

**Appendix 2: Comments on Draft Houses in Multiple Occupation SPD**

ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
<a href="#">HiMO1</a>	Madeline Sutton	Object	It depends on where the Multiple Occupancy building would be. For example if it was on Whitby Moors it is a great idea as I'm sure the occupiers will be have transport to shops in Whitby or Robin Hoods Bay. Another good place would be Raincliffe Woods. I have witnessed multiple occupancy in West Street and it turned a respectable area into something cheap and common, especially as thefts, drunks and shouting were involved. But having lived in a building for 2 years that had multiple occupancy of students, 3 flats on 1st floor, 3 flats on 2nd floor and 3 flats on 3rd floor, I don't like it much. As I was told by the landlord of the above properties, teenagers come alive at midnight and all through the night is 'their daytime'. So after the talking in loud voices and laughing loudly outside my bedroom window for 2 years (except July-end of September) after midnight at 2am, 3am, 4am and 5am, I am now trying to get my flat ready to put up for sale. I did report it all to Environmental Services but they weren't much help and go the impression I was considered a nuisance to the Council. They did send letters out but after 2 months all the hassle started again. I am now 75 and hoping to sell and move to retirement flats for the over 60's, so maybe I am the wrong person to consult. also I need my bedroom window open year round and this is why I can hear everything.
<a href="#">HiMO2</a>	Mason	Observations	In view of problems at the Breece in West Street which stemmed in part from the large numbers of residents, I feel that a maximum number of ten bedrooms, although arbitrary, is at least a working number. Applications requesting more than ten would have to justify their request and give undertakings that the site would be properly controlled and managed, which was not the case at the Breece.
<a href="#">HiMO3</a>	Town Clerk	Support	The Town Council unanimously agreed that the HiMO SPD Draft Consultation is received and welcomed. Members look forward to its adoption in due course.
<a href="#">HiMO4</a>	Mr David Auton	Support with conditions	I have read the draft SPD in its entirety, and have been made aware of changes to the draft. The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation, with the significant exception that there is no specific mention of any maximum number of bedrooms in an HMO. This is despite options being provided within the earlier consultation where over 91% commented that the maximum size should be 10 bedrooms. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and whilst I support these changes, I would have preferred a particular number being seen as the normal figure for decision making. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.6 which I understand will become part of the application papers, and as such will become available for public viewing through the planning application portal. Hopefully this greater and earlier transparency will lead to a more robust management process by SBC in the event that the management of any sized HMO falls below that stated in the application papers, and will prevent the opportunity of a badly managed HMO eroding the quality of life in any community. There must be sanctions available to enforce the management plan. I also welcome the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1. With the conditions detailed, I support this SPD
<a href="#">HiMO5</a>	Mr David Auton	Support with conditions	I am aware that the wording 'and visitor accommodation' has been proposed to be added at the end of this paragraph. I support this addition.
<a href="#">HiMO6</a>	Amanda Robinson	Observations	I would like to make it clear that the Breece had a management plan (it was offered by its operator to convince councillors on the planning committee to vote FOR the application). In my experience the members on the planning committee think that a management plan can be enforced by planners to make sure operators of HMO's operate in a responsible manner, as the Breece proved these plans are not worth the paper they are written on. It took a lot of time, effort and money to TRY and get the operators of the Breece to enforce their plan and it never happened. I urge planners to restrict bedroom numbers in ALL applications otherwise Councillors on P&D committees will be unlikely to refuse applications. I sat on the Breece application, members voted in favour because they actually believed the HMO would be better run with a management plan and conditions which would ensure a better run property, this was not the case.
<a href="#">HiMO7</a>	Mrs Jill Wood	Observations	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO8</a>	Jonathan Sampson	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO9</a>	Ian Geldart	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO10</a>	F R Boyes	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO11</a>	Susan	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned however, that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view.

ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
	Hill		I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added, which gives some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications and I support these changes. I also support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO12</a>	Mr J A Gavins	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am, however, concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that para 3.18 has been amended and a new para 3.19 added which gives some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications and I support these changes. I also support the new management plan requirement in para 4.16 and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paras 3.17 and Policy HMO1. I also would ask that planners consider the needs of tourist visitors to our area. A leisurely stroll after an evening meal at one of our hotels can be something of an unexpected challenge at times due to the behaviour of the drug and drink dependant individuals who occupy some of our existing HMOs. Our parks and gardens department and our refuse and litter picking teams due a superb job in creating an excellent environment for residents and tourists alike. It is the behaviour of some HMO residents that is the only blot on the landscape. Those occupied by students however, from my experience, rarely give cause for concern. Similarly, those better equipped for the young professional, likewise.
<a href="#">HiMO13</a>	Mrs Elizabeth Bott	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO14</a>	Pauline Hadi	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO15</a>	Jan Berry	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO16</a>	Jacqueline Roberts	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO17</a>	Glenis Kirkham	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO18</a>	Daphne Barr	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO19</a>	Irene May	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO20</a>	R J MacDonald	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO21</a>	Eva Haigh	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes.





ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
	Wooley	conditions	I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO44</a>	Z WorriLOW	Observations	There is strong support for 10 bedrooms to be the maximum HMO limit, to avoid another Breece incident. In the South cliff area there are a significant amount of properties with more than 10 bedrooms, with HMO potential, all of which would fit into the council planning proposal. I feel very strongly that there should be some limit to the number of bedrooms in any one HMO. 10 or 11 bedrooms may not be a problem, 12+ may be a problem if not managed.
<a href="#">HiMO45</a>	Mrs Jessie Pickett	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO46</a>	Mr Arthur O'Nion	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO47</a>	Penny O'Nion	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO48</a>	Mr David Auton	Support with conditions	I would like to make the following comments in this consultation. The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. However the previous round of consultation - Issues and Options - the overwhelming percentage of respondents expressed the opinion that there should be a numerical limit to the size of an HMO. That is the single issue that is specifically not included in this draft SPD. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I generally support these changes, with qualification. The numerical bedroom number of an HMO is in part replaced by a requirement for a management plan to be submitted at planning application stage. That Management Plan may persuade decision makers to approve applications in the future, but the significant concern exists - what sanctions will planning enforcement officers have at their disposal to deal with breaches of the management plan. To be effective an management plan, and before passing this SPD, councillors should clearly detail what sanctions they expect to be used to deal with HMO owners/managers/licensees who breach the details used to obtain their licence. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1
<a href="#">HiMO49</a>	Michael Jaconelli	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications but am still concerned that this could prove to be insufficient safeguard against potentially problematic large HMOs. I therefore suggest that the inclusion of a 'maximum number' would still be advisable. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, as long as sanctions are in place to ensure the full and constant implementation of the plan. I am also in favour of the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO50</a>	Ursula M Badger	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO51</a>	Grant Lister	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1
<a href="#">HiMO52</a>	Mrs Margaret Auton	Support with conditions	I would like to make the following comments in the above consultation. The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1

ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
			However non of the changes suggested by the S.P.D will be effective if, sanctions are not clearly laid out and then acted upon. Permitting landlords to stretch the system by allowing them time to 'test the water' before putting in an application for change of use will set a precedent that could allow another 'Breece situation'
<a href="#">HiMO53</a>	Mr Stephen Worrilow	Object	I would like to express my concerns regarding section 3.18 The size of individual HMOs, That there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms. I believe at the last consult there was a majority in favour of a limit of 10. My concern is that there are a high number of large properties on the South cliff with more than 10 bedrooms. All would fit into the councils proposals if there is no bedroom limit. As you say there may be no difference between 10 or 11 if managed well, however the difference between 10 and 15 is significant however well managed , as to the impact on the area, especially if there was a high number of them. I strongly feel there should be some limit to bedroom numbers to avoid another 'Breece' incident. I would support the new management plan required in paragraph 4.16 for all HMOs.
<a href="#">HiMO54</a>	Adele Richmond	Object	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1 I am concerned regarding 'sandwiching' residential properties. As a person living alone I would feel intimidated by an HMO at either side not to mention the devaluing of my property. Whilst I appreciate people need to be housed I am concerned about the volume and the possible concentration of HMO's in any particular area and also the size. If you have a larger house that would accommodate say ten people surely it would make sense to split that house into two separate sections with five in each and two communal areas thus halving any problems arising. It would appear that the communal areas create the most problems but well managed HMO's are obviously the key, whatever the size.
<a href="#">HiMO55</a>	Noelle Nelson	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO56</a>	Kevin Patton	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO57</a>	Raymond Birch	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16 and the addition of wording to include " or visitor accommodation" as well as residential properties in paragraph 3.17 and policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO58</a>	Mrs D P Rushworth	Object	I have some concerns regarding sections 3.18 and 3.19 about doing away with the 10 bedroom option selected by 91% of the consultees at the South Cliff Meeting. Not to mention a maximum number of large properties in the South Cliff Area (redundant hotels or large guest houses) could become HMO's and maybe up to 15 should be considered as a maximum. Sections 4.5 Neighbours residential amenity should be mentioned this is as important as noise assessment. 4.6 Management requirements - Some detail ought to be given to the procedures to be adopted. The plans ought to be specific, robust and enforceable.
<a href="#">HiMO59</a>	Alan Firth	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO60</a>	Jenifer Susan Noble	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO61</a>	David Kettlewell	Support with conditions	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation. I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO62</a>	Mrs	Support with	The draft document generally supports the views expressed by the majority of respondents in the previous rounds of consultation.

ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
	Denise Lacroix-Kettlewell	conditions	I am concerned that there is no direct reference to the number of bedrooms limiting the size of an HMO, where 10 was the overwhelming majority view. I am aware that paragraph 3.18 has been amended and a new paragraph 3.19 added which give some guidance to decision makers about the size of an HMO in future planning applications, and I support these changes. I support the new management plan requirement in paragraph 4.16, and the addition of wording to include 'or visitor accommodation' as well as residential properties in paragraphs 3.17 and Policy HMO1.
<a href="#">HiMO63</a>	Harriette Teasdale	Object	I must express my dissatisfaction with regard to various areas contained within the reworked HMO SPD. My main concern remains the number of HMOs allowed within a certain radius, though the figures apparently suggest (however close the results) that this is not an issue now open for discussion. And as for the overall number of HMOs allowed to exist in Scarborough as a whole - too many by far. However you look at it and however necessary they are you cannot dispute that a high concentration of this type of accommodation does not make for a desirable, well looked after family friendly area, the very reason we came to South Cliff in the first place. Surely we should be building on our tourist industry and attracting young families? An issue that can be raised however if the figures are to be taken into account (and if not, why ask our opinion?!!) is that of the number of occupants per dwelling (3.18). There must be an absolute cap on this at 10 as to suggest that to have more would have a negligible impact is ridiculous. The more rooms and occupants per dwelling, the more imposing in a myriad ways said dwelling. This is especially pertinent when (as outlined in the proposed Policy HMO 1) our only certainty is that we won't have an HMO either side of our family home and that there won't be two next door to each other! Additionally with ref to point 4.5 - the only matter that really shows any consideration of neighbouring residents is 'Noise assessment'. What about all the other 'issues associated with high concentration of HMOs' outlined in 3.5 within 'Background' which must be clearly outlined and considered in each and every proposal. Even if you do not deem the proposed percentages in question to be 'high concentration', as far as we, the residents of South Cliff are concerned they most certainly are.
<a href="#">HiMO64</a>	Gillian Ryan	Observations	The draft generally supports views expressed by respondents in previous rounds of consultation. I welcome the amendments made to certain paragraphs... 3.17 Clustering of properties - Amended to include 'Visitor Accommodation' as well as residential properties. 3.18 Size of Accommodation - You state the explanation and reasons for coming to the decision, not to limit the number of bedrooms to 10, the number favoured by the majority of residents in previous consultations. I understand and take on board the point you make; I agree a well managed HMO over 10 bedrooms would be preferable to a property being left to fall into dereliction, as a result of not being a financially viable business proposition. The addition of paragraph 3.19 is a welcome addition. Paragraph 4.6 : New Management Plan Requirements. When the operators of the Breece Hotel submitted their plans to the Council Officers on the planning committee, they included a management plan (which presumably influenced the committee to pass the plans). In the light of the knowledge the residents of the area around the Breece (to what happened as a result of that decision) have; one wonders if the plan was worth the paper it was written on! Any plan must be monitored and policed responsibly from the onset. Future planners may not have knowledge of the consequences of these decisions.
<a href="#">HiMO65</a>	Gillian Eade	Object	I am writing to you as a concerned homeowner and resident of Granville Square in relation to the proposed HMOs for the area. I am worried that with the amount of large houses and hotels in the area that we could soon be over-run with properties of this type, for the following reasons: 1. History Repeating The Breece, on West Street, was closed, only after 57 separate reported cases of anti-social behaviour over a 9 month period. People in the surrounding houses were subjected to months of anti-social behaviours - some low-level as well as an alleged stabbing and rape. The property was seriously damaged inside, homemade weapons were discovered as well as drug paraphernalia. Even the thought of history repeating itself is an unfair strain on families and residents who have worked hard to own their own homes. Unless the proposed HMOs were run under a strict, robust and effective management plan there would be huge risk of something similar occurring. How could you ensure such a strict and continued enforcement for years down the line? 2. Democracy? I have been made aware that a survey was posted out to residents in the South Cliff area of Scarborough and a staggering 91% voted that occupancy of proposed HMOs should be kept to 10 bedrooms or less. Worryingly, I am also informed that Scarborough Borough Council ignored that 91% and stated that instead, each proposal would be considered separately, meaning that should an application come in for a 15-20 bedroom HMO, it could go ahead. It occurs to me that if the Council took the time to send out a questionnaire to people who could be directly affected by this housing situation, they should have listened and seriously considered their response. Surely HMOs would be simpler to manage, impose less of a risk to others and operate more effectively if the size and occupancy was kept to a minimum. 3. Social Impact/Health and Well Being The idea of clustering HMOs in our area is also a concern. These houses would tar the South Cliff area with a reputation for housing that is not well looked after and prone to anti social behaviour. I do not object to student housing as it can be well managed, brings more money to the town and is less likely to result in damage to the property and surrounding area. What I do object to are residents that are drug users, criminals and people who have lack of concern for other people's happiness and safety; people who wouldn't think twice about damaging someone else's property, or disturbing the night's sleep of young children and workers. My husband and I are not long-standing residents at Granville Square, but we intend to live here for the foreseeable future. We are newly married and hoping to start a family very soon. I hope that SBC take into consideration how safe they might feel if their homes were surrounded by HMOs, and if they might feel threatened by anti-social behaviours and drug use in close proximity to their homes. I hope that you reconsider the maximum occupancy clause, listen to the 91% of residents who would prefer a 10 bedroom HMO, and devise a way to manage such properties robustly and effectively. I also hope that you consider the high value of the houses in this area and the love and money we have put into our homes and how we would be loathed to put this at risk.
<a href="#">HiMO66</a>	Maureen Gatie	Observations	I know that there are many people upset with quite a few things in the SPD. The thing that upsets me, and it must be very wrong, is that you offered us options in the number(s) of bedrooms that could be the maximum for HMO's. Then 91% of residents who replied to this selected the "max 10" bedrooms option. You, the planners, who set the options, completely ignored the residents' selection and imposed a "no-limit" on numbers of bedrooms; you alter it slightly in the further draft, but it is just not right. Further, it will encourage more of the larger HMO's to open. This is not good for the social profile of the South Cliff and other areas.
<a href="#">HiMO67</a>	Mr Thomas	Observations	Regarding the SPD for HMO's - it is wrong that no attention has been given by you to the 91% of people who want a maximum of 10 bedrooms to be applied to HMO's in Scarborough's new Local Plan. You say that you will not put any limits on. This is not consultation. When there is another Breece... How will we be protected?

ID	Full Name	Nature Of Response:	Response
	Penman		
<a href="#">HiMO68</a>	Adrian Gatie	Observations	<p>Relating to the recent re-jigging of the HMO Supplementary Planning Document draft; I am unhappy with the sparse wording of 4.6 (management plan requirement), being of the firm opinion that it should be more detailed regarding the procedures to be adopted. The plans themselves must be robust, and specific, as well as enforceable... and policed if necessary.</p> <p>I am also still very concerned, having looked at your revised 3.18 (and additional 3.19) sections again since first issued at the recent South Cliff Group meeting, about the current situation regarding the planners' doing away with the 10 bedroom option as selected by 91% of the consultees (a noun obviously not given any respect or notice by the planning department)... and the farcical situation in 3.18 of making an expedient comparison between 10 and 11 bedrooms when a comparison between 10 and say 13 or 16 just would not have made the same conjured point... Alice in Wonderland rhetoric!</p> <p>I believe that there should be another bullet-point added to the list in 4.5... neighbours' residential amenity.. things other than the already listed noise assessment are needed to be covered.</p> <p>Regarding Policy HMO1, the proposal is for far too many HMOs to be able to exist in Scarborough. All we are guaranteed (point c) is that we will not have an HMO on both sides of our homes... Big Deal!!</p> <p>If things go as envisaged by the planners of this, the HMO Supplementary Planning Document adjunct to the new Local Plan, before too long there will be more occupants of Houses of Multiple Occupation on South Cliff than Council Tax-paying residents. We will soon be an endangered species... in more ways than one!</p>
<a href="#">HiMO69</a>	Susan Teasdale	Object	<p>I am most upset to hear that in Policy HMO1 the proposed radius for consideration with regard to the number of allowed HMOs is going to be set to 100m and your sketches showing how lucky we are to not have the possibility of being 'sandwiched' by such residences is actually disturbing not reassuring.</p> <p>And as for simply disregarding the majority who have specified a cap on 10 bedrooms per dwelling, that is wrong and must be reviewed.</p> <p>Finally in 4.5 there is very little there that considers us potential neighbours apart from 'Noise assessment'. What about all the other aspects of potential impact (ref to 'Background' as far a high concentration of HMOs). Noise is clearly a potential issue but this is just the tip of the iceberg. Our residential area will be undoubtedly 'go downhill' and we need to put as many criteria in place as possible to avoid this - surely as a town we want to raise our profile and attract tourism, not drive it away??</p>
<a href="#">HiMO70</a>	Mr Jason Leach	Object	<p>You have apparently ignored the majority that have said an absolute maximum of 10 residents must be allowed in each HMO in Scarborough.</p> <p>If we have no control over how many are in our locality then we must at least be heard when we make our opinion on an issue such as maximum size and absolutely when this forms the majority.</p>