



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Property Owners & Business Improvement Districts

Formalising the role of property owners, who are not
ratepayers, in Business Improvement District Schemes

© Crown copyright, 2013

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/dclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, email contactus@communities.gov.uk or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

July 2013

ISBN: 978-1-4098-3968-2

Contents

The consultation process and how to respond	4
Scope of the consultation	4
Basic Information	4
Background	5
Confidentiality and data protection	5
Help with queries.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Scope of Legislative Powers	8
Scheme Design	8
Relationship with Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts.....	8
Liability for a Property Owner Business Improvement District.....	9
Liability for both a Ratepayer and Property Owner Business Improvement District	10
Identification of Property Owners	10
The Proposal.....	12
The Amount of the levy	12
Voting Requirements.....	13
Sending ballot papers outside England.....	13
Declaring a ballot void.....	13
Veto of Business Improvement District proposals	14
Alteration of Business Improvement District arrangements.....	14
Termination	14
Collection and Enforcement	15
Local Authority Costs.....	16
Annex A	17
How do Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts work?	17
Annex B	18
List of Questions in consultation paper.....	18

The consultation process and how to respond

Scope of the consultation

Topic of this consultation:	This consultation considers how the role of property owners, who are not ratepayers, can be formalised in Business Improvement Districts. The Government appreciates the potential benefits of allowing for property owner Business Improvement Districts and is therefore minded to provide for such schemes, pending responses to this consultation – which seeks views on a framework for allowing such schemes.
Scope of this consultation:	Providing for property owner schemes is not straightforward and therefore this consultation canvasses views from interested parties to seek assurance that what is being proposed is workable. However, subject to those views the Government proposes to move forward to implement.
Geographical scope:	England only – and current powers under which the scheme would be implemented apply only where there is a Business Rate Supplement being levied. Although this can in future expand to other areas, currently, only London levies a Business Rate Supplement.
Impact Assessment:	An Impact Assessment has not been completed yet. It will be done once a final policy is determined, following this consultation and alongside any legislation made.

Basic Information

To:	Business Improvement District companies, Business Improvement District representative bodies, Electoral Commission, local authorities, Property Owners and other interested parties
Body/bodies responsible for the consultation:	Department for Communities and Local Government, Business Rates and Settlement Division in the Local Government Finance Directorate.
Duration:	8 weeks: 23 July to 17 September 2013
Enquiries:	Junaid Azam Business Rates and Settlement Division Department for Communities and Local Government 5/D1 Eland House Bressenden Place London SW1E 5DU

	NDR@communities.gsi.gov.uk
How to respond:	<p>By email:</p> <p>NDR@communities.gsi.gov.uk. Please mark the subject box as Property Owner BID consultation response</p> <p>By Post:</p> <p>BIDs Team, Business Rates and Settlement Division Department for Communities and Local Government 5/D1 Eland House Bressenden Place London SW1E 5DU.</p>

Background

Previous engagement:	<p>We have engaged with the Business Improvement District community via meetings and using a virtual working group. It is through this engagement that the proposal set out in the consultation paper was determined.</p> <p>In addition to this, there was also an All Political Party Group Meeting on 12 June 2012 to discuss Business Improvement Districts, including property owner involvement.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Confidentiality and data protection

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, there is a statutory code of practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, in itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

The Department of Communities and Local Government will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested.

Help with queries

Questions about the policy issues raised in the document can be sent to the address given above.

A copy of the Consultation Principles Guidance is at:

<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultation-principles-guidance>

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed these principles? If not or you have any other observations about how we can improve the process please email:

consultationcoordinator@communities.gsi.gov.uk

or write to: DCLG Consultation Co-ordinator,
Zone 4/J1,
Eland House,
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU.

Introduction

1. Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts have been a tool to improve local areas since 2004. They allow the business community and local authorities to work together to improve the local trading environment. Business Improvement Districts therefore meet two of Government's key priorities: promoting economic growth and localism. Business Improvement Districts have built an excellent reputation in the time that they have been in operation.
2. Currently, property owners can make voluntary contributions towards a ratepayer Business Improvement District (see Part 4 of the Local Government Act 2003) and some do. However, others choose not to make a contribution but still benefit from the success of a Business Improvement District. Furthermore, there are Business Improvement District companies that have a desire to take forward projects that would appeal to owners, and, also, we are told, there are property owners who see the benefit of schemes and therefore want the simple right to vote on certain Business Improvement District proposals.
3. Mary Portas, in her independent report into the future of high streets¹, argued that landlords, as critical long-term stakeholders should be able to make contributions and have a voice on planning and strategic decisions that affect their property. She recommended that the Government should legislate to allow landlords to become high street investors by contributing to their Business Improvement District.
4. The Government agrees that the role of landlords is crucial to the future success of our town centres. We welcomed the focus on Business Improvement Districts in the Portas Review and committed to explore how a property owning Business Improvement District could be delivered with the assistance of the Business Improvement District Community. Their view has been that property owner Business Improvement Districts could strengthen the part that landlords play in the future of town centres and in promoting growth. We have listened to the views of Mary Portas and the Business Improvement Districts community and we are committed to look at formalising the role of property owners in a Business Improvement District.
5. The Government appreciates the potential benefits of allowing for property owner Business Improvement Districts and is therefore minded to provide for such schemes. This consultation therefore seeks views on a framework for allowing such schemes. As mentioned above, providing for property owner schemes is not straightforward and therefore this consultation canvasses views from Business Improvement District companies, Business Improvement District representative bodies, local authorities, Property Owners and other interested parties-to seek assurance that what is being proposed is workable. However, subject to those views the Government proposes to move forward to implement.
6. The proposed framework provides wide discretion for proposers of property owner Business Improvement Districts and significant responsibility for producing good

¹ High streets at the heart of our communities: government response to the Mary Portas review (30 March 2012): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-streets-at-the-heart-of-our-communities-government-response-to-the-mary-portas-review>

quality, successful schemes. Any failed property owners schemes could damage the good reputation of ratepayer Business Improvement Districts.

Scope of Legislative Powers

7. The legislative powers which would enable property owner Business Improvement Districts to be established are contained within the Business Rate Supplements Act 2009 (referred to in the legislation as Business Rate Supplement-Business Improvement District arrangements – see section 16 and Schedule 2 of the 2009 Act). These provisions allow for property owner Business Improvement District arrangements to be made in areas where both a Business Rate Supplement is imposed (or the conditions for imposing one have been met) and ratepayer Business Improvement District arrangements are made (currently, only London has a Business Rate Supplement levy in place). Any property owner scheme must therefore:
- be in the same geographical area as a Business Rate Supplement and a ratepayer Business Improvement District; and
 - impose the levy only for periods falling within the period that both the Business Rate Supplement and ratepayer Business Improvement District arrangements are in operation.

Scheme Design

8. The legislative framework in the Business Rate Supplements Act 2009 leaves much of the detail applicable to property owner Business Improvement District arrangements to be set out in regulations. The following sets out our proposals for the detailed elements of property owner Business Improvement District Schemes that could be established under those regulation-making powers. The guiding principles are simplicity and, where possible, that existing rules for ratepayer Business Improvement District, contained in the Business Improvement District (England) Regulations 2004 (S.I. 2004/2443), should be adopted and it can be assumed that that is the Government's proposed approach if a particular issue is not covered in this paper. If consultees consider that further provisions are necessary that are not covered in this paper, we would be grateful to hear details of those views. A guide to ratepayer Business Improvement Districts can be found at Annex A to this paper.

Relationship with Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts

9. The legislation allows regulations to be made which would provide for combined ratepayer and property owner ballots on a single proposal. Alternatively, the regulations could ensure that any property owner scheme must be balloted on separately (subject to a ratepayer scheme being in place at the same time).

10. Allowing for combined Business Improvement District ballots would mean that proposals would be put to a single ballot of owners and ratepayers. That may require complex balloting arrangements (e.g., how to fairly apportion the rateable value between owners and ratepayers, where separate, for the same property) and may mean that difficulties identifying owners impact on the potential for ratepayers to be levied. The benefit would be that such projects would be seen as single schemes, as opposed to two separate ones that need to be administered separately – although there would be two different sets of levy payers that are subject to different legislation - but may be ultimately for the same project.
11. Alternatively, we could implement what would be the default position whereby any property owner Business Improvement District would be proposed and balloted upon separately from the ratepayer Business Improvement District. That would mean that two ballots would be required even where both the ratepayer and potential property owner levy are in support of the same project. However, it would have the benefit of simplicity.
12. We propose that initially the regulations should only provide for separate Business Improvement District ballots. The Government could then revisit this issue in the light of experience of property owner schemes.

Q1. Do you agree that we should ensure that any Property Owner Business Improvement Districts is balloted on separately?

Liability for a Property Owner Business Improvement District

13. The statutory powers permit regulations to specify the type of property interest a person must have before they can potentially become liable to a property owner Business Improvement District levy, but regulations may only prescribe freehold, leasehold or commonhold interests. Unless legislated for, it would then be for the Business Improvement District arrangements to specify the description of persons who are to be liable for the levy. The regulations could provide potentially for more than one “owner” to be liable for each property. However, we propose to initially restrict who could be liable to just one type of owner for each property for the sake of simplicity and, again, the Government could revisit that in the light of experience. To be clear, this has no impact on joint ownership arrangements (where joint owners are separately and equally liable). It simply means that for each property, it would not be possible to collect the levy from the freeholder and the leaseholder – it would be one or the other.
14. We could simply allow property owner Business Improvement District proposers to have complete freedom as to who within those categories should be the liable owner. That would allow proposals to specify, for example, that only leaseholders with 7 years or more remaining on a lease be liable or those in receipt of the market rent be liable.
15. Alternatively, we could limit – as they do in Scotland - those who could potentially be liable. The main options would be to specify that:
 - only leaseholders with X number of years left on the lease be liable;
 - only those in receipt of the market rent be liable; or
 - only those entitled to possession be liable.

16. Restricting those who could potentially be liable may have the benefits of limiting liability to owners who could be more easily identified or to those that would clearly benefit from property owner Business Improvement District schemes.
17. We propose to leave the decision as to who could be liable entirely open on the basis that any proposal will have the safeguard of being put to the ballot. However, that will place great responsibility on proposers to ensure that schemes are successful by clearly defining those who should be subject to the levy and identifying such owners.

Q2. Do you agree that we legislate to allow for a property owner to be defined as any freeholder, leaseholder or persons with common hold interest?

Liability for both a Ratepayer and Property Owner Business Improvement District

18. Owner occupiers or owners of empty properties could – unless prevented through our proposed regulations - potentially be liable for both, ratepayer Business Improvement District and property owner Business Improvement District levies in respect of the same property. Of course this may be in addition to the Business Rate Supplement.
19. We could exclude ratepayers that are subject to a ratepayer levy from being liable for a property owner levy as well, on the basis that it would be unfair for someone to be liable for both (and potentially, a Business Rate Supplement levy).
20. On the other hand we could leave that decision to the Business improvement District proposer, as proposals could exclude those already liable for a ratepayer Business Improvement District levy from being liable for the property owner levy. That may be appropriate because the proposer could take account of the characteristics of the particular area, such as the nature of ownership of local properties and consider whether those targeted are also liable for a Business Rate Supplement levy.
21. On balance, we believe that this is a matter best left to local discretion.

Q3. Do you agree that we should not legislate for owner/ratepayers to be exempt from property owner Business Improvement Districts where they are liable for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts in the same area?

Identification of Property Owners

22. Possibly the most significant practical challenge that must be addressed when considering how to enable property owner Business Improvement Districts to be established is whether it would be possible to identify owners. For ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, potential levy payers will be known from the rating list. However, as authorities do not already hold information about property owners in their areas it would not be that straightforward for property owner Business Improvement District schemes.

23. As mentioned above, apart from in the case of empty properties, the concept of owner does not appear in business rates legislation. Therefore, owners of properties will need to be identified by different means. That would largely mean by reference to the land registry, by local knowledge, or by seeking information from the ratepayer of the property. We have been assured by stakeholders wishing to put forward Business Improvement District schemes that it will be possible to identify owners and therefore these proposals have been put forward on that basis. It will be vital to the success of property owner Business Improvement Districts that proposers correctly identify their proposed levy payers.
24. Unlike ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, where the list of potential levy payers can be readily compiled by the local authority using information they have on the rating list, breaking the link with business rates liability would mean that information on property owners will not be easily available to local authorities. In addition, property owner Business Improvement District proposers will have ownership of the scheme and we believe that they should therefore carry the responsibility of identifying the owners.
25. Therefore, under property owner Business Improvement Districts, we propose that the duty for compiling the list lie with the Business improvement District proposer. In consequence, it will be incumbent on the proposer to ensure that the list is accurate. It will obviously be in proposers' interest to do so to minimise the risk of challenge and to ensure that the levy is collectable.
26. As is the case with Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, we would expect that in practice authorities and proposers would work closely together to compile the list. We also propose that proposers would still be able to request information from local authorities, such as information on the hereditaments and their rateable values, as well as to request that the authority use their powers to try to obtain information on property owners by writing to ratepayers. As with ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, we propose to allow local authorities to charge reasonable costs for the work that they do.
27. Local authorities have existing powers to request information about persons with interest in land under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provision) Act 1976. In addition, the Business Rate Supplements Act 2009 provides power to make regulations conferring powers on authorities to acquire information. Under these powers the local authority can obtain details of the recipient's interest in the land as well as the name and address of either the ratepayer, or a person with an interest (such as a property owner) in the land.
28. We propose that it would be for the proposer to instruct the ballot holder to hold the ballot once it was satisfied that the list was accurate and other requirements as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts had been followed.
29. As mentioned above, we recognise that this is the most difficult issue in providing for property owner Business Improvement Districts. We therefore would be very grateful for comments from consultees as to the workability of this proposal and whether further safeguards are necessary to ensure that the list is accurate.
- Q4. Do you agree that the responsibility for identifying and compiling the list of property owners should lie with the Business Improvement District Proposer?**

The Proposal

30. We propose that property owner Business Improvement District proposals set out the same matters as ratepayer scheme proposals. Any proposal would not, of course, be able to continue beyond the life of the ratepayer Business Improvement District within the same area – which may last for up to 5 years before seeking a renewal ballot - and Business Rate Supplement. However, once a ratepayer Business Improvement District was renewed, a further property owner scheme could be proposed.
31. Under the Business Rate Supplements Act 2009 property owner Business Improvement District arrangements may set out different projects to be financed by the levy than those specified in the ratepayer Business improvement District arrangements. We propose that the proposal should contain information about the relationship with the ratepayer Business Improvement District.
- Q5. Do you agree that we should legislate to make it compulsory for a property owner Business Improvement District proposal to provide information about any relationship with the ratepayer Business Improvement District in the same area?**

The amount of the levy

32. The proposals for property owner Business Improvement Districts are aligned as far as possible with the ratepayer Business Improvement Districts scheme. In ratepayer Business Improvement Districts the amount of the levy for any liable person for a chargeable period is set out in the arrangements. In practice, there are various ways in which ratepayer Business Improvement District liability is generally calculated, for instance at a flat rate per year, by applying a multiplier to the rateable value of the liable person's property or as a percentage of the levy payer's non-domestic rating bill. The proposed amount of the levy (or the way that it will be calculated) will be set out in the proposals for the Business Improvement District, which will then be subject to a ballot before it can be imposed. The ballot involves a double lock voting method by which the arrangements for the Business Improvement District are only confirmed if there is a majority both in terms of the number persons voting and the rateable value those persons represent who have voted in favour.
33. The legislation on property owner Business Improvement Districts could also allow for the extent of a property owner's liability for the levy to be as to be set out in the arrangements. However, the Secretary of State does have the power to set out in the regulations the manner in which the Business Improvement District levy is to be calculated. As Business Improvement Districts are a local arrangement one view is that the amount of the levy should be determined by the parties involved in developing the arrangements and that the ballot, with its double lock method of voting, is adequate protection against the setting of excessive levies. However, it has also been suggested that it may be necessary to limit the amount of the levy by prescribing how it is to be calculated in regulations. This could be considered necessary to give further protection to property owners.

- Q6. Should the calculation of the levy be set out as part of the Business Improvement District proposal or left to be prescribed by regulations? If prescribed by regulations, should this include limiting the amount of the levy that may be charged, and what limit should be applied?**

Voting Requirements

34. We propose that the double lock voting system which applies to ratepayer Business Improvement Districts should also apply to any property owner Business Improvement District. Under that there must be a majority of votes in terms of votes cast and in rateable values.
35. One option we have considered is that owners of multiple properties should only have one vote (but all rateable value should count) in order to limit influence in the vote. However, such owners would, potentially, be liable for more than one levy and therefore we believe that it is only right that they get a commensurate number of votes.
- Q7. Do you agree that voting arrangements should be the same as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?**

Sending ballot papers outside England

36. The legislation for ratepayer Business Improvement District restricts ballot papers to England only. This seems unnecessarily restrictive in an age of global corporations. Therefore the department proposes to allow for ballot papers to be sent outside England. We would also bring ratepayer Business Improvement District legislation into line with that proposal.
- Q8. Do you agree ballot papers should be able to be sent outside England?**

Declaring a ballot void

37. Section 9 of the 2004 Regulations set out the process for declaring a ratepayer Business Improvement District ballot void. In short, the Secretary of State may declare void a ballot where a material irregularity has occurred and that either voting or the result has been affected to a significant extent. The Secretary of State can only exercise this power following a complaint by the Business Improvement District proposer or body, 5% of those persons entitled to vote or the relevant billing authority. We propose to mirror the process for declaring void ballots on the one for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts.

Q9. Do you agree that the process for declaring a ballot void should mirror those for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?

Veto of Business Improvement District proposals

38. Section 12 of the 2004 Regulations allow for the relevant billing authority to veto a Business Improvement District proposal in prescribed circumstances. We propose to mirror the process for vetoing Business Improvement Districts on the current one for ratepayer Business Improvement.

Q10. Do you agree that the veto arrangements should mirror those for the current ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?

39. In addition to this, we think that due to the link between them (as explained in paragraph 8) an additional prescribed circumstance should be included in the Ratepayer Business Improvement District - the impact on the linked property owner scheme. So we propose that the legislation be amended so that when considering whether to veto a ratepayer scheme, the authority should have regard to the impact on the property owner Business Improvement District.

Q11. Do you agree that legislation should include that considering whether to veto a ratepayer scheme, the authority should have regard to the impact on the property owner Business Improvement District?

Alteration of Business Improvement District arrangements

40. We propose to mirror the rules for altering Business Improvement Districts on the one for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts (set out in Regulations 16 and 17 of the 2004 Regulations).

Q12. Do you agree that the process for alteration of arrangements should mirror those for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?

Termination

41. The effect of the Business Rate Supplements Act 2009 is that property owner Business Improvement District arrangements must terminate where the ratepayer Business Improvement District or Business Rate Supplement has come to an end (as therefore there would be no powers for the property owner Business Improvement District levy to

be imposed). We propose that should that occur the relevant local authority should notify ratepayers of the date that they will cease to become liable for the property owner levy as soon as practicable after that date is known to them.

Q13. Do you agree that the relevant local authority should notify ratepayers of the date that they will cease to become liable for the property owner levy – due to the Business Rate Supplement or ratepayer levy ending - as soon as practicable after that date is known to them?

42. As with ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, there may be other circumstances in which it would not be viable for a property owner Business Improvement District to continue. For the circumstances in which a property owner Business Improvement District may be terminated before the end of its term, we propose to mirror the circumstances in which a ratepayer Business Improvement District may be terminated which, for ease of reference, are set out below.

43. The 2004 regulations set out a number of circumstances in which Business Improvement District arrangements may be terminated:

- under regulation 18 1(a) an authority may terminate the Business Improvement District arrangements where the Business Improvement District body has insufficient funds to meet its liabilities.
- under regulation 18 1(b) an authority may terminate Business Improvement District arrangements where it is unable to provide works or services for the Business Improvement District to continue.
- under regulation 18 (2) Business Improvement District arrangements may be terminated by a Business Improvement District body or a local authority Business Improvement District body which is responsible for implementing the Business Improvement District arrangements where works are no longer required or it is not possible to provide works or services which are necessary for the Business Improvement District to continue.

Q14. Do you agree with the proposal for the termination of a property owner Business Improvement District?

Collection and Enforcement

44. We propose that collection and enforcement should be the same as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts. However, we recognise that it may be more difficult to enforce a levy against an owner than it is a ratepayer because of the new relationship with the local authority and as they may be more likely to be based outside England. Therefore, we will keep this matter under review. As mentioned above, we propose that local authorities should be able to charge reasonable costs for administering any property owner Business Improvement District

Q15. Do you agree that collection and enforcement for property owner Business Improvement Districts should be the same as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?

Local Authority Costs

45. We propose that, as with ratepayer Business Improvement Districts, local authorities should be able to charge reasonable costs for any work – such as in identifying owners and collecting the levy – that they do in connection with a property owner Business Improvement District. It would of course be open to authorities to decide not to charge for such work.

Q16. Do you agree that authorities should be able to charge reasonable costs for any work conducted?

Annex A

How do Ratepayer Business Improvement Districts work?

- Business Improvement Districts give local businesses the power to effect changes that will benefit them in their local community. Improvements include, but are not limited to, extra safety/security, cleansing and environmental measures. The legislation does not put a limit on what products or services can be provided through a Business Improvement District – save that it should be something that is not already provided by the local authority.
- Business Improvement Districts work by allowing businesses in a defined area to vote on any additional services they want to invest in, to improve their trading environment
- The vote is open to ratepayers with the interests of large and small businesses protected through a system which requires a successful vote if a majority, both by number and by rateable value, approve the proposal.
- Once voted for, the levy becomes mandatory on all defined ratepayers and is treated as a statutory debt
- Business Improvement Districts are generally operated by not-for-profit partnership organisations
- The Business Improvement District can run for a maximum period of 5 years – after which a renewal ballot would have to be sought. There is no limit to the number of renewal ballots – only that each time the maximum period can be for 5 years.
- Local Authorities are responsible for administration and manage the Business Improvement District levy via a ring-fenced Business Improvement District Revenue Account. They are responsible for passing the levy, after taking into account to the Business Improvement District company for use on the projects and services set out in the proposal.
- The levy rate is set out in the proposal voted for. The majority of Business Improvement Districts charge 1% of rateable value.
- Business Improvement Districts can choose to exclude certain businesses/sectors/types of properties etc from paying the levy (and therefore from voting in the Business Improvement District ballot). Many Business Improvement Districts exercise this right for example by excluding the smallest businesses and charities.

Annex B

List of Questions in consultation paper

- Q1** : Do you agree that we should ensure that any Property Owner Business Improvement Districts is balloted on separately?
- Q2**: Do you agree that we legislate to allow for a property owner to be defined as any freeholder, leaseholder or persons with common hold interest?
- Q3** : Do you agree that we should not legislate for owner/ratepayers to be exempt from property owner Business Improvement Districts where they are liable for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts in the same area?
- Q4** : Do you agree that the responsibility for identifying and compiling the list of property owners should lie with the Business Improvement District Proposer?
- Q5** : Do you agree that we should legislate to make it compulsory for a property owner Business Improvement District proposal to provide information about any relationship with the ratepayer Business Improvement District in the same area?
- Q6**: Should the calculation of the levy be set out as part of the Business Improvement District proposal or left to be prescribed by regulations? If prescribed by regulations, should this include limiting the amount of the levy that may be charged, and what limit should be applied?
- Q7** : Do you agree that voting arrangements should be the same as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?
- Q8**: Do you agree ballot papers should be able to be sent outside England?
- Q9** : Do you agree that the process for declaring a ballot void should mirror those for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?
- Q10** : Do you agree that the veto arrangements should mirror those for the current ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?
- Q11** : Do you agree that legislation should include that considering whether to veto a ratepayer scheme, the authority should have regard to the impact on the property owner Business Improvement District?
- Q12** : Do you agree that the process for alteration of arrangements should mirror those for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?
- Q13** : Do you agree that the relevant local authority should notify ratepayers of the date that they will cease to become liable for the property owner levy – due to the Business Rate Supplement or ratepayer levy ending - as soon as practicable after that date is known to them?
- Q14** : Do you agree with the proposal for the termination of a property owner Business Improvement District?

- Q15** : Do you agree that collection and enforcement for property owner Business Improvement Districts should be the same as for ratepayer Business Improvement Districts?
- Q16** : Do you agree that authorities should be able to charge reasonable costs for any work conducted?