Application Number	17/0381/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	15th March 2017	**Officer**	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	10th May 2017		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	71 Greville Road Cambridge CB1 3QJ		
Proposal	Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer, and change of use of dwelling to large scale HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) for 8 no. persons, with associated bin and bike storage		
Applicant	Croftmead Ltd C/o Agent		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposed extensions are the same as those that have consent under the previous extant planning permission. - The proposed change of use would be acceptable compared to the fall-back situation for a small HMO.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 No.71 is a two-storey semi-detached property situated on the south side of Greville Road. There is a small drive to the front of the site and a long garden with an outbuilding to the rear.

1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character and is formed of similar sized semi-detached and terraced properties. The site is in close proximity to Mill Road, the railway station and the city centre.

1.3 The site is not within a Conservation Area and is outside the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for a two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer and change of use of dwelling to 8 no. person HMO (House in Multiple Occupation).

2.2 The extensions would be the same scale and design as were approved planning permission reference 16/1841/FUL subject to conditions. This consent is extant; however it has not been implemented.

- The two-storey side extension would be approximately 1.2m wide and would match the existing eaves and ridge of the original roof and change the part-hipped roof to a gable end. It would extend approximately 4.4m beyond the existing rear elevation.
- The rear extension would be part single and part two-storey. The two storey element would be approximately 4.5m wide. The single storey element would infill to the boundary with No. 69. The two storey element would have a lean-to roof, set no higher than the existing eaves line of the original roof. The single-storey element would be flat roof approximately 2.8m high.
- The extensions would be brick to match the existing.
- The proposed roof extension would project out of the rear roof plane by way of a near full-height and near full-width box type dormer. The proposed dormer would be clad in zinc.
- The area in front of the property would be paved to provide one car parking space.

2.3 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which included:

- laundry facilities shown within the main house;
- a bin and bike store at the rear;
- change from French doors to smaller window on the ground floor rear elevation of the proposed extension.

2.4 An HMO management plan was also submitted during the course of the application.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/1841/FUL	Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer	Approved subject to conditions

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 4/13, 5/1, 5/7 8/2, 8/6, 8/10

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95

Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 <u>Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan</u>

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 The development is considered likely impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the local planning authority should consider.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection. Recommended conditions and informatives:
- construction hours
- collection during construction
- piling
- housing informative

Refuse and Recycling

6.3 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.4 All new or altered external surfaces within the site boundary should be of permeable construction. Recommended condition for surface water drainage works.

6.5 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The application has been called-in to committee by Councillor Baigent on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- This is a residential area and in many ways HMOs are likely to change the area significantly;
- Parking is already difficult and problematic and an 8-bed HMO is likely to impact on that significantly;
- The level of public interest in the application.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting to the application:

- 2 Greville Road
- 2A Greville Road
- 7 Greville Road
- 9 Greville Road
- 14 Greville Road
- 15 Greville Road

- 16 Greville Road
- 18 Greville Road
- 19 Greville Road
- 26 Greville Road
- 27 Greville Road
- 29 Greville Road
- 31 Greville Road
- 33 Greville Road
- 36 Greville Road
- 38 Greville Road
- 39 Greville Road
- 44 Greville Road
- 51 Greville Road
- 54 Greville Road
- 57 Greville Road
- 59 Greville Road
- 62 Greville Road
- 64 Greville Road (2 owners/occupiers)
- 66 Greville Road
- 67 Greville Road
- 68 Greville Road
- 73 Greville Road
- 74 Greville Road
- 75 Greville Road
- 78 Greville Road
- 80 Greville Road
- 25 Kingfisher Gardens, Cambridge

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Overbearing and overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties;
- Permanent loss of a needed family home;
- Over-provision of HMOS, one-bed units and bedsits in Cambridge;
- Likely to be occupied by students for which there is an over-provision in Cambridge;
- Scale of development is not appropriate for the location;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Potential for HMO to be occupied by up to 10 no. people;
- No existing HMOs on Greville Road;
- Overconcentration of HMO use in the locality;
- Loss of community with transient occupiers including commuters;

- Increase in noise to neighbouring properties including through party wall to No. 69 and from access to the bin/bike store;
- Anti-social behaviour from future occupants;
- Limited shared amenity space and facilities, including laundry;
- Inadequate kitchen facilities;
- Internal laundry facilities are unlikely to provide adequate facilities;
- Poor quality living environment for future occupants;
- Inadequate headroom and limited natural lighting for second storey front room;
- Fire safety for the future occupants.
- No comment from the Residential Team within Environmental Health;
- Concerns about management of the HMO particularly if property is sold;
- Outbuilding providing a laundry in the rear garden would be over-development;
- Lack of parking and increased demand for on-street parking, with impact on residential amenity, bin collection, access for emergency services, cycle and pedestrian safety;
- Future residents are not unlikely to be car users;
- Increase in pollution;
- Pressure on refuse storage and collection;
- Bins put out on the street for collection would impact on pedestrians;
- The management plan is not what has been experienced by local residents at other properties owned by the applicant;
- Implementation of the management plan in the event that the property is sold;
- Negative impact on street scene. Damage to the tree and the loss of the verge, and visual impact of paving the front garden;
- Impact of construction on residential amenity;
- Impact on sewerage network and pressure on utilities shared with No. 73;
- The current application follows consent granted for extensions, and the applicant is ‘playing the system’, which puts local residents at a disadvantage when commenting on planning applications;
- Only the developer will benefit.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

- Principle of development
- Context of site, design and external spaces
- Residential amenity
- Refuse arrangements
- Highway safety
- Car and cycle parking
- Surface water drainage
- Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/7 refers to supported housing/housing in multiple occupation and sets the relevant tests. This states that the development of properties for HMOs will be permitted subject to:

a. the potential impact on the residential amenity of the local area;
b. the suitability of the building or site; and
c. the proximity of bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services

8.3 I have assessed the proposal against the three criteria of policy 5/7 in the sections that follow. At the outset, it is important to explain that my assessment must consider the applicant's fallback situation as a material consideration. The fallback situation is that the property could be used as a 6 no. person HMO (referred to in planning terms as a 'small HMO') under permitted development rights, without the need for planning permission. The proposal is for 8 no. persons (referred to as a 'large HMO'), so my assessment must take account of the impact of the 2 no. additional occupants. The number of occupants would be controlled through a condition.

8.4 Notwithstanding this, third parties have raised concern about the loss of family housing and cited an overprovision of accommodation for single occupants within the City. I accept that there is a need for family housing within the City; however there is a range of housing needs including accommodation for single occupants. The Local Plan recognises that HMOs meet an identified need for affordable housing for single occupants, stating in paragraph 5.14 of the supporting text for policy 5/7 that, 'supported housing and housing in multiple occupation add to the mix and range of housing to meet the needs of a diverse community and workforce and helps in the creation of mixed communities'.

8.5 The property could be used as a small HMO (Use Class C4) under permitted development, albeit it could revert back to a dwelling house (Use Class C3) without the need for planning permission. The proposed large HMO would be 'sui generis' (does not fall within a Use Class), so planning permission would be required to convert it back to a dwelling house. The property would remain in residential use and would be capable of conversion back to a dwelling house, subject to planning permission. For this reason, in response to concerns from third parties, in my opinion, the proposal would not result in the permanent loss of a family home. Notwithstanding this, there are no grounds within policy 5/7 or other relevant policies to resist the loss of family housing to other residential uses.

a. Impact on the residential amenity of the local area

8.6 Paragraph 5.14 of the supporting text to policy 5/7 gives the following guidance on assessing the impact of HMOs on residential amenity:

> *These uses [HMOs] are residential in character but often have different servicing needs and increased levels of activity associated with them. The location of such provision requires careful consideration to ensure that the proposals respect the character and residential amenity of the local area. An overconcentration of uses, which can affect amenity and character, can have a detrimental impact on a locality.*

8.7 The area is characterised by semi-detached properties with relatively long rear gardens. There are currently no licensed

HMO on Greville Road, however the applicant owns No. 6 Greville Road which was granted permission for extensions by committee in July 2016 and intends to use this as a small HMO under permitted development. In my opinion, there would not be an overconcentration of HMO uses along the street.

8.8 I recognize the strong concerns of local residents, however, I must consider the applicant's fall back situation which is to use the property as a small HMO for up to 6no. peoples under permitted development. In my view, it would be very difficult to argue any substantial difference in the impact of the operation on the residential amenity of neighbouring property between a 6 bed and 8 bed HMO in this instance.

8.9 The impact on neighbours of HMO uses – whether a small or large HMO - largely depends on how the property is managed. The applicant has provided a HMO management plan, which sets out measures to minimise noise and disturbance. This includes single occupancy of rooms, sound-proofing the building, and management of bikes and bins. I am satisfied that the management plan is acceptable and implementation of this would result in an HMO which does not have a significant impact on neighbouring properties, compared to the fall back situation.

8.10 Third parties have raised concerns about the implementation of the management plan. I have recommended that this would be controlled through a condition requiring the operation of the HMO to be in accordance with the management plan. Should the Council receive complaints that the operation of the HMO is not in accordance with the management plan, then this could be investigated as a breach of planning condition, and enforcement action taken as appropriate. In the event that the property is sold, the new owners would be bound by this condition to continue to operate the HMO in accordance with the management plan, or with alternative details submitted for approval. I am satisfied this gives the Council adequate control over the management of the HMO and the means to take action should there be non-compliance.

8.11 The nearest residential properties are No. 69 which is the adjoining property to the east, and No. 73 to the west. The application site (no.71) has a rear garden approximately 21m long and backs on to a footpath. As a result of the extension,

the property would be approximately 1.3m from the western boundary. The proposal includes a bin and bike store within the rear garden which would be accessed via the side passageway adjacent to No. 73.

8.12 Third parties have raised concerns about noise and disturbance from future occupants using the rear garden. I acknowledge these concerns, however in my opinion, it would be difficult to argue that the 2 no. additional occupants would have a substantial impact compared to the fallback scenario for a small HMO. Moreover, the measures within the HMO management plan – including vetting future tenants and providing contact details for the property manager to neighbouring residents – would reduce the likelihood of unacceptable noise and disturbance compared to a small HMO that could operate without a management plan in place.

8.13 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of noise and disturbance from comings and goings along the side to access the bin and bike stores on the amenity of the occupants of No. 71. The passageway would be approximately 1.3m wide between the side elevation of the extension of the boundary with No. 71. The neighbouring property has a corresponding passageway so the side elevation is set back from the boundary. There are windows on the side elevation. I acknowledge these concerns, however in my opinion, it would be difficult to argue that the 2 no. additional occupants would have a substantial impact in this regard.

8.14 No. 71 has a large outbuilding along the boundary close to the rear elevation of the house. Bin and bike facilities would be within stores located against the boundary corresponding to the rear of the outbuilding, which would be against part of the boundary that is approximately halfway down the garden of No. 71. The stores would be covered and in my opinion, the bin and bike arrangements would not result in an unacceptable noise and disturbance or odour impact on the amenity space of No. 71, particularly compared to facilities that could be provided under permitted development for a small HMO.

8.15 During the course of the application, concerns were raised about an apparent lack of laundry facilities within the main house, and the possibility that the applicant intended to provide this within a separate outbuilding. The applicant has submitted

revised floor plans which show space for such facilities within the communal living space. While the internal arrangement cannot be controlled through the planning process so that there is guarantee that these facilities will be provided, the plans do not include an external laundry building and the HMO would not benefit from permitted development rights to erect an outbuilding. The applicant would need to apply for planning permission and the impact on residential amenity for neighbours and future occupants of an outbuilding would be assessed at that stage.

8.16 Concerns have been raised by third parties regarding the impact of additional demand for on-street car parking on residential amenity. The proposal includes 1 no. car parking space. In terms of planning policy, this provision is in accordance with the adopted maximum car parking standards. The Highways Authority has not objected to the proposal and has advised that the Local Planning Authority should assess the potential impact on residential amenity resulting from an increase in demand for parking. In this regard, I must take into consideration that the property could be occupied by up to 6 no. persons under permitted development, so only the impact from the additional 2 no. occupants is relevant to my assessment.

8.17 The site is in a highly sustainable location close to the Mill Road District Centre, and to walking, cycling and public transport routes. The management plan states that bikes will be provided for each room and a bike store will be provided in order to encourage cycling, and I have recommended conditions to control this. The future occupants would be individuals. Given the sustainability of the location and the cycling provision, in my opinion, the future occupants are unlikely to be car-dependent. Moreover, the high demand already for on-street parking is only going to dissuade car-owners from moving in in the first place.

8.18 I recognise that Greville Road is subject to on-street parking pressure, including from those parking to use the train station. However, properties along Greville Road have private car parking spaces via a dropped kerb to the front. The proposed scheme would not alter this provision and in my opinion, any resulting demand from the additional 2 no. occupants would not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, access for bin collection or emergency

services, or on cycle and pedestrian safety, particularly compared to the existing or fall-back situation.

b. The suitability of the building or site

8.19 I have considered the suitability of the building in terms of the impact on residential amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and the wider area above. It is also relevant to consider the suitability in terms of the amenity for the future occupants.

8.20 The future occupiers would have access to a large rear garden which would provide an acceptable amount and quality of amenity space. There would be views from the amenity space into the proposed ground floor bedrooms at the rear, and the bin and bike store would be in close proximity to the rear windows. During the course of the application, the ground floor window on the rear elevation was changed from French doors to a smaller window in order to protect the privacy of the future occupants.

8.21 Third parties have raised concerns about the amount and quality of the communal living space, shared facilities and living environment in some of the rooms. The Council has no adopted internal space standards and, in my opinion, there would be no policy justification to refuse the proposal on the basis of internal living environment. Nonetheless, having assessed the layout of the property and the site, I am satisfied that there is enough internal space to accommodate the number of occupiers and provide sufficient communal provision such as a large kitchen/common area. The HMO will also be subject to Licensing under other legislation.

c. The proximity of bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services

8.22 As previously stated, the site is in a highly sustainable location close to the Mill Road District Centre, and to walking, cycling and public transport routes. In my opinion, this is a suitable location in close proximity to the facilities and services that the future occupants are likely to make use of.

8.23 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal meets the tests of policy 5/7 and the principle of development is acceptable. I

have given full consideration to the concerns raised by third parties and have assessed these taking account of the fall-back scenario which is a material consideration that I must give weight to.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.24 In terms of the proposed extensions, the scale and massing is the same as the extensions that have extant consent under reference 16/1841/FUL. This is a material consideration that I must give weight to in the assessment of this application. The fall back situation is that the applicant could implement this consent subject to conditions. It would not be reasonable to recommend refusal on the grounds that the extensions would harm the character of the area. The extensions are in any event relatively modest additions to the property and would result in no visual harm to the street.

8.25 The area at the front of the property would be hardstanding for one car parking space. This is the same as the extant consent and thus would also be acceptable. The bin and bike store is proposed to be located at the rear of the site and would not impact on the street scene.

8.26 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

8.27 I have assessed the impact of the proposed use on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the wider area, and the amenity of the future occupants in the relevant sections above.

8.28 The extensions are subject to an extant consent and the fallback situation is that these could be implemented, subject to conditions. The impact of the extensions on neighbouring properties, in terms of overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking, is the same and thus it would not be reasonable to recommend refusal on these grounds.

8.29 The impact of noise and disturbance during construction could be satisfactorily addressed through a condition to restrict construction hours. The additional conditions to control delivery

hours and for details of piling recommended by the Environmental Health Team were not applied to the extant consent and it would be unreasonable to impose them on this permission bearing in mind the proposals for the extension are unchanged.

8.30 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site, and provides an acceptable living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers. I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 5/7.

Refuse Arrangements

8.31 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which showed a bin store with space for 5 no. bins located at the rear of the site against the western boundary. The Refuse Team has not responded to the consultation, however in my opinion, the capacity would be acceptable. The width of the access would be 1.3m which would allow the bins to pass.

8.32 The HMO management plan states that bins will be taken to the kerb on collection days and brought back. It is not clear whether this would be the responsibility of the tenants or whether this would be handled by a management company. Third parties have raised concern that bins would be left on the highway for long periods if this is the tenants' responsibility. It would be in the tenants' interests for the bins to be taken back to the store following collection. This is similar to many other HMOs within the City.

8.33 Subject to a condition requiring the store to be provided prior to first occupation, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13.

Highway Safety

8.34 Third parties have raised concern about the impact on highway safety from the demand for on-street car parking and from bins left out for collection. The Highways Authority has advised that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety and I accept their advice. The placement of bins on the

highway on collection days is a temporary situation and is common across the City. The management plan states that bins will be returned following collection, so I have no reason to believe that this would have a significant adverse impact on highway safety.

8.35 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Cycle Parking

8.36 The proposal includes a cycle store at the rear of the site with space for 8 no. cycle parking spaces. This is in accordance with the adopted standards. Details of the covered store have been provided and are acceptable. I have recommended a condition for these facilities to be provided prior to first occupation. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Surface water drainage

8.37 The Sustainable Drainage Engineer has recommended a condition for a surface water drainage scheme. As the proposed external works are the same as the extant consent, I have recommended the same condition for the hard standing to be permeable paving, which is reasonable.

Third Party Representations

8.38 I have addressed the third party comments as follows:

Representation	Response
Overbearing and overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties;	The proposed extensions are the same as the extant consent, and thus the impact in this regard is the same and is acceptable.
Permanent loss of a needed family home;	Paragraphs 8.3-8.5.
Over-provision of HMOS, one-bed units and bedsits in Cambridge;	Paragraphs 8.3-8.5.
Likely to be occupied by students for which there is an	The HMO could be occupied by students or non-students.

over-provision in Cambridge;	The provision meets a demand for accommodation for single occupants, including for students.
Scale of development is not appropriate for the location;	The proposed extensions are the same as the extant consent, and thus the impact in this regard is the same and is acceptable.
Overdevelopment of the site;	The proposed extensions are the same as the extant consent, and thus the impact in this regard is the same and is acceptable.
Potential for HMO to be occupied by up to 10 no. people;	I have recommended a condition to limit the number of occupants to 8 no. persons. Occupation for up to 10 no. persons would be in breach of this condition and enforcement action could be taken as appropriate.
No existing HMOs on Greville Road;	Paragraph 8.7
Overconcentration of HMO use in the locality;	Paragraph 8.7
Loss of community with transient occupiers including commuters;	There is no evidence before me that the occupiers of HMOs are less likely to contribute to the community. The HMO management plan includes a minimum tenancy period of 6 months. There is no reason to suggest that a typical occupier such as a young professional would not be respectful to neighbours or not engage in a community-minded way.
Increase in noise to neighbouring properties including through party wall to No. 69 and from access to the bin/bike store;	This is a residential use in planning terms. The HMO management plan include a commitment to insulate the walls. This would be

	enforceable through breach of condition. Noise from access to bin/bike store has been addressed in paragraphs 8.13-8.14.
Anti-social behaviour from future occupants;	Paragraph 8.12
Limited shared amenity space and facilities, including laundry;	Paragraph 8.21
Inadequate kitchen facilities;	Paragraph 8.21
Internal laundry facilities are unlikely to provide adequate facilities;	Paragraph 8.15
Poor quality living environment for future occupants;	Paragraph 8.21
Inadequate headroom and limited natural lighting for second storey front room;	Paragraph 8.21
Fire safety for the future occupants.	This is not a relevant planning matter and would be addressed through separate HMO licensing.
No comment from the Residential Team within Environmental Health;	The HMO would be subject to licensing which is separate from the planning system.
Concerns about management of the HMO particularly if property is sold;	Paragraph 8.10
Outbuilding providing a laundry in the rear garden would be over-development;	Paragraph 8.15
Lack of parking and increased demand for on-street parking, with impact on residential amenity, bin collection, access for emergency services, cycle and pedestrian safety;	Paragraph 8.16-8.18 and 8.34
Future residents are not unlikely to be car users;	Paragraph 8.17
Increase in pollution;	The scale of development compared to the fall-aback situation for a small HMO would not have a significant

	impact in this regard.
Pressure on refuse storage and collection;	Paragraphs 8.31-8.32
Bins put out on the street for collection would impact on pedestrians;	This is a temporary arrangement on bin collection day and would be a similar situation across the City. I do not consider it would have a significant impact on safety or residential amenity.
The management plan is not what has been experienced by local residents at other properties owned by the applicant;	I have recommended a condition for the operation of the HMO to be in accordance with the management plan. Should the Council receive complaints that the operation of the HMO is not in accordance with the management plan, then this could be investigated as a breach of planning condition, and enforcement action taken as appropriate.
Implementation of the management plan in the event that the property is sold;	Paragraph 8.10
Impact of construction on residential amenity;	I have recommended a condition to restrict construction and demolition hours, which is consistent with the previous consent for the extension.
Impact on sewerage network and pressure on utilities shared with No. 73;	This is not a relevant planning consideration.
Negative impact on street scene. Damage to the tree and the loss of the verge, and visual impact of paving the front garden;	The potential damage during construction would be associated with the extension which has planning permission. There was no condition placed on the previous consent for tree protection or landscaping works, so it would not be

	reasonable to recommend such conditions on the current application. I have recommended the same condition as on the previous consent for the extension for the hardstanding to be constructed in permeable paving.
The current application follows consent granted for extensions, and the applicant is 'playing the system', which puts local residents at a disadvantage when commenting on planning applications;	The applicant's approach to the extensions and change of use is not relevant to the assessment of this application, which must be determined on its own merits.
Only the developer will benefit.	This is not a relevant planning consideration.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 I recognise that there are a substantial number of objections to this proposal. I have addressed the third party concerns within my assessment. I must consider the applicant's fall-back situation for a 6 no. person HMO under permitted development and the extant consent for the extensions, which are material considerations.

9.2 In my opinion, it would be very difficult to argue any substantial difference from the impact of the operation of an 8 no. person HMO compared to a 6 no. person HMO in terms of the impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and the wider area. The impact of HMOs – whether a small or large HMO in Use Class terms - largely depends on how the property is managed. The applicant has provided an acceptable HMO management plan which would be controlled through a condition. I am satisfied this gives the Council adequate control over the management of the HMO and the means to take action should there be non-compliance.

9.3 In terms of a key third party concern regarding the impact of additional demand for parking, the Highways Authority has not objected on highway safety grounds. I have assessed the impact on residential amenity taking account of the fallback

situation for a small HMO under permitted development. In my opinion, the accessibility of the location by non-car modes, the nature of the accommodation for single occupant and the existing demand for on-street parking mean it is unlikely that the future occupants are not likely to be car dependent. The parking provision is in accordance with the adopted maximum car parking standards, and in my opinion, this would not be reasonable grounds to recommend refusal.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The property shall be occupied by no more than 8 no. people at any one time.

   Reason: A more intensive use would need to be reassessed in interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 5/7)

4. The property shall operate for the approved use only in accordance with the HMO management plan provided by Croftmead Ltd. submitted in the letter from Don Proctor Ltd. on behalf of the applicant dated 30 May 2017, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and future occupants (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 5/7).

5. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. The area labelled "hardstanding to provide 1 parking space" as shown on drawing no.P02 Rev E shall be constructed in permeable surfacing only.

   Reason: To minimise flood risk (Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)).

7. Prior to first occupation of the property for the use hereby permitted, the cycle parking and bin storage facilities shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be retained thereafter.

   Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/6).

   INFORMATIVE: The use of the property as an HMO may require a licence under the Housing Act 2004. You are advised to contact Housing Standards in Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on 01223 457000 for further advice in this regard.