

## Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document – Update March 2026

The consultation on the updated Supplementary Planning Document was undertaken between Tuesday 23rd March 2026 and Friday 8th May 2026. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Emails were sent to everyone on the Council's planning policy database. Consultation was undertaken with statutory bodies, local businesses, residents, agents and developers, wider interest groups and stakeholders, local councillors, The Council also publicised the consultation via the website and through social media posts. The responses are summarised in the table below. Following the consultation, a number of changes have been incorporated:

- Strengthened policy wording throughout (e.g. clauses 1.3.4 and 3.5.2) to replace advisory language with firmer requirements.
- Added heritage section and policy (Section 3.7 / Principle 9) to address impacts on listed buildings and conservation areas, including requirement to conserve significance.
- Introduced drainage safeguards in parking guidance (Clause 3.2.1), requiring porous materials or runoff to permeable areas to address SuDS concerns.
- Included Secured by Design guidance as a new appendix, strengthening expectations around crime prevention and safety in HMOs.
- Clarified that the SPD applies borough wide, supporting consistent application beyond Article 4 areas and emphasising cumulative impact considerations.

### Consultation Responses

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Consultation Response</b>	<b>Council Comment</b>	<b>Action Recommended</b>
Active Travel England	Confirmed they do not comment on plan making consultations.	Noted.	None.
Awsworth Parish Council	Fully support and agree with the updates and changes proposed.	Noted.	None.
Chetwynd: The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	No specific comments to make and supports the updated provisions within the SPD.	Noted.	None.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Consultation Response</b>	<b>Council Comment</b>	<b>Action Recommended</b>
Environment Agency	Confirmed they have no comments.	Noted.	None.
Historic England	Note that there is currently no reference to the historic environment, or heritage assets within the document. They would welcome a paragraph within the SPD that relates to heritage assets and the need to conserve and where possible, enhance their significance, including their setting. Specifically, they recommend including a paragraph detailing how to consider applications for houses in multiple occupation when they are a heritage asset, how to avoid and minimise harm to heritage assets and when listed building consent will be required.	Agreed that a section should be added to outline how to consider applications for houses in multiple occupation when they are a heritage asset.	Added section detailing how the Council will consider applications for houses in multiple occupation when they are a heritage asset, how to avoid and minimise harm to heritage assets and when listed building consent will be required.
National Highways	Confirmed they have no comments.	Noted.	None.
Natural England	Confirmed they have no comments	Noted.	None.
Nottinghamshire County Council Highways	In the absence of a locally defined parking standards, the County Council advises it will apply its own established	Any comments provided by the Highways Authority would be considered as part of a planning application. The SPD	None

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>parking criteria when assessing applications. This is currently based on one parking space per bedroom, plus one additional space per three bedrooms for visitors, and would inform future consultation responses.</p> <p>Concern is also raised over discouraging “excessive concreting” of gardens, as hard surfacing may be necessary to provide adequate off-street parking. Without sufficient on-site provision, parking demand could be displaced onto the public highway, potentially undermining highway safety.</p>	<p>does not seek to vary existing parking standards. The SPD requires adequate car parking to be provided and requires a parking survey if parking spaces cannot be provided for off-street.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to discourage the excessive concreting of gardens due to the potential this has on drainage and on the appearance of the property and wider streetscape.</p>	
<p>Nottinghamshire Police: Designing Out Crime (Architectural Liaison Officer)</p>	<p>Raises concerns about the vulnerability of HMO occupants to crime due to inadequate security measures commonly observed in such properties. The response emphasises the risk of repeat victimisation, the challenges tenants face in implementing security upgrades, and the</p>	<p>The response recommends including detailed specifications related to Secured by Design to reduce the risk of crime. This will be included as an appendix to the SPD.</p>	<p>Add appendix outlining Secured by Design principles.</p>

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>benefits of following Secured by Design (SBD) principles. The consultee outlines the SBD approach, including standards for access control, door and window specifications, external lighting, CCTV provision, mail delivery security, and cycle storage. They recommend that all HMOs achieve Secured by Design accreditation prior to occupation. Overall, the representation encourages the Council to embed strong security expectations within the SPD to reduce crime risk and promote safer living environments for HMO residents.</p>		
The Coal Authority	Confirmed they have no comments.	Noted.	None.
Resident 1	<p>Raised concerns about the occupation of HMOs by individuals placed there without prior notification to local residents. The representation suggests that there should be clearer requirements for transparency from landlords when seeking</p>	<p>The purpose of the HMO SPD is to provide guidance on the planning considerations relevant to assessing HMO proposals. Matters relating to the status of occupants, or requirements for landlords to disclose personal information about prospective tenants, fall</p>	None.

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>HMO consent, including advance information to the Council about the intended nature of occupation. The respondent also emphasised the importance of local engagement and expressed a desire for greater community involvement when HMOs are proposed within established residential areas.</p>	<p>outside the scope of both planning legislation and this SPD. Residents are consulted on planning applications for HMOs following the Council's consultation policy in the Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	
<p>Resident 2</p>	<p>Concerns based on long-term experiences living adjacent to student accommodation and HMOs in Beeston. They reported persistent issues including noise, anti-social behaviour, and general disturbance over many years,. The respondent feels that these problems have not been adequately addressed despite repeated complaints and believes that HMOs, particularly student HMOs, are unsuitable within established residential areas. They disagree with the presence of student HMOs in residential areas and feel that the</p>	<p>The concerns regarding noise, anti-social behaviour, and the broader impact of HMOs on residential amenity are acknowledged. These issues are recognised within the SPD which includes guidance aimed at minimising amenity impacts, including considerations relating to noise, layout, intensification, and the compatibility of HMOs with surrounding residential areas.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	interests of local residents are not given sufficient priority.		
Resident 3	<p>The respondent raises concerns about the strength, clarity, and enforceability of several proposed clauses within the SPD, particularly where wording relies on encouragement rather than requirement.</p> <p>Lack of enforceability (Clause 1.3.4): The use of phrasing such as “strongly encouraged” is considered ineffective, as developers may disregard it. The respondent emphasises that key policy expectations—such as considering HMO proximity—should be framed as enforceable requirements rather than advisory guidance.</p> <p>HMO concentration threshold (Clause 2.2.1): The proposed threshold of 20% HMOs within a 100m radius is regarded as excessively high and likely to harm neighbourhood</p>	<p>Noted and covered below.</p> <p>Agreed that the wording should be strengthened.</p> <p>It is considered the radius, consistent with the current SPD, is appropriate taking into account the wording of existing planning policy and other requirements within the</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3.4 now states that applicants must consider the proximity of existing HMOs.</p> <p>None.</p>

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>character. A significantly lower threshold (suggested between 5%–10%) is recommended to better protect established communities.</p> <p>Impact on drainage and planning standards (Clause 3.2.1): Concerns are raised that encouraging off-street parking within property curtilage could lead to excessive hard surfacing (“concreting over” gardens), potentially conflicting with Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) principles and weakening existing planning controls.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures (Clause 3.5.2): The current wording, which advises applicants to “consider” sound reduction measures, is viewed as insufficient. The respondent argues that noise is a major source of disturbance and that mandatory, clearly defined standards should be</p>	<p>SPD in respect of sandwiching and clustering.</p> <p>Agreed that there should be clarification added regarding ensuring parking areas include adequate drainage.</p> <p>Agreed that the wording should be strengthened.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.2.1 now includes reference to using porous materials or including a run off to a permeable area.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.5.2 now states that applicants must consider sound reduction measures.</p>

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>introduced to ensure consistent and effective mitigation.</p> <p>Queries whether the Council is confident the SPD will prevent 'corporates' circumventing regulations.</p>	<p>The SPD applies to all HMOs where planning permission is required, regardless of the applicant.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Cllr James Walker-Gurley, Nottinghamshire County Councillor</p>	<p>Supports applying the SPD borough-wide, welcoming the removal of references limiting it to specific Article 4 areas. They consider a consistent approach necessary, noting that the impacts of HMOs—such as pressure on housing supply, parking, waste management, and changes to neighbourhood character—are being experienced across the borough, not only in Beeston. They welcome the introduction of clearer assessment principles and the explicit emphasis on cumulative impact, including consideration of the combined effects of HMOs and Purpose Built Student Accommodation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondent	Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	<p>The comments are supportive of stronger expectations around space standards, amenity, and overall living conditions, highlighting the importance of preventing poor-quality HMOs that technically comply with standards but undermine resident wellbeing and neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>Notes existing pressure on on-street parking in many areas and stresses the need for firm requirements to protect road safety, emergency access, and everyday residential amenity.</p>		