based on smaller units in return for higher levels of shared space and better service/ affordability. Therefore setting a higher bracket for room sizes will either prevent development from being viable, or lead to decreased affordability	There is a balance to be struck and the draft SPD advocates a range based approach which includes flexibility. Affordability should not be used as a justification for smaller bedspaces.	None. Minimum room sizes are necessary to provide amenity.

Appendix 1

<p>for local residents. In terms of shared amenity, this should be at a minimum of 1sqm per bedroom for the policy to be effective.</p>		
<p>The walking distance is unreasonable for co-living schemes and is by no mean justified. Co-living schemes advocate much more centralised kitchens within a building to promote the wider ‘community’ aspect, and provide better quality cook stations in a larger setting. The areas quoted mean that cooking and eating are all done locally and do not allow for a more social centralised environment, which is the main point/advantage of the co-living product. Many schemes therefore cater for far more than 10 bedrooms to build community.</p>	<p>For amenity purposes the Council considers the provision of shared kitchens on each floor a necessity to support effective management and to ensure residents who want to cook in shared kitchens but eat in their own rooms do not have to travel long distances with hot food.</p>	<p>Consider distances to shared kitchens.</p>
<p>Under Planning Obligations, Paragraph 11.12.2 refers to planning permission would be required to convert the property into C3 accommodation. Whilst the statement is noted (Co-living is a sui generis use) this is not a matter necessarily for a planning obligation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Change title of section.</p>

Appendices

Appendices		
Comment	Response	Proposed Action
The indicative layouts in Appendix 3 are not practical or workable.	Noted. They are indicative and will depend on particular property types.	None. These are indicative.
The layouts are difficult to read	Noted.	Ensure text on indicative layouts is readable.
Some of the figures quoted for PBSA schemes do not match the accommodation schedules.	Noted. Approved plans for listed schemes have been measured using specialist software.	Clarify methodology.
Appendix 3: it is not clear whether the indicative layouts are guidance. All the other appendices appear to be included for information, but is Appendix 3 intended to indicate exemplary, acceptable or unacceptable examples of layouts.	Noted.	Clarify role of Appendix 3.
Appendix 3: Clarity is needed on how the layouts will be used by officers.	Noted.	Clarify role of Appendix 3.