Appendix 2 – HMO Thresholds in Other Local Planning Authority Areas

| Local Planning Authority | Threshold in Article 4 areas |
|--------------------------|---|
| Barking & | 10% of the total number of houses in the road; and no two |
| Dagenham | adjacent properties, apart from dwellings that are separated |
| | by a road, should be converted. |
| Welwyn & Hatfield | 20% within 50m |
| Birmingham | 10% within 100m |
| Bath | 25% within 100m |
| Milton Keynes | 20% within 100m |
| Southampton | 10% within 40m |
| Leeds | No specific threshold but Article 4 Direction in place. |
| Oxford | The proportion of properties within 100 metres of street length |
| | either side of the property does not exceed 20% |
| Exeter | 25% within certain areas, no radius from individual properties. |
| Leicester | No specific threshold but Article 4 Direction in place. |
| Manchester | No quantified threshold, merely "high concentration", however |
| | supporting text to policy states "once a 20% threshold is |
| | reached problems become harder to manage, but a tipping |
| | point would be difficult to set universally across Manchester |
| | due to varying capacities of neighbourhoods to accommodate |
| | this type of housing" |
| Nottingham | 10% within the Census Output Area within which a |
| | development proposal falls and all Contiguous Output Areas |
| | (those with a boundary adjoining the Home Output Area). |
| | (draft policy yet to be subject to examination) |
| Plymouth | No specific threshold but Article 4 Direction in place. |
| Portsmouth | 10% within 50m |
| Warwick | 10% within 100m, and the proposal does not result in a non- |
| | HMO dwelling being sandwiched between 2 HMOs; or lead to |
| | a continuous frontage of 3 or more HMOs. |