

Application Number	18/0454/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd March 2018	Officer	Rob Brereton
Target Date	17th May 2018		
Ward	Kings Hedges		
Site	53 Kings Hedges Road Cambridge CB4 2QE		
Proposal	Change of use of existing dwelling to 9 bedroom large scale HMO. Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and front rooflights following demolition of existing garage.		
Applicant	Lilpop Ltd		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed change of use would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.• The proposed extensions would have an acceptable not have an adverse impact on the streetscene.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 No. 53 is on the southern side of Kings Hedges Road and is a semi-detached 3 bedroom dwellinghouse. It is finished in brick and has a hipped roof. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and made up of single and two storey dwellings. To the rear garden is a garage, shed and hardstanding.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the existing dwelling to 9 bedroom large scale HMO. Part two storey, part single, storey rear extension and hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and front rooflights following demolition of

existing garage.

2.2 During the life of this application the scheme has been amended to:

- Re-orientate the two proposed bedrooms on the second floor, so they are wider in both directions and have more useable space .
- Move the cycle store and refuse store further into the rear garden.
- Additional information was provided in regard to trees on the site.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

No planning history

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 3/14 4/13 5/1 5/2 5/7 8/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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 application form states that there is no change in parking provision within the site, but provides no other details of existing or proposed provision. No layout of parking is shown. The development may 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 Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to conditions limiting construction hours, collections during construction and piling and an informative regarding a House in Multiple Occupation.

Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Officer)

- 6.3 Originally the Tree Officer had reservations about the proposal as it impacted a mature willow tree to the rear. To ensure this tree was not cut down prior to an assessment a temporary Tree Protection Order was placed on it. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment was therefore submitted by the applicant defining its quality as category C2. The Tree Officer then responded stating:

Having assessed the AIA, there are no formal objections to the proposed removal of the willow, subject to suitable replacement. The TPO was served as a precaution to ensure that the willow was a material consideration but I agree with the arboriculturalist's assessment and believe the proposal to replace the tree is pragmatic. If the application is granted consent therefore, please attach two tree replacement conditions and, we will then not confirm the TPO.

Landscaping

- 6.4 No objection to the amended scheme subject to a condition on hard and soft landscaping.

Drainage

- 6.5 No objection subject to a standard condition on sustainable urban drainage systems.

Urban Design

Original plans

- 6.6 Urban Design had some concerns with the original scheme as it considered bedrooms 8 and 9 were insufficient in size and did not comply with the National Technical Housing Standards. The proposed main door of the property, being located on the side elevation was poor design. The proposed location of the cycle storage and refuse storage would impact the occupants of bedroom 3. The side entrance does not appear to meet the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments which states that “the access way should preferably be 1500mm wide or a minimum of 1200mm over a distance of no more than 10m.” The access path is less than 1500mm over a distance of approx. 13m. The entrance to the dwelling on the access path further compounds the tightness of the overall entrance. The side entrance should have a lockable gate to provide a secure location for the cycles in the rear.

Revised plans

- 6.7 The layout of bedrooms 8 and 9 have been rearranged, which creates a more usable space for the occupants. Refuse and cycle stores have been relocated away from the ground floor bedroom, which is acceptable. A secure lockable gate is proposed for the side entrance. Concerns still remain about the legibility of the entrance.
- 6.8 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 owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 64 Kings Hedges Road
- 66 Kings Hedges Road
- 68 Kings Hedges Road
- 70 Kings Hedges Road
- 72 Kings Hedges Road
- 37 Roseford Road (owner of 51 Kings Hedges Road)

The representations can be summarised as follows:

7.2 Noise

- Noise impacts to No. 66 Kings Hedges Road's bedroom window.
- The lack of indoor recreational space would mean that residents are likely to migrate outside, which will cause noise/nuisance.
- Residents do not want to continually contact environmental health, can it be guaranteed noise will not be an issue.
- The proposed amount of occupants will create a detrimental level of noise.

7.3 Bins

- The management of bin collections.
- Overflowing bins may be stored at the front of the property and will create an eyesore.

7.4 Parking

- The lowered kerb was extended several years ago so emergency services could attend the three bungalows with a wheeled stretcher. This would be restricted by the extra vehicles parking there.
- There will only be room for 2 vehicles on the property's driveway leaving up to 7 vehicles with no parking. Since parking has been banned on the grass verges there are rarely any parking spaces along Kings Hedges Road after 6pm, this causes problems for current residents, adding

another 7 cars to the equation will only exacerbate the situation. Regarding the letting manager's comments, can residents be banned from owning cars?

- Having so many vehicles parking in front of this property could create a highway safety issue.
 - The occupants of No. 66 Kings Hedges Road did a parking study at various times. They looked at twenty eight houses either side of 53 looking for spaces:
 - Sunday 10.30 = One space
Tuesday 18.15 = No spaces
Thursday 16.45 = One space
Saturday 15.00 = One space, 17.30 = No spaces
- They conclude any extra vehicles will not find a space to park in this vicinity. I cannot see how this issue can be resolved. This HMO will only bring a lot more parking problems.

7.5 Amenity for future occupiers

- Room sizes are unacceptable for homes.
- Quality of life, the only communal area is a kitchen/diner. This area has two small windows, one which will have no sun apart from early morning, the other just a few feet from a fence. This lack of natural light is not conducive to good mental health. This does not appear to be a suitable area for relaxing in.
- The kitchen area will house two ovens/hobs/sinks for 9 residents - how are they expected to cook an evening meal.
- The kitchen would also appear too small for the number of separate residents trying to store their food, not enough room for sufficient refrigeration.
- Rooms are far too small for university standards and would result in a low mood and loneliness and other problems.

7.6 Overshadowing/overlooking

- The proposed changes to the roof will interfere with No. 51's natural light.
- The development will both overshadow and overlook the rear of the bungalows.

7.7 Building Control Issues

- Currently the property has one bath/shower and one toilet. The proposed plan would increase this number to 9 showers and 9 toilets - how will the current 1930s waste pipe system deal with this amount of sewerage?
- There is only one main/fire exit on the side of the property for 9 residents. This main/fire exit is accessed by two of the rooms through the kitchen - the most likely place for a fire to start.
- It is not clear whether the proposed materials of the rear extension will be in keeping.
- The occupants of bedrooms 8 and 9 would be un-safe in a fire.
- The current power supply will not be powerful enough for the number of residents proposed.
- Water supply will have to be increased.
- The construction of number 53 is timber and asbestos. Under health and safety law, this cannot be disturbed in any way as it would allow particles into the air.

7.8 Management

- How can the letting company control that residents cannot have guest.
- Will the owners of this property manage the HMO or will managing agents?
- It is not clear whether the occupants of the proposed HMO would be students, professionals or families staying at the property.
- The future occupants of these type of units may bring anti-social behavior to this location.
- As residents do not have adequate facilities in the kitchen, appliances may be used in the bedroom creating a fire risk.

7.9 Out of character

- The proposed rooflights facing the street are out of keeping.
- The occupants of these proposed units will conflict with the elderly/more vulnerable individuals that live in the nearby bungalows.

- The HMO is occupied by single people only the character of the area will change to the detriment of the majority.

7.10 Creating a precedent

- This proposal will create an unacceptable precedent.

7.11 Impact on the willow tree

- The proposed rear extension will damage the roots of the lovely mature willow tree.
- The willow to the rear deserves protection and it would be unthinkable to approve the destruction of such a well-established specimen.
- With regards to the willow tree and the report from OMC associates, the report clearly states in section 4.2.1 that 'The proposed scheme does not necessitate the removal of the willow'. However it then goes on to say 'though removal and replacement with three new trees set further down the garden would be a far better longer term solution'. Why is a solution needed when the report has already stated that the tree does not need to be removed? Also contact was made with OMC associates to advise that their surveyor had made an error when stating the age of the willow tree and we were given an apology and assured that a revised report would be sent.

7.12 Miscellaneous

- The proposal will devalue property values.

7.13 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:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and impact on heritage assets

3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations

Principle of Development

- 8.2 This area of Kings Hedges Road is a mainly residential in nature comprising semi-detached and terrace family dwellings. This house in multiple occupation (HMO) would offer an alternative type of accommodation along this street which would help meet the needs of a diverse and mixed community.
- 8.3 Policy 5/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) supports the additional of new HMOs and states that the development of properties for multiple occupation will be permitted subject to the potential impact (A) on the residential amenity of the local area, (B) the suitability of the building or site (C) and the proximity of bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services. These impacts will be assessed in the paragraphs below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 As part of the proposed change of use a part two storey side/rear extension as well as a single storey rear extension. A rear box dormer is also proposed. The two storey side extension would be visible from the streetscene. It has the same ridge and eaves height as the existing property but converts the side elevation of the roof from hipped to gable ended. As this is a common type of extension in this location and the width of the extension is only 1.2 metres I consider it will have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the streetscene and the character of the dwellinghouse.
- 8.5 The proposed dormer is similar scale to that allowed under permitted development rights. However, as it extends over the proposed side extension it does require planning permission. Again, this is a common type of addition to a residential dwellinghouse in this location and subject to a condition requesting a sample of its cladding I consider its design, appearance and form in keeping with the existing dwelling.

- 8.6 The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible from the streetscene and is considered in keeping with the character of the dwellinghouse.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 5/7.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.8 The proposed single storey extension adjoins the boundary with No. 51 Kings Hedges Road. The eaves height adjoin this boundary is 2.2 metres. As per BRE guidance a 45 degree angled plane was taken from this eaves line. This plane cut below the centre point of No. 51's dining/sitting ground floor window nearest the shared boundary. It is therefore considered the loss of daylight to No. 51's habitable rooms will be acceptable. A detrimental level of enclosure is not envisaged to this neighbours garden from this single storey extension as permitted development would allow a boundary fence to be 2 metres in height. The proposed two storey extension at 7.8 metre away from the boundary is considered a sufficient distance away to dispel any overshadowing impacts.
- 8.9 The proposed two storey extension is indented 1.4 metres from the boundary with No. 3 Campkin Road which is a single storey bungalow. The side elevation of this bungalow is indented nearly 3 metres from the shared boundary with No. 53 Kings Hedges Road. There are 4 openings within this elevation facing the proposed extension. Two are doorways; one is a bathroom window and the other a hallway window. As these windows are associated with non-habitable rooms BRE guidance indicates loss of light is acceptable. I also consider loss of outlook from these non-habitable rooms is acceptable. The proposed two storey extension does not extend past the rear elevation of No. 3, therefore no detrimental overshadowing impacts are envisaged to the rear garden of this neighbouring property.
- 8.10 The HMO will increase the number of occupiers living at the property and the number of people coming and going which could increase noise levels. The Environmental Health Team does not consider that this proposed change of use to a large HMO will create a significant additional detrimental level of noise

impact to neighbours. I agree with this assessment. The day to day running of the HMO is not assessed under planning but both the landlord and tenants have a responsibility to be neighbourly under other legislation and an informative will be added to remind the applicant of their responsibilities. But as there is some local concern and to ensure the management of this HMO would be of a high standard, a management plan condition is recommended. The planning statement states clearly this proposal will have 9 occupants and I have recommended that a condition be added to ensure this. A construction hours condition will also be added to ensure that any disruption is minimised.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.11 The outlook for the majority of windows proposed is acceptable. However the window opening into bedroom No. 3 was less than satisfactory. This ground floor window will face the proposed bin store and the rear garden. The location of this bin store has been amended so that now it is over 8 metres away. I therefore consider this window now has an acceptable outlook. Both bedroom windows of Nos. 2 and 3 will be overlooked by those using the garden or bin/bike store. I consider this inter-looking acceptable in this HMO circumstance.
- 8.12 The agent has taken some of Urban Designs initial comments into account when amending the scheme re-organising the layout of bedrooms 8 and 9 and adding a lockable gate to the side passage. I note that Urban Design have stated the scheme does not comply with national space standards. *The Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard by the Department for Communities and Local Government dated March 2015* do not relate to HMO development, this instead is monitored by other legislation outside of the planning process, mainly the *Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (England) Regulations 2006*. I consider therefore that the layout of room 8 and 9 are acceptable and would offer an adequate amount of internal amenity space.
- 8.13 The large amenity space to the rear of this property is considered sufficient to meet the reasonable expectations of the 9 occupiers even with some of the area being taken up by bin and cycle stores. To ensure this amenity is of a high quality a hard and soft landscaping condition is recommended.

- 8.14 In my opinion therefore the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 4/13 and 5/7.

Refuse Storage

- 8.15 Bins would be housed in a secure store, located 8 metres from the rear of the house. The bin provision is sufficient for a 9 bed HMO. The location of the proposed bin store was amended to be located further away from the rear facing window of bedroom 3. I now consider the impact to the occupants of this room will be acceptable. Whilst this bin store adjoins the boundary with No. 3 Campkin Road as this property has an outbuilding adjoining the boundary no detrimental impacts are envisaged. The additional bins would need to be taken to the kerbside for collection. However it is considered that this will not cause undue disturbance to neighbours once they are managed correctly.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 4/13.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.17 There are no envisaged detrimental impacts to highway safety. The Highway Authority have raised concern regarding the potential for the application to increase on-street parking, although they state this is an amenity rather than highway safety issue. A number of local residents have concerns that this proposal with just one car parking space will have an adverse impact on the limited on street parking situation. There are no parking standards for HMOs in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and the City Council promotes lower levels of private car parking particularly where good transport accessibility exists. Part C of policy 5/7 state that HMOs should be permitted if they are located in buildings with good proximity to bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services. The subject building is located close to Milton Road which has excellent transport links to the city centre and contains many shops/services. Cycle storage would also be covered and secure and 10 cycle spaces would be provided in a building alongside the bin store in the rear garden. The side passage is currently 1.4 metres wide, whilst 1.5 metres is the recommended width to allow cycles to be wheeled through

easily. Given the width of the passage cannot be altered, I consider this width on balance to be acceptable in this instance.

- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal, in these circumstances, is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/2, 8/6 and 8/10.

Impact on Trees

- 8.19 Initially as there were no Tree Protection Orders (TPO) and the site is not within a Conservation Area all trees on site could be removed without first obtaining permission from the Streets and Open Spaces Team. After I went on site and concern was voiced from residents, a temporary TPO was put on the mature Willow located to the rear of No. 53 Kings Hedges Road and visible from the streetscene. This was because there were concerns this tree may have been felled prior to a full Arboricultural Impacts Assessment (AIA) being undertaken and submitted as part of this application. The Tree Officer was satisfied with the AIA by OMC Associates and stated:

Having assessed the AIA, there are no formal objections to the proposed removal of the willow, subject to suitable replacement. The TPO was served as a precaution to ensure that the willow was a material consideration but I agree with the arboriculturalist's assessment and believe the proposal to replace the tree is pragmatic. If the application is granted consent therefore, please attach two tree replacement conditions and, we will then not confirm the TPO.

I note neighbours have concerns regarding the accuracy of this report as the Willows age is incorrectly quoted. The consultants whom wrote this report accept this inaccuracy stating:

Yes a neighbour called on 1 June informing me that the tree is at least 70-80 years of age based on local testimony. I'm happy to accept this since willows after about 40 odd years develop fissured/textured bark and estimating age can be difficult, especially when chopped about like this one has been. The species is relatively short lived so if its 80 years old, it has, actually, a somewhat reduced life expectancy.

8.20 I am therefore satisfied the loss of this tree has been thoroughly assessed and accept the recommendation of two conditions relating to replanting.

8.21 Third Party Representations

The concerns quoted below relate to the subheadings in paragraph 7.2.

Concern	Response
Noise	See paragraph 8.10
Bins	See paragraph 8.15
Parking	See paragraphs 8.17 and 8.18
Amenity for future occupiers	See paragraphs 8.11 to 8.14
Overshadowing and overlooking	See paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9
Building Control Issues	These are not issues which are assessed in the planning process, but are assessed by Building Control prior to commencement, if this application is approved by the planning committee. The proposal would address all sanitary and drainage issues through Building Regulations
Management	See paragraph 8.10
Out of character	See paragraphs 8.4 to 8.7
Creating a precedent	Each planning application is examined on its own merits.
Impact of the Willow tree	See paragraph 8.19 and 8.20
Impact on property values	This is not a valid consideration for determining a planning application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In conclusion the proposal as amended would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties and future occupants and no detrimental impacts are envisaged to the streetscene by the proposed extensions.

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. 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).

4. The House of Multiple Occupation hereby permitted shall have a maximum of 9 occupants.

Reason: In the interests of the neighbours' residential amenities and to accord with policies 3/7, 5/7 and 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

5. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14).

6. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12).

7. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

8. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 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).

9. No works to any trees shall be carried out until the local planning authority has received and approved in writing the full details of the planting of two replacement trees including species, size, location and approximate date of planting.

Reason: To require replacement trees to be approved, planted and subsequently protected, to ensure continuity of tree cover in the interest of visual amenity.

10. Trees will be planted in accordance with the approved planting proposal. If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, replacement trees are removed, uprooted, destroyed or die another tree of the same size and species shall be planted at the same place, or in accordance with any variation for which the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent.

Reason: To require replacement trees to be approved, planted and subsequently protected, to ensure continuity of tree cover in the interest of visual amenity.

11. Prior to the first occupation of development, full details of the refuse layout/bin provision and cycle shelter shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate bin and cycle storage is provided (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7).

12. Prior to the occupation of the building, a management plan for the property shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall include details of: who will be managing the property; external display of contact information for on-site management issues and emergencies for members of the public; how issues will be addressed; how external spaces/functional provisions will be managed (lawns, bins, bikes etc.); and what new tenant guidance will be issued re: acceptable standards of behaviour/use of the premises including bin storage etc. The management of the property shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure the use of the property does not adversely impact the amenity of adjacent residents (Cambridge Local Plan policies 5/7 and 4/13).

INFORMATIVE: The Housing Act 2004 introduced the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

Further information may be found here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/housing-health-and-safety-rating-system>

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.