

Barrow-in-Furness Local Area Planning Committee

Report Title:	HMO Briefing Note
Meeting:	Barrow in Furness Local Area Planning Committee
Meeting Date:	13 th February 2023
Report Author:	Jennifer Dickinson
Lead Cabinet Member(s):	
Wards Affected	All
PUBLIC, PART EXEMPT OR FULLY EXEMPT	Public
List of Appendices	<p>Appendix A: Appeal Decisions APP/W0910/W/23/3319147 and APP/W0910/W/17/3179882</p> <p>Appendix B: Local Plan Policy H26</p>

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Following the request from Planning Committee at the 19th December 2023 meeting, this report explains the background to applications for change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and the implications of appeal decisions.

2. Recommendation

For the reasons set out in this report, it is recommended that -

- 2.1 The contents of this report are noted by members.

3. Information: the Rationale and Evidence

Use Classes

- 3.1 When considering HMO properties the first matter to establish is which use class the conversion falls within.

- 3.2 Under planning legislation there are two use classes which can apply to properties:

3.2.1 *Class C4 - Small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom.*

3.2.2 *Class Sui Generis – As above but with more than 6 occupiers*

3.3 Under the General Permitted Development Order (GDPO) a C3 residential property can convert to a C4 use without the need for express planning permission. They are not therefore recorded. It is only conversions for more than 6 occupiers that require permission under the Planning legislation.

Determination

3.4 When determining applications for more than 6 occupiers, planning law requires that, like all other applications, they are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions which seeks to promote sustainable development in a balanced way considering the three overarching objectives: economic, social and environmental.

3.5 Local Plan policy H26 (attached as an appendix) is a key policy which sets criteria against which proposals are assessed. The criteria cover:

- i. loss of family housing,
- ii. impact on residential amenity of neighbours,
- iii. impact on the character of the building and surrounding area,
- iv. amenity standards provided for future occupiers including stacking of rooms, bin/cycle storage, outdoor amenity space and access from front and rear of property,
- v. potential for over concentration of similar uses and potential loss of social and community cohesion,
- vi. the sustainability of the site location in terms of transport.

3.6 Other relevant material considerations that are not covered under H26 can include previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions); adequacy of parking and highway safety.

3.7 These application types often generate concerns from residents nearby which can often identify site specific material considerations.

3.8 It also relevant to note non-material considerations which cannot be considered in planning decisions. The Courts have determined that the “type” of person to occupy a property is not a material consideration and neither are matters such as change in property prices, applicant’s motives or private matters related to boundaries. Matters covered under other legislation are also not material considerations for planning.

3.9 Potential benefits of HMOs

The government view HMOs as an important component of housing supply, helping to meet a specific market need. They can often have benefits such as bringing empty property back into use, securing inward investment, increasing footfall to the town centre and helping to meet the need for a growing transient workforce to serve local industries and the health service.

3.10 Potential negative aspects of HMOs

On occasion HMOs can be associated with a change in the character of an area and social cohesion, negative connotations, increased car parking and traffic and potential noise and disturbance.

3.11 Planning balance

In reaching a planning decision, officers and Members must weigh up all the relevant competing material considerations and reach a decision based on planning judgement. The Local Plan policy is a key component in helping us reach a decision.

Other Legislation

3.12 Whilst Planning is one area involved in the control the development of properties into HMOs, any over 5 occupiers are also required to be licensed under the Housing Act. This covers matters such as ensuring the site is properly managed to a suitable standard.

3.13 In addition to this, Building Regulations are also in place to ensure compliance with the Building Act.

Relevant Appeal Decisions

3.14 52 Paradise Street - *conversion of existing building (Use Class F1) to a 14 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Use Class Sui Generis)*
APP/W0910/W/23/3319147 – decision date 23.11.23

3.14.1 In this instance the Inspector allowed the appeal. The main issue was the suitability of the site for the proposal having regard to the Local Plan's approach to the provision of houses in multiple occupation (i.e., policy H26). This specifically reviewed criteria b) (residential amenity of neighbours), c) (character of the area) and i) (over concentration of similar uses).

Criteria b) – residential amenity of neighbours

3.14.2 The Inspector took the view that the existing use of the building was likely to generate many comings and goings daily, including vehicles, and that the proposed conversion would result in a decrease of movements. Some increase in comings and goings into the evening and at night would take place. The Inspector did not consider that, given the appeal buildings location at the end of the terrace, the scale of such activity in respect of noise or disturbance would be likely to cause any material harm to the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in what is an established residential area.

3.14.3 Having considered the submitted drawings and the appeal buildings relationship with its surrounding properties, the Inspector also considered that the scheme would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbours. It was therefore concluded that the requirements of criteria b were met.

Criteria c) – character of the area

3.14.4 The Inspector considered the external changes did not affect the character of the area.

3.14.5 In terms of impact on parking, which was a key matter raised by residents, the Inspector reported the conditions when visiting the site and the availability of a car park directly opposite, and nearby, along with the residents parking scheme in place. They also acknowledged that it is unknown what level of car ownership future occupiers may have and this may fluctuate over time. Nonetheless, they acknowledged the potential for each occupier to have access to a car and this could lead to an additional number of vehicles parking in the area.

3.14.6 Furthermore, the Inspector acknowledged the site is readily available to alternative public transport including buses and trains and future occupiers may choose not to own a private vehicle. The Inspector judged that, should parking be required, this can be readily absorbed into the surrounding area without detriment to the character of the area. Accordingly criteria c) was met.

Criteria i) – over concentration of similar uses

3.14.7 The Inspector noted the concerns of the Council and other interested parties about the location and number of existing HMOs, including unlicensed HMOs in the locality and the effects of such concentrations. However, when considering the map provided, and taking account of a HMO at 9 Harrison Street, the Inspector felt that the number of licensed HMOs was well dispersed within the surrounding area. The Inspector observed quiet and well-kept urban street scenes surrounding the site with what appeared to be predominantly family homes. As such, even if it was accepted that there are unlicensed HMOs which have not been identified, the Inspector considered there was negligible aural or visual evidence, such as litter, noise or parking congestion, one would expect in an area with an imbalance towards HMOs.

3.14.8 The Inspector also referred to not being supplied with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that existing HMOs in the area have resulted in a significant increase in crime. Having regard to the nature of the application, the Inspector considered there was no cogent evidence that the proposed HMO would attract or be likely to be occupied by persons more likely to commit crimes or to carry out anti-social behaviour. In addition to this the Inspector also advised there was no convincing evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would place an unacceptable demand on local services. It was therefore concluded that the proposal satisfied criteria i) of policy H26.

3.15 4 Park Avenue – *change of use of existing dwelling to HMO including conversion of loft and comprising 7 no. en-suite bedrooms with shared kitchen and 1 no. self-contained bedroom with en-suite shower and kitchenette – APP/W0910/W/17/3179882 (decision date 6.2.18)*

3.15.1 This appeal was dismissed. The main issue related to the potential effect the proposed development would have on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. This decision was prior to the adoption of the current local plan.

3.15.2 The context of this appeal related to a change from residential use to a HMO for 8 persons in an area which is close to the station with pressure for on-street parking and had a residents permit scheme in place.

3.15.3 The Inspector considered, in this instance, that the additional 2 occupiers beyond the permitted C4 use would generate sufficient levels of noise and disturbance to warrant refusal. The Inspector took account of the size, situation and configuration of the appeal property, which is a mid-terraced property.

- 3.16 In terms of the implications of the appeal decisions, the Paradise Street decision is most recent and provides a useful independent assessment of the issues relating to HMOs which are often raised as concerns. This was a robust test of the adopted local plan policy H26. The Park Avenue decision makes clear the relevance of property positions in relation to neighbours when considering potential impacts from conversions. The difference in approach to these two applications highlights the importance of assessing applications on an individual basis.

Context

- 3.17 Members will be aware that there is an increasing demand for HMO accommodation to provide residential accommodation for workers on specific term contracts coming into the area. This is driven from local employers including BAE systems and NHS and the market is reacting. The availability of larger houses and properties is offering a solution to that demand. This is a positive step in certain respects, as it is resulting in considerable inward investment to the town centre periphery area, whereby houses in poor condition are being renovated, and local suppliers and tradespersons are also benefiting. The alternative is that these houses/properties remain in poor condition, often empty and attracting anti-social behaviour, which has potential to lead to a loss of social and community cohesion.
- 3.18 Whilst the Council map all applications for licensed HMOs (5 or more people), we do not have clear records of those with a lower level of occupancy, principally because there is no method of tracking them. However, given that in these unrecorded cases the number of people is more likely to have a similar impact to that of a regular household, this is the context of our considerations.
- 3.19 Going forward we are continuing to monitor the locations of licensed HMOs and planning applications received to assess whether any further actions are required.

4. Link to Council Plan Priorities: (People, Climate, Communities, Economy and Culture, Customers, Workforce)

- 4.1 In terms of the Council's priorities, HMOs provide an accommodation option for residents and contribute towards the housing mix in the area.

5. Consultation Outcomes (with services, ward councillors & public consultation where required)

- 5.1 Not applicable

6. Alternative Options Considered

- 6.1 Not applicable

7. Financial Implications and risk

7.1 Staff time spent on preparing Statements for Appeal cases

8. Legal & Governance Implications

8.1 Not applicable

9. Human Resources Implications

9.1 Not applicable

10. Equality & Diversity Implications (including the public sector equality duty, Armed Forces Families, Care Leavers and Health inequalities implications)

10.1 Not applicable. This report is for information only and these will have been considered by the decision-maker, as necessary.

11. Background Information & Sources (used in preparation of this Report)

11.1 Appeal decisions (Appendix A)

11.2 Local plan policy H26 (Appendix B)



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

By A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0910/W/23/3319147

52 Paradise Street, Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria LA14 1JG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Clark and Mr Gregory against the decision of Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council.
- The application Ref B20/2022/0709, dated 6 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2023.
- The development proposed is described as conversion of existing building (Use Class F1) to 14 Bedroom house in multiple occupation (Use Class Sui Generis). Works include conversion of existing floors, loft conversion, creation of roof terrace with balustrade and 1.8m wall, construction of dormer, hip to gable extension and new roof lights and new front entrance.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing building (Use Class F1) to 14 Bedroom house in multiple occupation (Use Class Sui Generis). Works include conversion of existing floors, loft conversion, creation of roof terrace with balustrade and 1.8m wall, construction of dormer, hip to gable extension and new roof lights and new front entrance at 52 Paradise Street, Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria LA14 1JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref B20/2022/0709, dated 6 October 2022, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form, albeit slightly reordered.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the suitability of the site for the proposal, having regard to the development plan's approach to the provision of houses in multiple occupation.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a large end terrace property located on a predominantly residential street at the junction of Harrison Street. The appeal site is also located within the defined town centre and is close to a number of services and facilities, including public transport.
5. Barrow Borough Local Plan (BBLP) Policy H26 establishes a number of criteria that will be taken into account for development proposals for Large Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The parts most relevant to this appeal are b), c) and i).

6. Criterion b) of Policy H26 states there will be no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, especially with respect to privacy, noise and other disturbance. The most recent use of the building, from the evidence presented, is that of an office that was open to the public.
7. This use of the building is likely to have generated a large number of comings and goings, including vehicles, during the day. As such, a decrease in movements could be reasonably expected from the appeal proposal. The proposed development would generate additional comings and goings into the evening and at night. However, I do not consider that given the appeal building's location at the end of the terrace, the scale of such activity in respect of noise or disturbance would be such that it would cause any material harm to the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in what is an established residential area.
8. Furthermore, having considered the submitted drawings and the appeal building's relationship with surrounding properties, there is no substantive evidence before me to conclude the proposed scheme would result in any unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of nearby properties. Accordingly, the requirements of criterion b) are met.
9. Criterion c) seeks to ensure that HMO proposals do not adversely affect the character of the building or the surrounding area.
10. The proposed development would see a number of changes to external elevations and the roof. These include the relocation of the entrance, alterations to the roof, including a gable with dormers inserted and a roof terrace. The proposed changes to the elevations are minimal and would still allow the form of the original building to be read and understood. The works to the roof are more substantial. However, these would largely be restricted from public view by the L-shape of the finished roof form. As such, the changes would not unduly affect the character of the building or surrounding area.
11. At the time of my site visit, mid-morning on a Thursday which I appreciate is only a snapshot in time, there were a number of vehicles parked on the roads surrounding the site. Signage advising permits was also in place. Nevertheless, there were several areas where on-street parking spaces were available. Additionally, there was also availability on nearby private car parks, including the one adjacent to the appeal building.
12. I do not know what level of car ownership future occupiers may have and this may fluctuate over time. Nonetheless, there is the potential for each occupier to have access to a car and this could lead to a number of additional vehicles parking in the area. However, from my observations on site there is parking available on nearby private car parks and on the surrounding streets to accommodate the potential increase in vehicle numbers.
13. Furthermore, as the site is readily accessible to alternative public transport, including buses and trains, future occupiers may choose not to own a private vehicle. In any event, should this not be the case, the level of parking required could be sufficiently absorbed within the surrounding area without detriment to the character of the area. As such, criterion b) is satisfied.
14. Criterion i) seeks to avoid proposals that would lead to an over-concentration of similar uses resulting in the loss of social and community cohesion.

15. I note the concerns of the Council and other interested parties about the location and number of HMOs, including unlicensed HMOs in the locality, and the effects of such concentrations. However, from the map provided by the Council¹, even taking into consideration the HMO at 9 Harrison Street, the number of licensed HMOs is well dispersed within the surrounding area. Outside of the shopping area and within the surrounding residential streets, I observed quiet and well-kept urban street scenes of what appeared to be predominantly family homes. As such, even if I were to accept there are unlicensed HMOs which have not been identified, there was negligible aural or visual evidence, such as litter, noise or parking congestion, one would expect in an area with an imbalance towards HMOs.
16. I have not been supplied with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that existing HMOs within the area have resulted in a significant increase in crime. Having regard to the nature of the application there is no cogent evidence that the proposed HMO would attract or be likely to be occupied by persons more likely to commit crimes or to carry out anti-social behaviour. Additionally, there is no convincing evidence to demonstrate the proposed development would place an unacceptable demand on local services. The proposal would therefore satisfy criterion i) of Policy H26.
17. Overall, I conclude that it has been shown that the appeal site is a suitable location for the proposed development, having regard to the development plan's approach to the provision of HMOs. The proposal would accord with Policy H26 of the BBLP.

Conditions

18. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the suggested conditions as appropriate.
19. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. It is necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, to secure bin storage. In the interests of living conditions of future occupiers, a condition is necessary for soundproofing.

Conclusion

20. The proposed development would accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: Appendix 1 - 52 Paradise Street, Barrow-in-Furness LA14 1JG – Appeal 3319147, dated 11/10/2023

2022/0709

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings 22031-300-A, 22031-301, 22031-310-A, 22031-306-A, 22031-308-A, 22031-309-A, 22031-305-B, 22031-304-C and 22031-307-A.
- 3) The bin storage area, as shown on approved drawing 22031-304-C, shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the building and thereafter retained as such.
- 4) Prior to the occupation of the property, the soundproofing as detailed on approved plans 22031-307-A, 22031-308-A, and 22031-310-A shall be installed and permanently retained.

End



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2017

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/W0910/W/17/3179882

4 Park Avenue, Barrow-in-Furness, LA13 9BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mathew Johnston against the decision of Barrow-In-Furness Borough Council.
 - The application Ref B20/2016/0882, dated 2 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of existing dwelling to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) including conversion of loft and comprising 7 No. en-suite bedrooms with shared kitchen and 1No. self-contained studio bedroom with en-suite shower and kitchenette.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the proposed development would have on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a four bedroom terraced house with a basement set between two similar properties. Park Avenue is lined by dwellings on one side facing the park on the opposite side of the road. I have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that other properties within the terrace, or farther along Park Avenue, are occupied as Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) or have been subdivided into flats.
4. The proposal would provide eight bedrooms over four floors with a shared kitchen and living area in the basement. One of the bedrooms would be in the attic and although described by the appellant as a self-contained studio bedroom could in effect be capable of being occupied as a separate flat with its own cooking facilities, albeit that occupiers may well have access to use shared facilities as well. The appellant advises that it is intended that the development would be occupied by eight persons.
5. The site is set between two adjoining houses and this close proximity means that it has a sensitive relationship to its immediate neighbours at 2 and 6 Park Avenue. The front door is immediately adjacent to that of No 2 and the rear

French doors would be next to the party boundary with the outdoor space to the rear of No 6.

6. Taking account of the size of the appeal property, the activity generated by eight persons living independent lives, along with their visitors, and their coming and goings would lead to an level of activity that would be more marked and intensive than that which could reasonably be expected to be associated with a single house, even one occupied by a large family. This would give rise to a level of general noise and disturbance at an intensity that would be disruptive, particularly to the occupiers of Nos 2 and 6. The overall effect would be one which would lead to material harm to the living conditions of those neighbours, a consideration which carries considerable weight against the proposal.
7. On street parking immediately outside the site is designated for permit holders only for certain hours, with unrestricted parking on the other side of the road. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that there would be any severe adverse impact on highway safety, and I note that the Highway Authority reached a similar conclusion in that respect.
8. However, accepting that it cannot be certain what level of car ownership future occupiers may have and this may fluctuate over time, there is the potential for each occupier to have access to a car and this could lead to a considerable number of additional vehicles coming and going. Whilst such an activity would not on its own necessarily be disruptive, considered cumulatively and focused on a single property would lead to significant disturbance as a result of the intensity of use, compounding other effects.
9. These circumstances would also lead to increased competition for spaces in an area which it is reported is presently heavily parked. This would result in increased inconvenience and frustration to occupiers of less densely occupied neighbouring residential properties, adversely affecting their enjoyment. Whilst such effects are unlikely in themselves be so harmful to neighbours' living conditions to warrant dismissing the appeal, they would nevertheless further compound the harm caused by noise and disturbance and this too weighs against the proposal.
10. As the proposal includes the subdivision of part of the property to a flat, the development would not accord with saved Local Plan¹ Policy B6 which only permits such subdivision where there is no detriment to residential amenity, amongst other criteria. I note that this policy does not have any requirements particular to the HMO component of the scheme. The development would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's core planning principle of always seeking a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
11. Emerging Local Plan² Policy H26 sets criteria for the acceptability of proposals for HMOs with over six occupiers and the subdivision of dwellings. The development would not accord with its requirement that there should be no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, especially with respect to noise and other disturbance. However I can only give this emerging policy limited weight having regard to its stage of

¹ Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council Local Plan Review, 2001.

² Barrow Borough local plan – Pre-Submission draft, 2017.

- preparation. The terms of emerging Local Plan Policy H26 would appear to be less pertinent to the consideration of the main issue of this appeal.
12. The appellant advises that he is in the process of converting the property into a six bedroom HMO, with the benefit of permitted development rights, and I noted that internal works were underway when I visited the site. There is therefore a greater than theoretical possibility that such a 'fallback' development would take place and it is one which carries some weight in support of the proposal.
 13. However, as a proportion an additional two rooms is a material and significant increase upon the six rooms in the fallback scheme, including that a separate flat would effectively be created. Even considerate occupiers would generate a degree of noise and disturbance through every day comings and goings. Having regard to the size, situation and configuration of the appeal property, the cumulative effects of those associated with occupiers of eight separate rooms would be clearly perceptible, and obviously and evidently greater than those compared to the occupation of the dwelling as a six person HMO or indeed as a large family home.
 14. I have been referred to a number of appeals and I am conscious that the circumstances, character and likely occupants of each were particular to those cases and these were in different authority areas, with a different development plan policies in force. However, I noted that in an appeal³ in Southampton relating to a terraced house the Inspector found that in respect of a proposed eight bedroom HMO, the effect of two additional occupiers would be perceptible and result in material harm to neighbours' living conditions compared to occupation as a family dwelling or a 'small HMO' (i.e. six persons) and result in the over-intensive use of that site.
 15. The Inspector in appeals⁴ in Liverpool found that a six person HMO in a semi-detached property would be materially less densely occupied than an eight person one and would be likely to give rise to less disturbance than the proposed configuration. Conversely, whilst an appeal⁵ in Nottinghamshire was allowed for accommodation for up to eighteen persons where the Inspector found that increased movement and people would not have a materially adverse effect on living conditions, that related to a much larger twelve bedroom detached property set within a spacious plot.
 16. My decision does not turn on consideration of these other appeals, although I have noted that in their particular circumstances Inspectors have found material differences between an eight room HMO and a six room fallback development, circumstances which concur with my findings. I have also been referred to a number of other appeals by interested parties objecting to the proposal, however I have only been provided with very limited details of these and consequently they have not been considerations I have been able to take into account.
 17. I recognise that the matter is finely balanced but whilst a genuine fallback of a six person HMO exists, this does not provide sufficient justification for the proposal which would result in materially more dense and intensive occupation

³ APP/D1780/C/11/2156569

⁴ APP/M4320/A/11/2147504, etc.

⁵ APP/P3040/W/16/3158449

of the building and lead to material harm to neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.

18. The development would have the benefit of providing additional homes and contribute to the variety of accommodation available, in a location which the appellant advises is relatively close to the town centre and public transport. However, these benefits would be limited in scale and weighing them against the material harm to neighbours' living conditions they would not amount to the convincing justification necessary to warrant allowing the appeal. Given the harm to neighbours' living conditions the proposal would not perform the social or environmental roles the Framework considers development should demonstrate to be considered as sustainable.
19. I am conscious that the Council's decision was different to that which officers' recommended, however elected members are not duty bound to accept their officers' recommendations and this has not led me to an alternative conclusion.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, contrary to the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR

Policy H26: Large Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and the Subdivision of Dwellings

Proposals for the subdivision of dwellings and those which involve the creation of large houses in multiple occupation (over 6 occupiers) will be acceptable providing that:

- a) Such proposals do not lead to the unacceptable loss of good quality family housing, taking into account housing needs identified in the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment;
- b) There will be no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, especially with respect to privacy, noise and other disturbance;
- c) The proposal would not adversely affect the character of the building or the surrounding area, for example through an unacceptable increase in on-street parking;
- d) The proposed internal design ensures that units will have access to sufficient natural light, ventilation, privacy, outlook and indoor amenity space;
- e) The proposal does not lead to inappropriate stacking of rooms;
- a) Adequate suitably screened space is provided for the storage of refuse, recycling bins and cycles;
- g) Outdoor amenity space is provided where possible;
- h) There is adequate access from the residential unit to both the front and rear of the building;
- i) The proposal would not lead to an over-concentration of similar uses resulting in the loss of social and community cohesion; and
- j) The site is within easy reach of public transport and community facilities.

The design principles set out in the Development Strategy chapter should be followed where appropriate.