**Bristol Student Community Partnership (BSCP) Minutes**

**24 July 2023**

**Present:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **University of Bristol (UoB)**    Steve Smith (SS): Community Liaison Officer  Phaedra Karaoli (PK): Community Liaison Coordinator  Liam O’Shea (LOS): Head of Public Affairs & Executive  Communications  Palie Smart (PS): Pro Vice Chancellor (Global Civic  Engagement)  John McWilliams (JMW): Director Civic Engagement Ben Pilling (BP) : Chief Executive, Bristol SU    **University of the West of England (UWE)**  Emma Dent (ED): Business Support Team Leader    **Bristol City Council (BCC)**  Cllr Tom Hathway (TH): Councillor, Clifton Down Ward  Cllr Paula O’Rouke (POR): Councillor, Clifton Ward,  Lord Mayor  Cllr Guy Poultney (GP): Councillor, Cotham  Ward (Chair)    Megan Davies (MD): Neighbourhood Enforcement  Team  Becky Gale (BG): Private Housing Service | **Residents Groups**  Andrew Waller (AW) Harriet Bradley (HB)  Fiona McVey (FMV)  Anthony Negus (AN)    **Bristol Waste Company (BWC)**  Nerys Neath (NN)  **Landlords/Letting Agents**  Pippa Barry (PB): Private Landlord  Jon Hickey (JH): Private Landlord    **Avon & Somerset Police**  Jon Scott (JS): Acting Inspector  Sian Harris (SH): University Police Officer |
| **Apologies:**  Apologies were received from Dr Jill White (Resident Group Representative), Chris Swinscoe (BCC Neighbourhood Enforcement Team) and Jack Boydon (BWC) | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of actions arising from this meeting**:  Item 3: Updates on Actions on last minutes   * LOS to seek further clarity on barriers to supplying behavioural references.   Item 4: OP Beech – Introductions A/Inspector Jon SCOTT   * SH to consider and see if the Op Beech number can be diverted to 101/community liaison office and check whether an out-of- office message can be added to inform callers about OP Beech summer closure.   Item 6: BCC/NET – Policy for enforcement of bins on the street • MD to progress this request and report back.   * HB to meet with BW/Clean Streets forum and to update group on progress. * NN will share the results of that trial with the forum at next BSCP. * NN will look to review this with BCC/BWC and Highways and to report back to forum. * MD to identify decision maker within BCC so that interested parties can request a review of policy.   Item 7: Students on the Move updates / staff student engagement changes • MD to update the investigation results.  Item 10: Student agreement – update UOB   * SS to feedback to all when Student Rules and regulations are posted and updates from the SRS re new processes.   Item 11: A.O.B - UoB Community Fund awards – UOB • SS agreed to feed back at end of last event. |

**Item 1: Chair’s Welcome & Introductions**

SS introduced the new Community Liaison Coordinator, Phaedra Karaoli (PK).

Palie Smart, UOB Pro Vice Chancellor Civic Engagement, was introduced by LOS and she welcomed the meeting. She introduced her role and further commented on the good work done by the CLO.

**Item 2: Approval of last minutes 23/04/2023**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as correct.

**Item 3: Updates on Actions on last minutes**

# Updates on Action 6

GP explained that Pinpoint may have been updated and there was a listing of an expired licence which is now showing as ‘application in process’. It has not been confirmed whether this update is widespread but certainly is a new change in updates on Bristol Pinpoint gov website.

BG explained that due to GDPR they are not able to add landlord contacts for email/telephone numbers.

# Update re Action 11

LOS explained that there is no lawful basis for the University to provide behavioural references to private landlords and to do so would breach data protection legislation.

JH as a private landlord licence holder stated that, to ensure his license meets the requirements he requires a reference from university or elsewhere, particularly in cases where anti-social behaviour issues have been reported at a previous rental property.

JH asked how this is in accordance with UOB/UWE policy to not provide the relevant reference.

PB also confirmed the same and mentioned that landlords are found in a delimited situation, where they are unable to comply with HMO licence conditions due to Universities’ policy to not provide said references. She mentioned that landlords do not want tenants who have been found guilty of or are likely to commit antisocial behaviour however, it is impossible for them to be aware of this as universities are not able to provide this information to landlords.

AW suggested that, in that case, landlords don’t take on student rentals.

LOS suggested that not providing a reference was not illegal but that there is no lawful basis to do so. He will seek further clarity.

**Action 1:** LOS to seek further clarity on barriers to supplying behavioural references.

**Item 4: OP Beech – Introductions A/Inspector Jon SCOTT**

Inspector Jon Scott and PC Sian Harris updated the forum on workings of OP Beech.

SH explained they had been fully staffed over the last few months.

Op Beech concludes on 21ST July 2023. Intelligence from previous years shows lack of reported cases during the month of August. Depending on university funding Op Beech is expected to start back on 21st September 2023.

SH explained there had been a reduction in large parties and the reported cases were mostly regarding small events and general noise complaints.

SH explained they had seen a reduction in the spike from June 2022 and although it had been busy in June 2023, the situation was nowhere near the level of June 2022.

SH gave the reported Op Beech numbers which are in sync with the CLO published annual report.

GP asked if the Op Beech phone is monitored during Op Beech closure and whether an answer machine message could be left to divert callers who would not know that Beech had concluded for summer months.

**Action 2**: SH to consider and see if the Op Beech number can be diverted to 101/community liaison office and check whether an out-of- office message can be added to inform callers about OP Beech summer closure.

## Item 5: CUA - Next steps

Dr John McWilliams - Director of Civic Engagement gave an update on the CUA.

JMW explained that the ‘Working Together for Bristol’ agreement has been drafted and has now been signed with the UWE on 5th June 2023.

He explained there is a physical signed copy, which has also been produced on the website. The agreement lays out 6 key strategic areas on ways of working together.

JMW thanked AW for his collaboration with questions and ideas.

JMW stated he would keep the BSCP group aware of future developments.

AW asked whether there would be a Bristol University document like the Nottingham’s CUA document, that would accommodate ideas and residents’ issues and believed this would be a useful tool.

JMW suggested he was looking into Nottingham’s CUA model.

LOS suggests it could be useful to make a specific document for Bristol.

GP asked how the university will see details added to the CUA.

JMW stated that they would investigate the specific groupings and make sure to not overlap with work that has already been done elsewhere, to see where specific details could be added. He explained it was an action document and not a paperwork exercise. He explained that they would investigate it and focus on the first topic to see what is needed and how the information would be disseminated, produced, and published.

GP mentioned that although UWE has been included, the South Gloucestershire council and the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) have not signed that agreement.

JMW confirmed the above but stated that the document was a city-wide document and recognised WECA as part of the wider Bristol area. He also mentioned that he is mindful there will be other partners who might be part of the CUA agreement.

## Item 6: BCC/NET – Policy for enforcement of bins on the street

MD from NET informed the group that the email sent in March re enforcement policy for bins on the street was correct. The council policy is not being enforced at present due to lack of resources, and issues in identifying the individuals, to support a successful prosecution. BCC considered the resources are better deployed elsewhere.

MD explained that there is a pilot scheme running in Fishponds, in collaboration with the Clean Street Teams around education and engagement of student properties and she recommended flagging this pilot scheme and any updates on it, back to this forum.

GP asked for the name of who made that decision for NET non-enforcement of bins on the street.

MD agreed to take this back to the BCC.

**Action 3**: MD to progress this request and report back.

HB explained that in the Chandos Neighbourhood it is impossible to enforce bins on the street when there are no storage facilities with such small gardens at the front of some of the smaller terraced properties. She stated that the black wheelie bins are an eyesore and obstruction to the pedestrians on the pavement, and the black bin facility is not fit for purpose.

HB stated that there are locations where Mini Recycling Centres (MRC) /1100 litres bins could be placed on Station Road area at bottom of each street within the Chandos area.

HB asked what can be done by Bristol Waste to change the process as it is.

HB wants to meet with Bristol waste to change and discuss new ways of bin process for Chandos area of HMO properties

**Action 4**: HB to meet with BW/Clean Streets forum and to update group on progress.

POR reported that there needs to be a full review in some places and gave specific examples of the Meridian Road and how black bins could be replaced with communal bins in strategically placed areas.

POR mentioned that education is also key.

NN states that there is evidence that communal bins tend to attract more fly tipping. She also mentioned that there is a trial scheme looking at collection methodology in the Old Bristol area, St Stephens Street/Corn Street area.

HMO flats, often student properties above shops/restaurants, have been given 1 x black reusable sack for general waste and same for recycling, to keep bins off the street, with collections being once a week.

NN awaits outcome of that trial which has been running for 4 months.

**Action 5**: NN will share the results of that trial with the forum at next BSCP.

POR states it is not acceptable to have numerous black bins all the way down certain streets such as Meridian Place.

NN mentioned that it can be tricky to replace black bins with other bin collection methodology including placing communal bins or MRC in strategic placed areas. Many factors can affect this; for instance, vehicle collection access, removal of parking bays, fly tipping, authority for council highways to place bins, obstructions, location, and siting of bins may not be agreeable to all parties. It may also be the case of non-standard collections.

GP asked if there is a legal process in place, to get bins changed and asked how residents go about requesting change in procedures?

NN stated there is not a written process but if residents wish to change procedure they have to get in touch with BCC/BWC/Highways authorities to state change of bin methodology and reasons as to why.

PB states she has many properties in Meridian Place and agrees with POR that at least once a month PB’s company receives reports for fly tipping, and she would support a similar move to that on Southleigh Road with an MRC for Meridian Place.

NN stated that currently BWC is being led by BCC.

**Action 6**: NN will look to review this with BCC/BWC and Highways and to report back to forum.

HB felt that the scheme in Old Bristol would not work in the HMO properties in Chandos area with black reusable sacks.

NN confirmed that, the Old Bristol scheme appears to be working and is representative of many HMO properties.

GP asked if it would be possible to review BCC policy of bin street enforcement. He felt there was statutory duty by BCC.

**Action 7**: MD to identify decision maker within BCC so that interested parties can request a review of policy

## Item 7: Students on the Move updates / staff student engagement changes

NN confirmed that the campaign has now been completed.

Debrief of strategy on 26th July 2023:

43 x 1100 litre bins were placed on the street in strategic areas.

70 tonnes of general waste recovered.

Collections were over a 5-week period.

Bin collections closed on 6th July 2023 as they believed there was impending BCC strike action and would present waste being collected.

NN stated there should be more focus on recycling of materials rather than landfill and BWC will work with universities to educate students on recycling more.

They had two complaints where bin lids were not closed properly and one complaint re SOTM bins being moved from their designated location.

HB explained and thanked those who had designed and devised the ‘’student green renter booklet’’ together as this has been very informative.

The student green renter booklet was produced by the CLO office to support and educate students during the SOTM campaign, Move Out of Halls campaign and Hall Kitchen talks. Each individual student has been sent an email link to the Halls to House leaflet via student comms.

HB thanked BWC for its success.

PB seconded thanks to BWC and its supporters, they confirmed that the issues have been significantly reduced in compared to previous years.

Feedback was required for debrief and a link was sent in the forum chat for feedback to BWC.

Initial feedback was the literature to be produced earlier and for the campaign to run its course.

NN suggested that there had been less money anticipated from providers to run the campaign and that providers had now been billed.

GP asked about the operational debrief and operational strategy for 2024.

NN explained that this starts as soon after the debrief on Wednesday 26TH July 2023.

MD explained that BCC NET had investigated a fly tipping issue relating to SOTM on 3rd July 2023 resulting in identification of 55 names – 24 of those names relate to UOB students. BCC NET is now investigating those offenders including previous students and some landlords for specific offences.

**Action 8**: MD to update the investigation results.

SS stated that delivery of educational material had reached approx. 39 halls of residences for first year students living in university owned halls and private halls. Delivery of SOTM educational material had also gone to student homes in the key areas of Cotham, Redland, Clifton, Kingsdown and Highbury Villas – supported and facilitated by the CLO, BWC student engagement team and the residents’ associations. It’s important to note that the delivery of SOTM educational materials was also supported on QR scan codes, as it was evident throughout the campaign students like to receive the information via the scan link, which is easily accessible and can be sent on to their peers quickly and easily.

CLO had facilitated trade stand education in May for BWC access to UOB properties where there was significant student footfall.

CLO is also continuing the education messages throughout welcome week and invited residents to the educational trade stands during that time, to see how UOB messaging works in practice.

## Item 8: Annual reports – UOB and UWE

SS opened with facts comparing figures from 2022 / 2023 reports.

SS identified the reduction in complaints and invited comment.

AW, on behalf of the Resident Associations, thanked UOB’s CLO for his concerted efforts to bring about change in noise reduction and quieter place to live in last twelve months.

AW explained that, although figures appear to decrease, pre pandemic they were lower than the current 400 plus complaints received which are attributable to student behaviour.

## Item 9: Community liaison procedural changes – UOB

SS highlighted changes that will take effect from August 2023.

SS had already highlighted the changes to two residents associations during the week of 4th July 2023 as they had impending meetings and AGMs prior to the BSCP.

Prior to the BSCP and to ensure fairness to all Ras, the CLO invited AW to a meeting on 4th July 2023 to identify the new process so that this could be disseminated to the other RAs groups prior to the BSCP meeting.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education, relating to non-academic student discipline, suggests best practice framework for universities to follow. While this is not mandatory, the OIA recommends that the CLO/investigator should not be expected to act as investigator and decision maker. (i.e., judge and jury)

It recommends that the process needs to be robust to prevent students from appealing the process/decisions made.

The community process will now be as follows:

Upon receipt of complaint the CLO will investigate and if required will advise the students on their behaviour; the CLO sees no change in that process from what happens now. Students will be informed in writing about the complaint, then the CLO will follow up inviting the students to a meeting. For less serious/first offences, the advice will be given and the turnaround to the complainant with the relevant feedback will be expected to be within a matter of days.

Upon receipt of complaint for a more serious/second offence, the CLO will investigate, collate evidence and will, if necessary, refer to Student Resolution Service (SRS) with an opinion on the appropriate sanction. The CLO will still make sure the students in question are aware in writing that they are under investigation and any repeat offences in this time will be taken into consideration.

The CLO believes there may be a slight change in the time frame until the CLO investigation process is completed and ensured to be robust enough to withstand scrutiny. The CLO still expects a quick turnaround to the complainant with the initial feedback to ensure the complainant knows that the CLO has referred the case to the SRS.

AW responses to the changes on behalf of the RAs were reported as:

SRS body does not have the same working relationship with the community as the CLO.

SRS body deals with more internal staff and student matters and they are of a different nature to the community reported complaints.

The CLO system has been in place for 10 years and appears to work well.

Does the SRS understand the background of what residents deal and put up with due to student behaviour?

Does SRS understand the serious nature of residential issues reported to the CLO?

Hard won development by the resident and CLO reputation could be damaged.

There have been repeated requests for SRS to attend this BSCP meeting to answer the RA questions, the response had been they will not be attending, why?

***CLO note: The Interim Head of SRS addressed the BSCP in January 2022 and answered questions at length. CLO also shared position paper on approach to enforcement. Through this paper, it was clear SRS would be examining the findings of disciplinary investigations to determine outcomes on a case-by-case basis. This process would follow referral of cases by the CLO.***

What has happened to the SRS cases referred to by the CLO in the last twelve months?

Public confidence in the system may then disengage residents with the university process and they will then report incidents direct to police.

There is concern on feedback of complainant’s information from SRS – Will SRS give anonymised feedback to the residents via CLO on sanctions given in relation to the complaints escalated by the CLO?

Currently the CLO anonymises the complainants but if the complaints are escalated to SRS, will residents’ identities be referred to SRS and will the identities be identified to the offending students during process or appeal process? There is concern if that if this is the case then residents may receive retaliation for reporting, and may withdraw from making a complaint, and working with university process designed to stop student anti-social behaviour. How will SRS deal with this issue?

In relation to household waste, has this been taken out of the student rules and regulations?

Is waste classed as antisocial behaviour and will SRS /Sec Office allow it to be dealt with under this heading? Will CLO and SRS deal with student sanctions where necessary for waste?

The residents feel that there has been no consultation with them, as expected, given their capacity as joint partners. They see the nature of the partnership being under strain when SRS/Sec Office will not attend and give answers to the relevant questions.

SS responded as follows.

This process is in line with OIA frameworks for best practice to ensure a more robust process to withstand scrutiny and be more transparent to students, staff and the public and to prevent student appeals relating to process issues.

SS could not comment on SRS and awaits updates from them.

SS could not comment on Student Rules and Regs re waste and awaits publication of them.

SS could not comment on SRS upheld appeals from the 151 cases referred to them.

To put the questions posed by AW and the RAs into context it must be noted that prior to the BSCP on the 20/7/2023 there was a number of questions that AW sent to the CLO. These were all given considered answers by the CLO following consultation and were responded back to on the 20/7/2023 for AW and the associations to consider.

A copy of the questions and answers were given to the chair on the same day of receipt and response on 20/7/2023.

It was felt inappropriate for the CLO to respond in detail to those questions at the meeting and written responses had been shared and could be circulated (see Appendix 1)

LOS stated the University’s disciplinary process needed to be robust. It is unlikely that students who know they are under investigation will reoffend while that process is ongoing. The process is to do the right thing for the students, staff and public. LOS also sees no difference in process other than the fact that there is now a separate decision maker who will review the facts on a case-by-case basis.

LOS confirmed the VC sees this as an important area, backs the CLO and the willingness to do right by all.

In cases where a student is under investigation for a prior offence, for which the decision has not yet been made, should a second offence occur, that second offence will also be investigated and referred to SRS.

The SRS have a maximum 90-day investigation timeline, but it is expected that the process will be swifter than this.

The evidence provided will ensure there is a balanced burden of proof, against the balance of probabilities that the incident in question did happen, which will then dictate the recommendation and sanctions to be administered.

LOS said the CLO would not share detailed feedback on individual complaint outcomes as this is subject to GDPR. The CLO will receive outcomes from SRS which will be anonymised in reporting, but residents will be updated in general terms that a complaint has been responded to and the nature of the intervention by the CLO at local level.

LOS stated that the CLO is a representative of the University as a whole – the University’s interface with the community.

LOS suggests that there could temporary support staff for the CLO if required, once the full extent of workload is identified.

HB stated that she is content that there will be a better and more robust process. She has concerns over speed of process following a complaint under the new system and she has concerns over feedback and the SRS role. However, she stated she is assured by the support and comments made by LOS and CLO, and towards the support of the CLO. She stated the CLO has made a fantastic difference and his efforts have improved community relations and community issues by nipping in the bud issues before they escalate, and that this difference had been noted and commented upon by many other residents.

SS stated he would feedback once he had received updates from SRS.

GP is also concerned about preserving anonymity of residents when making complaints , how they would be dealt with by SRS and whether names and identities will be disclosed to potential student offenders.

GP also wanted on record, the positive impact the CLO had made in the community.

AW asked why SRS was not at the meeting?

CLO response was that he had sought clarification on their attendance, and they would not be attending.

LOS suggested a representative of SRS could be available to answer further questions once internal processes were finalised in the near future.

GP suggested a more timely response from a representative of SRS would be helpful, ahead of the next BSCP. LOS would look into that possibility.

## Item 10: Student agreement – update UOB

AW asked why the CLO could not comment on the Student Rules and Regs document and SRS community feedback?

CLO response was that he awaits the published document as well as update from SRS re community feedback on complaints. CLO will be able to provide an update once he gets hold of this information. He explained the student agreement is believed to be still in draft copy and the SRS have not feedback the clarification the CLO is seeking. The CLO stated he wants to be transparent and to give answers when the information is readily available.

**Action 9:** SS to feedback to all when Student Rules and regulations are posted and updates from the SRS re new processes.

## Item 11 : A.O.B UoB Community Fund awards - UOB

SS was able to say that five Bristol University Student Grants for community led projects of £250 each have been awarded to the following projects and grants had been successful. CLO will be represented at each event.

Chandos – Christmas Carol event – Dec 2023

Cotham and Trelawney – Street care project – October onwards

High Kingsdown -Student Brunch - 16/10/2023.

Clifton – Birdcage Walk bash - 26/5/2024.

Clifton – Alma – Students Welcome Event - 18/10/2023

GP asked if there was feedback to be provided and that photographs and good news stories of these events be highlighted in the meeting.

**Action 10**: SS agreed to feed back at end of last event.

Chair thanked all for attending.

**Date of next meeting scheduled.**

**Monday 9th October 2023 - 1400- 1530 hours**

**Appendix 1 :**

# Questions to UoB re agenda item 9, BSCP meeting 24 July 2023

## From Andrew Waller on behalf of the Residents Associations

1. In our view, the current CLO system gets results because it responds quickly to complaints. In future, it appears the CLO will have more work to do in preparing investigation reports and cases may take up to 90 days to conclude:

1. Will this new system be as effective as the present one—i.e., able to resolve noise and waste problems in time similar to now?
2. Will the new system apply the same levels of fines to repeat offences as now? If not, what will be the new approach?
3. Will complainants (members of the public) be told how their complaint is being dealt with, and the outcome?
4. Will the identity of complainants be protected? If not, in what circumstances might identities be disclosed, and how will this be managed?

**The CLO response was.**

OIA although not mandatory is best practice framework and OIA suggests that CLO cannot be expected to be investigator and decision maker. It is also the case that the process needs to be more robust to prevent students from appealing the process/decisions made. CLO investigations upon receipt of complaint that require investigation to advice stage will see no change in what happens now, students will be informed there is a complaint and following the CLO student’s advice, the expected turn around to the complainant with the feedback with be matter of days.

CLO investigations upon receipt of complaints that require investigation with referral to SRS may see a slight change to ensure the CLO investigation process is robust to withstand scrutiny, but the CLO still expects a quick turnaround to the complainant with the initial feedback to ensure the complainant knows that the CLO has referred the case to the SRS.

The CLO feels this procedure will also be a matter of days including the investigation and CLO recommended report.

The CLO will make recommendations to the SRS of what the student sanction should be in line with OIA framework and university policies re student sanctions.

However, the SRS decision making and feedback to the CLO is yet unknown, but it has been recommended by the CLO to SRS and management that the CLO requires the update on the SRS decisions made to ensure

* Complete accurate reporting
* Inform complainants of the outcome.
* Ensure process is working effectively.

Anonymised complaints – the CLO has this year and will always seek to protect the interests of witnesses and their personal information. Currently the CLO does not divulge the complainants name or address to the students who have been accused. The CLO does not see that practice changing. However, once a CLO investigation has concluded and be referred to SRS the details of all witness including contact details will be forwarded to SRS. The CLO is unable to comment on whether that personal information is divulged to the students accused of misbehaviour when the SRS decision makers consider students sanctions and/ or student appeals.

2. It appears the SRS may take on about 1,500 community-conduct cases a year (cases = individual students) over and above those the CLO currently refers to it. Complaints are not evenly spread through the year—they peak early, in September and October (particularly in relation to noise):

1. What arrangements are in place to ensure the new system can meet this early test of capacity?
2. Would it not be better to switch in, say, January, since complaints are usually much lower then and the new system would have time to bed in?

**The CLO response was**.

In the early stages the initial complaints will mostly be dealt with at local level as the intelligence picture would show from last twelve months. CLO will deal with them mostly way of advice, with a reminder that should there be a repeat performance then the incident would l be investigated and referred to SRS with CLO recommend for student sanction. There is normally a time between Dec - March where the CLO sees some students having a reoccurring event, which will require the investigation process and then this to be referred to SRS for decision making. The CLO belief is that the new process should start as soon as the new year starts to capture all first incidents and ensure students are advised before allowing incidents to continue to the further stages.

If the new process had been in being this last 12 months, then yes 1500 individual students would have been referred to SRS.

The capacity of workload has been identified and highlighted by the CLO and will have to be monitored, judged and considered this new year by the managers overseeing those departments to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of the new process.

3. In some of the worst cases, residents are repeatedly disturbed by noise from student neighbours, particularly in terraced houses, semis and flats sharing a dividing wall or floor. Students sometimes ignore warnings and resist intervention until severe penalties are imposed. Even under the present system, it can take weeks to get the disturbance stopped, which means misery for the residents involved:

1. What assurance can be given that under the new system, the time to resolve these acute cases will not be even longer?
2. More broadly, if the SRS takes longer to resolve cases than the CLO does now, what specific steps will be taken to ensure misbehaviour doesn’t simply continue until the case reaches a conclusion?

**The CLO response was.**

It is expected and anticipated the CLO investigations will be conducted and referred to SRS within a matter of days and still are told that they are under investigation. The CLO cannot comment on how long another department will take to decision make a student sanction or if on appeal how long they will take to investigate that appeal, but the SRS have 90 days from submission of investigation to make their decisions.

4. Despite efforts at clarification, we remain confused about how the university will in future deal with complaints about waste. The current Local Rules cite “Non-compliance with local council waste and recycling collection procedures” as grounds for disciplinary action:

1. Will this remain the case, or are the Rules being changed?
2. If there is a change, how will waste complaints be dealt with in future?
3. If an alternative approach is to be used, what is the specific regulation that will be applied, and does the SRS agree that this regulation can be used to pursue complaints about waste?
4. Everything considered, will there be any reduction in the university’s response to complaints about waste?

**The CLO response was**.

The CLO awaits this year’s version of Student Rules and Regs but understand waste in name has been edited. However, waste is still considered as antisocial behaviour and has been given the support to be dealt with under antisocial behaviour within these rules. There will be no change in the education and advice from Bristol waste and Bristol University on waste. It is still expected that all complainants/residents continue to report the issues to the BCC law enforcement body re waste issues, despite the change in the BCC March 2023 policy not to enforce bins on street legislation. Fly tipping does not change. For repeat offenders the waste issues will still be referred to Bristol City Council for investigation, and if required the CLO will carry out an investigation, and when complete will be referred to SRS for decision making.

CLO is unable to comment on the SRS decision-making student’s sanctions for waste but would expect the recommendations of the CLO to be considered when making the decisions. CLO recommendations for repeated waste issues will generally be £100 the same as what the Bristol City Council would do if they enforced.

The CLO sees that there will be no reduction in the way that the university deal with students and waste issues currently.

5. We believe large student parties are not just noisy and disruptive but also are dangerous to those attending. In crowded party houses, there is a risk of people being trapped in the event of fire or injured by structural collapse of floors or balconies. Add in the possibilities for physical confrontation with angry neighbours, or acting as a magnet for drug dealers (with further risks around gang influence and knives) and it becomes clear these activities should be stopped as a matter of priority for the safety of students themselves:

1. Does the university agree these events pose physical risks to students?
2. Does it agree there is a degree of urgency in eradicating these events?
3. If yes, what is its plan to do so?

**The CLO response was**.

Big house parties are considered breach of tenancy agreements and ASB legislation.

Most tenancy agreements will have the ASB clause written into as required by law.

Most tenancy agreements include how many people can be invited into an HMO to prevent overcrowding/fire issues/and other such risks.

Landlords and letting agents are always informed of such incidents and are duty bound under HMO licencing conditions to make a more proactive approach to the ASB with more regular visits in efforts to stop such behaviour when it has been reported.

They have powers of eviction if minded.

Dealing with very loud and large house parties has always been dealt with by way CLO immediacy and will continue to do so under CLO directions.

If it warrants and the evidence is provided, without need for initial student advice, then the CLO investigation will be referred by the CLO straight to SRS, along with CLO recommendations for relevant student sanction where the SRS decision will be made.

* Law enforcement can take place via powers invested upon them, and it is for their considerations.
* BCC HMO licence breaches for ASB on agent and landlord
* BCC HMO temp closures
* Police ASB legislation in form of Community Protection Notices and Community Protection Full notices if required.
* BCC NET enforcement in form of Community Protection Notices and Community Protection Full notices if required.

This was done on at least occasions in the last term as a partnership between Bristol NET/Police and University and Landlord intervention to tackling ASB. This will not change from the CLO /university viewpoint if the issue is severe enough to warrant that intervention.