Bristol Student Community Partnership (BSCP) ONLINE Minutes: Thursday January 30th, 2025.

Attendees

University of Bristol

Mark Aston (MA), Community Liaison Officer Liam O'Shea (LO), Head of Public Affairs and Deputy Chief of Staff Hannah Quinn (HQ), Chief of Staff Frank Chung, Community Liaison Assistant

Bristol SU

Lucy Pears (LP), Student Living Officer

University of the West of England

John Loughlin (JL), Deputy Team Leader, Security

Bristol Councillors

Cllr Guy Poultney (GP), Cotham (Chair) Cllr Ani Stafford-Townsend (AS), Central Cllr Izzy Russell (IR), Ashley

Bristol City Council

Becky Gale (BG), Private Housing Service (PHS) Onn Kee Davies (OKD), Private Housing Service (PHS) Kurt James (KJ), Neighbourhood Enforcement Team (NET) Ging Aurelio Laforteza, Landlord Liaison Officer

Avon and Somerset Police

PC Sian Harris (SH), University Police Officer, UoB PC Simon Topps, University Police Officer, UWE PC Steven Dexter, University Police Officer, UWE

Bristol Waste Company (BWC)

Sarah Burns (SB), Sustainability and Engagement Manager

Community representatives

Fiona McVey (FM) – Chandos Road Derrick Collier (DC) – Chandos Road Dr. Jill White – Cotham Hill

Landlords/Letting Agents Pippa Barry (PB) – Penlane

John Hickey – Landlord Representative

Apologies

John McWilliams (UoB Civic Engagement), Steve Dale (UoB Civic Engagement), Ben Pilling (Bristol SU), Cllr George Calascione, Cllr Mohamed Makawi, Cllr Patrick McAllister, Cllr Paula O'Rourke, Cllr Serena Ralston, Nohelia Fernandez (BWC), Alex McKie (BWC), Megan Davis (BCC NET), Naomi Jones (BCC NET), Anthony Negus (Community representative) Kath Rogers (Community representative)

Agenda

1) Welcome – GP (chair)

The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

2) Approve minutes of last meeting

AGREED: Minutes

OKD commented on action update (5) — where it was stated "no [PHS] representative was in attendance" — to emphasise that the PHS team had always endeavoured to attend all BSCP meetings, but the PHS representative for the previous meeting Hayden Berry had to send apologies due to an urgent family matter.

3) Actions Update:

1	GP to provide any further SOTM feedback for 2025 to BWC	COMPLETE
	There has been no further feedback.	
2	UWE to explore providing references for 2nd year students' to landlords	INCOMPLETE
	 PB remarked that Penlane has started requiring tenants to provide be references so it is now important for students to be able to obtain this university. 	
	ACTION: JL to bring back to UWE for follow-up.	
3	UWE to provide 2023–2024 annual report in time for the next BSCP meeting	INCOMPLETE
	ACTION: JL to bring back to UWE for follow-up.	
4	BCC PHS to provide a copy of the Bristol City Council Private Housing Sector Tenant Pack Update in time for the next meeting	COMPLETE
	 BG replaces Hayden Berry as BCC's Tenant Liaison Officer. BG shared the URL for the Tenant Pack for members' review: <u>https://services.bristol.gov.uk/files/documents/8539-final-private-hous</u> tenant-pack-a4-summary-printable/file 	ing-service-
5	GP to commence Community Forums following recruitment of UoB Community Liaison Officer	IN PROGRESS
	ACTION: GP will follow up on community forums and student surgeries w	vith MA.
6	GP to circulate draft Council approved warning letter to residents regarding bins on streets following recruitment of UoB Community Liaison Officer	IN PROGRESS
	ACTION: GP will follow up on the letter with MA.	
7	AN to send letter to BCC PHS regarding HMO licenses on Pinpoint and provide feedback on its response at the next BSCP meeting.	
	 AN has sent the letter to BCC PHS as agreed in the last meeting. OKD reported that BCC had responded to AN on 15 November 2024. response is attached as [Appendix 3]. 	A copy of the

	Further discussion: see 7.2. BCC response to residents' letter on HMO licence information on Pinpoint					
8	GP to formally raise ongoing issues regarding BCC Housing (attendance, reporting, Pinpoint issue) with Chair of Housing Policy Committee	IN PROGRESS				
	ACTION: GP to contact relevant policy committee chair					
9	HQ to circulate written update of VC working group meetings so far including action points, and dates and subjects of future meetings	COMPLETE				
	HQ tabled "Update from VC Working Groups" as paper for this meeting. This is attached as [Appendix 2].					
	Further discussion: see 5. UoB Vice Chancellor Working Group update					
10	GP to formally raise missed waste collections with relevant BCC	IN PROGRESS				
	policy committee					
	ACTION: GP to contact relevant committee					

4) Introduction to new UoB CLO – MA

MA who has been on board as UoB Community Liaison Officer since December 2024 introduced himself to members. Members welcomed MA to the meeting.

GP reported that Phaedra Karaoli had left the post of UoB Community Liaison Coordinator. Members expressed appreciation for her service.

5) UoB Vice Chancellor Working Group update – HQ

HQ tabled "Update from VC Working Groups" for this meeting. This is attached as [Appendix 2].

Since the paper, HQ and MA had met with SH and Inspector Jon Scott on 29 January 2025 to discuss Operation Beech matters. Residents' concerns around how anti-social behaviour can be effectively recorded by Operation Beech officers was conveyed. SH commented that Operation Beech feedback sheets for each attendance would always be scanned and made available to UoB, while the attending officer would also enter a log in the Police's designated system if the event was deemed to involve anti-social behaviour.

FM enquired on the effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor's letter for Operation Beech colleagues to issue to students. HQ commented that it had increased the speed of subsequent Community Liaison engagement with the household. SH opined that it also provided attending officers the assurance that consistent advice was given to students.

6) Residents' feedback

6.1. Consistency of approach in responding to noise complaints

FM noted an observed difference between UoB's and UWE's response to noise complaints.

JL commented that UWE emphasized on having UWE police officers visit the students to give advice directly, but agreed that there is room for UoB and UWE to collaborate and work on consistency of approach. GP and HQ concurred.

6.2 Accreditation system for student housing

GP inquired on the progress of establishing an accreditation system for student housing.

LP stated that Bristol SU Lettings had been working on a recognition system for students to rate landlords.

IR stated that Ruth Day (past student living officer in UoB) started work on an ethical lettings charter, but it was not deemed a priority while demand for housing remained high, and focus was shifted on to other housing ideas.

HQ stated she had spoken to Ben Pilling and Bristol SU Lettings and understood that work on a rate-your-landlord scheme remained ongoing.

7) **A.O.B**

7.1. Cumulative picture of HMO impact on the community

GP said that information on the impact of HMO properties on local residents is fragmented among Planning Department, BCC PHS, BCC NET and the Police, and there is no effective way to look at the cumulative picture.

KJ stated that NET could draw down information from the police for enforcement purposes.

OKD stated PHS could pick up on lower level issues only if they are reported to PHS.

SH stated the Police has an ASB team with information on events deemed to be anti-social behaviour.

HQ stated the university shares information on properties with persistent problems with BCC.

FM enquired on how local residents can raise issues about problematic properties with PHS. OKD responded that the BCC website has online tools for reporting various problems. OKD also offered to share the general e-mail address of PHS for direct reporting of issues.

DC opined that NET is the best team to collate all the issues, so that there is a central body of evidence of problems when evaluating HMO applications.

ACTION: GP proposed to form a small group to talk about information sharing among the universities, the Police and BCC.

7.2. BCC response to residents' letter on HMO licence information on Pinpoint

OKD reported that BCC had responded to AN on 15 November 2024. A copy of the response is attached as [Appendix 3], and highlighted the following changes that were implemented / being explored:

- Pinpoint now provides the e-mail address of PHS whom users of the system can contact to obtain landlord and letting agent information;
- PHS has direct liaison with the Planning Department to share HMO licensing and application information that does not depend on Pinpoint;
- PHS will explore the direct sharing of the public register of licensed properties with UoB and UWE.

HQ welcomed the offer to explore data sharing and would follow-up through the university's data

compliance office.

ACTION: MA and GP to follow up with PHS on sharing of public register of HMOs.

APPENDIX 1: NEW ACTION SHEET

1	JL	UWE to explore providing references for 2nd year students' to landlords
2	JL	UWE to provide 2023–2024 annual report in time for the next BSCP meeting
3	GP	Follow up on community forums and student surgeries with MA
4	GP	Circulate draft Council-approved warning letter to residents regarding bins on streets after discussion with MA
5	GP	Action Community Forums following completion of current Community Liaison recruitment process and report back to next meeting.
6	GP	Circulate draft Council approved warning letter to residents RE Bins on streets following completion of current Community Liaison recruitment process
7	GP	Formally raise ongoing issues regarding BCC Housing (attendance, reporting, Pinpoint issue) with Chair of Housing Policy Committee
8	GP	Formally raise missed waste collections with relevant BCC policy committee
9	GP	Form a small group to talk about information sharing among the universities, the Police and BCC with regards to impact of HMO issues to residents
10	MA	Follow up with PHS on sharing of public register of HMOs

Next BSCP meetings: **7th May 2025, 2pm (online)** 31st July 2025, 2pm 31st October 2025, 2pm

APPENDIX 2: UPDATE FROM VC WORKING GROUPS

Update from VC Working Groups

During 2024, it was agreed to establish a working group at Bristol University, sponsored by the Vice-Chancellor to better engage with residents, staff and other stakeholders and provide a combined response to residents' concerns and aimed to continue the downward trend in complaints received. This work was initially focussed on internal Bristol University issues and procedures and was designed to build on existing developments in the service, including the introduction of acceptable behaviour agreements and student ambassadors.

Resident engagement has been led by a small group of engaged residents, co-ordinated by Fiona McVey and two larger meetings were also held to explore the issues. Concerns raised were broadly categorised into either Enforcement or Education and Engagement.

Our first larger meeting was in relation to enforcement and we were joined by residents, students and relevant staff members to discuss our enforcement processes. Residents provided a list of questions and concerns which were responded to, and a full discussion of processes was held. Actions were identified and progress against these actions is set out below (Appendix 2.1). All actions have been completed with the exception of a meeting with Operation Beech on the 29 January.

Our second meeting was in relation to education and engagement, and we welcomed residents, students and staff to explore three themes of noise, waste and engagement. Each theme generated a series of priority actions, which were triaged and refined by the small group of residents, resulting in an action table below (Appendix 2.2). These actions will run during the spring and summer. Four of these actions will require a small group approach and while residents have nominated themselves to particular items, representation is still being finalised. Kick off meetings for these four areas are being scheduled.

Alongside these conversations, we also identified some additional, miscellaneous actions which will be taken forward by the Community Liaison Officer. These are more business-as-usual tasks and are set out below (Appendix 2.3)

The University would like to thank staff, students and residents who have engaged in this process and are happy to continue to report to BSCP on progress.

Area	Action	Who	Notes	Update
Response on the Night	UoB to meet with Inspector Jon Scott to explore options for extending Operation Beech	Hannah Quinn	 Need to review data as below 	Meeting scheduled 29 January
	UoB to develop letter for Op Beech colleagues to share with students when they attend	Liam O'Shea	 Explanation of role and process Call to action Consequences of failure to cease disturbance Jointly signed VC and NET 	COMPLETE and in use by Beech colleagues Reviewed by colleagues and agreed not to change
	UoB to explore how data on Op Beech reports is logged with Council and Police as ASB	University Police Officer Mark Aston	- PCC keen to address ASB in the City	To raise at Op Beech meeting on 29 January
	Explore whether UoB research could be commissioned to monitor noise in residential areas	Hannah Quinn	 Ute Leonards and Jill White involved in initial research Meeting scheduled with Ute and Theo 	COMPLETE: Initial meeting held, research could be possible but unlikely to impact Beech coverage. Initial research was linked to pedestrianisation of Cotham Hill. We do not plan to run that again as do not see that the benefit justifies the activity of academic colleagues.
	 UoB to review data on Op Beech to understand 1. No of UWE students engaged with 2. Any days of the week with more reports, where Beech does not operate 	Community Liaison Office (Frank)	- Use data in meeting with Jon Scott and to liaise with UWE	COMPLETE: 1. 38 households were referred to UWE in 2023/24. 2. Data does not show any pattern re requirements for additional nights
Anonymity of complainant	UoB to introduce a form to standardise request for consent to release personal data	Henry Stuart Liam O'Shea Keith Feeney	- Consult with residents to ensure it meets needs	COMPLETE: Text below added to reporting form. For complainants not completing the form, this information to be used to seek explicit

Appendix 2.1: Action List from VCWG 1

		- Align with existing	consent to share data at the point a
		witness form as	disciplinary investigation is concluded and
		mentioned by Keith	
		mentioned by Return	third party evidence.
			Please note that the University is not
			able to take disciplinary action based
			on anonymous reports.
			Where possible, the University will take
			disciplinary action based on available
			third-party evidence (e.g. testimony of
			Avon & Somerset Police). Where this is
			not possible, by completing this form you
			are consenting to the disclosure of your
			name or address to the students you are
			bringing a complaint against. This is to
			enable a reported student to respond to
			an allegation in full.
			Your email address and telephone
			number will not be disclosed to the
			students in question and will be used by
			the University solely to communicate with
			you concerning your complaint.
UoB to develop explicit	Henry Stuart	- Consult with	COMPLETE:
information for students on how	Liam O'Shea	students to ensure	Text below agreed. To be used from start
they can use the information	Keith Feeney	information is clear	of student involvement in process – i.e. initial invitation to discuss
		 Invite to interview – 	
		point to add in	Disciplinary proceedings are confidential and any information provided to you as
			part of the process is not to be disclosed
			to third parties or used for any purpose
			than responding to allegations. Any other
			use of such information will be considered
			an act of misconduct.

	THEME	ACTION	Rationale	WHO	WHEN
1	All	Review and update relevant content of the current training module, and make it mandatory	While the training will not be fully mandatory – i.e. it is not possible or desirable to apply academic penalties, it can be presented as such, with a schedule for chasing. Students recommend hosting on Blackboard (a virtual learning environment) alongside other mandatory training e.g. plagiarism.	 Staff in Education and Student Success 2 x student ambassadors 2 x residents – Fiona McVey and Ant Draper 	For Sept 25 launch
2	Waste	Lobby letting agencies to provide personalised information on recycling in student properties	Recognising the responsibilities of landlords and supporting them to provide appropriate information and support to their tenants	 CLO Consult with residents 	May
3	Waste	Upskill students in recycling through campaigns and info	We recommend focussed campaigns at key points in the year	 CLO Student Communications 2 x student ambassadors 2 x residents – Trish Franey and Ant Draper 	Move out and move in
4	Noise	Explore updates to Student Agreement Package	While there are many other requirements for the student agreement, we will explore what can be done to highlight relevant clauses.	 Legal 2 x student ambassadors 2 x residents – Andrew Waller and Sarah Cuthill 	For Sept 25
5	Noise	Provide information on underused SU Spaces/ local venue hire	Direct students to alternatives to holding parties in their own homes	Student Ambassadors	ASAP
6	Engagement	Residents (association?) and Bristol Waste stalls at welcome events (new and continuing students).	Early engagement with students sets clear expectations. Preference is for no charge – this to be explored.	Students Union (Welcome Fair) Education and Student Success (continuing students) CLO	Next Sept 2025
7	Engagement	Develop Residents Rules – like the Bristol Rules campaign.	Create clear framework for behavioural expectations which can be used in campaigns	- Bristol City Council	ASAP

Appendix 2.2: Action List from VCWG 2

		 Meet with Nighttime Economy team for more info 			2 x student ambassadors 2 x residents – Ant Draper and Trish Franey	
8	Engagement	Review success of Student Ambassadors and ensure awareness of designated residential areas.	Residents still report being unclear of responsibilities and remit of ambassadors	CLO		May/June 2025

Appendix 2.3: Miscellaneous Actions

Task	Lead	Rationale
Review distribution lists – are we communicating with the right	Community Liaison	Some key stakeholders are not RA chairs, or
people. Our current lists focus on RA Chairs and rely on	Officer	are not receiving information as standard.
subsequent distribution – this does not cover all interested	Fiona McVey to support	This causes additional work and/or concerns
parties. CLO to ideally hold multiple lists to be used as		from residents.
appropriate		
Review website (Students and the community Accommodation	Community Liaison	Information is not always comprehensive or
University of Bristol) for clarity and purpose. Ideally create	Officer	clear on audiences. Opportunity to hold
space for		additional information, e.g. reporting.
 Quarterly and annual reports 		Seek advice from web team in reviewing.
 Anonymised accounts of consequences for students 		
Explore raising maximum award made from Community Fund	Community Liaison	While we are happy to consider this, it will
	Officer	depend on funds raised via fines, so the
		decision will need to be made later in the
		year.

APPENDIX 3: BCC LETTER DATED 15 NOVEMBER 2024



Date 15 November 2024

Dear Alderman Anthony Negus,

Reference: Pinpoint

We are writing in relation to the letter titled 'pinpoint letter' received via Councillor Andrew Varney on 21 October 2024.

Within your letter, you have identified what you believe are problems with the use of Pinpoint and have provided potential solutions. We will address each point:

A: Planning

You have stated that there is a problem with Pinpoint not showing all HMOs at any one time and that it will never be up to date as only properties with a licence are shown on the public register/Pinpoint and that this does not allow for residents to effectively assess or comment on planning applications involving HMOs. You also believe that officers and planning committee members are unable to make appropriate planning decisions due to Pinpoint not showing all HMOs.

You have proposed a solution by providing another category on Pinpoint which shows whether there is a pending application for a property.

Due to the way that public register data is processed, and the functionality of the current system (Civica APP) for managing HMO licences, extracts cannot be and are not automated. This means that Pinpoint, which data currency relies on the frequency of updates available from the source system, is only updated every 4-6 weeks via a manual process. The method of data extraction is not automated, and it is not possible to automate this process. It should be noted that the public register of licensed properties is not produced for planning as its primary purpose, however, we liaise with the Planning Department and supply them with pending application information and licensed property information. The Planning Department utilise a Planning Toolkit they have produced which contains both licensed and pending HMO licence information which can help to better inform their decisions regarding density of HMOs in a given area, without the need for this information being available to the public.

It should also be noted that any HMOs that fall out of the licensing regime under the Housing Act 2004, have not ever appeared on Pinpoint, however with the city-wide additional licensing scheme now in place, all HMOs will eventually appear on Pinpoint as and when the licences are issued.

Service Area Private Housing Service Service Manager's Name Tom Gilchrist

A property may not appear on the public register if:

- a) it is a new application or
- b) a renewal application has been received (licences last no more than 5 years) or
- c) Private Housing is currently processing the application and has not issued a licence.

It should be noted that on expiry of a mandatory licence and until a renewal application is received and licence issued, the property may have changed occupation and may no longer be an HMO or a licence may not be issued for a variety of reasons.

The legal requirement for local authorities is to establish and maintain a public register of properties **licensed** under the Housing Act 2004 therefore Bristol City Council has no legal basis to publish pending licence application information. Legal advice has been sought regarding the publishing of details in relation to pending applications. Our Legal Department have advised that they are contacting the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) to seek their observations. We can update you further once further Legal and ICO advice has been received.

B: Licence holder / Agent information

You raise the matter of the removal of licence holder and agent names and addresses from Pinpoint and state that most licence holders do not provide their information to adjacent neighbours even though it is required by the licence conditions and that this is not monitored.

You have proposed a solution, where any HMO symbol on Pinpoint is clicked, the information box provides details on how to contact the Private Housing Service for further information on licence holders and agents. This suggestion has now been implemented.

Where the Private Housing Service is informed that licence holders are not providing their information to adjacent neighbours, we would contact licence holders to remind them of their responsibilities to provide the information.

With regards to the removal of licence holder and agent personal information from Bristol City Council's Pinpoint application, the reasons for the removal of the information and alternative means to obtain licence holder and agent information was detailed in an email to the Bristol Student Community Partner (BSCP) dated 29 April 2024 when the matter was previously raised in a BSCP meeting. For ease, the original response is detailed below in italics:

I have been advised that the matter of the public register and information that is available on Bristol City Council's Pinpoint application has been raised again at the most recent BSCP meeting.

I will once again explain Bristol City Council's duties in relation to the public register information and the associated GDPR implications which resulted in the landlord and agent personal information being removed from the public facing Pinpoint site. Please note, that Pinpoint Plus which councillors have access to, retains the landlord and agent personal information.

As required by section 232 of the Housing Act 2004

(<u>http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/34/section/232</u>) it is a legal requirement for local authorities to establish and maintain a public register of properties licensed under the Housing Act 2004, and to ensure that the contents of the register are available for inspection by the public and if requested to provide a copy of the register, and local authorities may apply a reasonable fee.

Service Area Private Housing Service Service Manager's Name Tom Gilchrist

232 Register of licences and management orders

(1) Every local housing authority must establish and maintain a register of—

(a) all licences granted by them under Part 2 or 3 which are in force;

(b) all temporary exemption notices served by them under section 62 or section 86 which are in force; and

(c) all management orders made by them under Chapter 1 or 2 of Part 4 which are in force.

(2) The register may, subject to any requirements that may be prescribed, be in such form as the authority consider appropriate.

(3) Each entry in the register is to contain such particulars as may be prescribed.

(4) The authority must ensure that the contents of the register are available at the authority's head office for inspection by members of the public at all reasonable times.

(5) If requested by a person to do so and subject to payment of such reasonable fee (if any) as the authority may determine, a local housing authority must supply the person with a copy (certified to be true) of the register or of an extract from it.

(6) A copy so certified is prima facie evidence of the matters mentioned in it.

(7) In this section "prescribed" means prescribed by regulations made by the appropriate national authority.

Section 232 (2) states that the register may, subject to any requirements that may be prescribed, **be in such form as the authority consider appropriate**. The use of Pinpoint as a means to provide the details of the public register of licensed properties is not a legal requirement. We are meeting legal requirements as per the Housing Act 2004 as we provide the information via a hard copy version with full details on it.

Private Housing were advised there was a risk of personal identification after it was brought to our attention by a third-party that various pinpoint layers could be manipulated to enable identification of groups of individuals and therefore potentially someone belonging to that group. After discussions with our Data Protection Team and ICT-related teams, the Data Protection Team recommended Private Housing look to comply with its obligations under Housing Act 2004 in a less obtrusive, privacy centred way whilst still complying with its obligations under Housing Act and GDPR. Bristol City Council made some changes to reduce that privacy risk which were also agreed by Private Housing management and was able to remain compliant with the requirements of the Housing Act 2004 whilst also enhancing the privacy rights of individuals, i.e. the removal of landlord and agent personal data from Pinpoint.

The relevant Bristol City Council public register website <u>Register of licensed properties</u> (<u>bristol.gov.uk</u>) has been updated to reflect this and an alternative means of obtaining a limited number of licence holder details for free has been provided, i.e.

emailing <u>private.housing@bristol.gov.uk</u> for up to three specific properties, although more properties may be requested on a case by case basis. This is in addition to the available option of purchasing a hard copy of the public register or viewing it at our offices.

Service Area Private Housing Service Service Manager's Name Tom Gilchrist

Apparently in your discussions, the group may have considered whether Bristol City Council was/is in breach of it's responsibilities as a data handler, in that by removing the landlord and agent information from Pinpoint we are contradicting our requirements to make available the contents of the public register and that due process had not been followed as there had been no consultation with yourselves and that Bristol City Council should be reporting itself to the ICO. As explained above, Section 232(2) of the Housing Act 2004 states that the register may be in such a form as the authority consider appropriate. Taking into account GDPR considerations, we consider it appropriate to have the public register in the form of a paper copy and are meeting our obligations of making the contents of the register available for inspection and are able to supply a copy of the register if requested (for a fee). The Data Protection Team have advised that there is no requirement to consult with the BSCP group in this circumstance and that although the potential for a data breach occurring was real and clear, and as a data controller BCC were under a duty to recognise and mitigate the risk, there was no breach such would be reported to the ICO. Only a breach considered "high-risk" i.e. affecting the rights and freedoms of individual data subjects would ever be reported to the ICO. I have copied the Data Protection Team at <u>data.protection@bristol.gov.uk</u> if you have further queries relating to GDPR.

This position has not changed. Further legal advice has been sought as to whether Bristol City Council is meeting legal requirements in relation to the information currently being provided to the public. We have been advised that the use of Pinpoint as a means to provide the details of the public register of licensed properties is not a legal requirement, Bristol City Council believes it is meeting its legal requirements and obligations as per the Housing Act 2004 as it provides a hard copy of the required information.

However, with the removal of licence holder and agent personal information from Pinpoint, we can explore the possibility of setting up external data sharing agreements with the University of Bristol and the University of the West of England to allow Private Housing to share the public register of licensed properties with them directly, providing they have a legal basis for processing the data.

Alternatively, could the universities consider whether they could utilise their own records of students and possibly have the students sign up to some sort of code of conduct/agreement when they join the university so that they have to provide their addresses while at university and the landlord or agents contact details? This will enable the universities to have their own live up to date information to work with which would include all student occupied properties including ones which may not be captured by the licensing regime, rather than rely on public register information. It should also be noted that HMOs are not solely occupied by students, therefore, this suggestion of the universities using their own data sets would not affect the privacy of those on the public register who do not let to students.

C: Residents' associations and universities

You advise that Pinpoint needs to show all HMOs and be kept up to date to allow the activities of universities and residents' associations.

Please see response to point A and also point B where it can be further explored whether a data sharing agreement can be made with the universities to allow the sharing of the public register directly.

Service Area Private Housing Service Service Manager's Name Tom Gilchrist

Yours sincerely,

Shona Ali

Shona Ali Private Housing Manager

Bristol City Council Private Housing Service

Service Area Private Housing Service Service Manager's Name Tom Gilchrist