



25/04322/FUL – 66 Ross Street, Cambridge, CB1 3BU

Application details

Report to: Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward/parish: Romsey

Proposal: Conversion of existing dwelling to 6 bedroom, 6 persons HMO including single storey rear extension.

Applicant: Mr George Panayiotou

Presenting officer: Lydia Green

Reason presented to committee: Called in by Councillor Pounds, Councillor Gardiner-Smith, and Councillor Baigent; Third party representations.

Member site visit date: N/A

Key issues: 1. Principle of Development

2. Residential Amenity

3. Highway Matters

Recommendation: Refuse

Report contents

Document section	Document heading

1	Executive summary
2	Site description and context
3	The proposal
4	Relevant site history
5	Policy
6	Consultations
7	Third party representations
8	Member representations
9	Assessment
10	Principle of development
11	Design, layout, and scale
12	Heritage assets
13	Biodiversity
14	Water management and flood risk
15	Highway safety and transport
16	Cycle and car parking provision
17	Amenity
18	Third party representations
19	Other matters
20	Planning balance
21	Recommendation
22	Planning conditions

Table 1 Contents of report

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The application seeks the conversion of an existing dwelling to 6-bedroom, 6 persons HMO including single storey rear extension.
- 1.2 The application site falls within the Mill Road and Central Conservation Areas. It is located within Flood Zone (1). There are no other specific site constraints.
- 1.3 Consultees raise no objections subject to conditions.
- 1.4 The proposal is not considered to result in any residential amenity harm or significant harm to the character and appearance of the Mill Road and Central Conservation Areas.
- 1.5 The proposed HMO presents a constrained internal layout, including three bedrooms falling below the Nationally Described Space Standards and limited communal space. While bedroom nos. 5 and 6 are within the existing part of the house, and therefore it is unreasonable to refuse on the standards of these rooms, the proposed bedroom no.3 would be contained in the operational development that is the extension and therefore the amenity for this room is unacceptable. As such, officers

consider the amenity for the future occupier of bedroom no.3 to be unacceptable by virtue of falling below the space standards for this room.

1.6 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

Table 2 Consultee summary

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment	Paragraph Reference
Conservation Officer	No objection	6.1
Environmental Health	No objection	6.2
County Highways Development Management	No objection	6.3
Third Party Representations (29)	Objections	7.1-7.3
Member Representations (3)	Objections	8.1-8.3

2. Site description and context

2.1 No.66 Ross Street is a two-storey terraced dwelling located within a residential setting. The character of the street scene is predominantly two-storey terraced dwellings. The properties along Ross Street are similar in architectural style with a mixture of different brick types and some render.

2.2 The application property is situated within the Mill Road Conservation Area. It is not within the setting of any listed buildings. The site is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). There are no other site-specific constraints.

3. The proposal

3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of an existing dwelling to 6-bedroom, 6 persons HMO including a single storey rear extension.

3.2 The application has been amended to address representations:

- Plan to show submitted location of bin and bike storage.

4. Relevant site history

4.1 There is no relevant site history.

5. Policy

5.1 National policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan 2024-2045 (Regulation 18 Stage Consultation - December 2025 to January 2026)

- 5.2.1 The Regulation 18 Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (the draft 'Joint Local Plan' (JLP)) represents the next stage of preparing a new joint Local Plan for Greater Cambridge. Once it is adopted, it will become the statutory development plan for the Greater Cambridge area, replacing the current (adopted) Local Plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District.
- 5.2.2 Following endorsement by Joint Cabinet in November, the draft JLP will proceed to a formal public consultation (under Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012). This is currently scheduled between 1 December 2025 and 30 January 2026.
- 5.2.3 In line with paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to several factors. The draft JLP is consistent with policies in the current NPPF, but represents an earlier stage of the plan making process. Therefore, at this stage, the draft JLP and its policies can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration in decision making.

5.3 Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
Policy 9: Review of the Local Plan
Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration
Policy 48: Housing in multiple occupation
Policy 55: Responding to context
Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 82: Parking management

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

5.5 Other guidance

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste
Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.6 Area Guidelines

Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6. Consultations

Publicity

Neighbour letters – Y

Site Notice – Y

Press Notice – Y – The application affects a Conservation Area.

Conservation Officer - No Objection

6.1 It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any harm to any heritage assets.

Environmental Health - No Objection

6.2 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the informatives outlined below:

- Housing Health & Safety Rating System;
- Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs);
- Licensing.

County Highways Development Management - No Objection

6.3 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal. The development may impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets.

7. Third party representations

7.1 29 representations have been received, all in objection.

7.2 They have raised the following issues:

- Principle of development

- Character, appearance and scale
- Density and overdevelopment
- Overconcentration of HMOs
- Loss of family homes
- Heritage impacts
- Residential amenity impact (Noise and disturbance, harm to future occupiers, anti-social behaviour)
- Construction impacts
- Highway safety
- Car parking and parking stress
- Cycle parking provision
- Bin storage provision
- Lack of foul water/wastewater drainage strategy
- Biodiversity

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8. Member Representations

8.1 Cllr Pounds has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Parking pressure and the resulting implications for emergency vehicle access; and
- Overconcentration of HMOs.

8.2 Cllr Gardiner-Smith has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Overconcentration of HMOs; and
- Parking pressure and the resulting implications for emergency vehicle access.

8.3 Cllr Baigent has made a representation neither objecting to or supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Public Interest.

9. Assessment

9.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:

- Principle of development
- Design, layout, scale and landscaping
- Heritage assets
- Biodiversity

- Water management and flood risk
- Highway safety and transport impacts
- Car and cycle parking
- Amenity
- Third party representations
- Other matters
- Planning balance
- Recommendation
- Planning conditions

10. Principle of Development

- 10.1 The application seeks permission for the change of use from a dwelling (Class C3) to a 6-bedroom, 6 person HMO (Class C4) with an associated single storey extension to the rear.
- 10.2 Policy 48 of the Local Plan supports the development of HMOs where the proposal:
- a. does not create an over-concentration of such a use in the local area, or cause harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area;*
 - b. the building or site (including any outbuildings) is suitable for use as housing in multiple occupation, with provision made, for example, for appropriate refuse and recycling storage, cycle and car parking and drying areas; and*
 - c. will be accessible to sustainable modes of transport, shops and other local services.*
- 10.3 With regard to part (a), Officers have reviewed the licensing record and planning history, in which the nearest licensable HMO to No.66 is No.59 Ross Street (6 tenants). Therefore, it does not appear that there is an overconcentration of HMO uses within this locality.
- 10.4 It is appreciated that representations raised in objections voice concerns about an intensification of the site, however the development is not considered to lead to excess levels of HMOs within the area leading to substantial impacts in the area.
- 10.5 It is also noted that representations raised in objections refer to there being an overconcentration of HMOs due to a similar planning application for a 6-bedroom, 6 person HMO being submitted at No.10 Ross Street. This application has been withdrawn and therefore cannot be considered when determining the overconcentration of HMOs in the area.

- 10.6 Part (b) of Policy 48 requires consideration of the suitability of the building for the proposed use. As explained in further detail in the residential amenity section of this report, bedroom no.3 falls below the nationally described space standards as defined in Policy 50 of the Local Plan.
- 10.7 It is considered that the proposal is unacceptable in principle due to the conflict with criterion b of Policy 48.

11. Design, layout, and scale

- 11.1 The development proposes a single storey rear extension, which will have a flat roof and a height of approximately 2.8m. The rear extension is projected to project approximately 3.1m from the host dwelling.
- 11.2 As the proposal would result in the creation of a flat roof, Policy 31(f) of the Local Plan requires that all flat roofs are a green or brown roof. This will be ensured by way of condition.
- 11.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would be modest in scale, proportionate to the existing dwelling as a continuation of the existing single storey outrigger, and utilise matching materials. Therefore, Officers consider that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 11.4 The proposal is compliant with Policies 55, 56, and 58 of the Local Plan (2018).

12. Heritage assets

- 12.1 The application falls within the Mill Road Conservation Area. The application is not within the setting of any listed buildings.
- 12.2 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 12.3 Chapter 16 of the NPPF focuses on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
- 12.4 Para. 212 of the NPPF set out that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective

of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Para. 213 states that 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification...'

- 12.5 The proposal would include the addition of a single storey rear extension. Due to the proposed extension's location at the rear of the property and that it is flat roofed and only single storey in nature, Officers do not consider that it would not be visible from the street scene.
- 12.6 The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application. Due to the rear siting of the extension and the utilisation of matching materials to the host dwelling, the Conservation Officer did not object to the proposed works. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that the proposed extension or change of use would materially impact the character of the historic context of Ross Street or the broader Mill Road Conservation Area.
- 12.7 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing and design, would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would not give rise to any harmful impact on the identified heritage assets and is compliant with the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF and policy 61 of the Local Plan.

13. Biodiversity

- 13.1 A representation has raised an objection regarding harm to biodiversity from the loss of garden space. The proposed single storey rear extension is projecting approximately 3.1m in depth and 3.1m in width. Given the small scale of development, Officers do not consider there to be significant harm to the biodiversity of the site from loss of garden space that the development proposes.
- 13.2 The Environmental Act 2021 and the Council's Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This accords with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which seeks to protect and enhance priority species and habitats.

- 13.3 The proposed development is exempt from the requirement to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as it does not impact a priority habitat and affects less than 25 square metres of on-site habitat. In accordance with the relevant exemptions set out in national legislation and guidance, developments that result in the loss or degradation of habitats below this de minimis threshold are not required to demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity. Based on the submitted plans and size of the proposed single storey rear extension, the extent of the habitat affected by the proposal falls below 25 square metres, and the development therefore qualifies for an exemption.
- 13.4 The proposal is compliant with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the Biodiversity SPD (2022).

14. Water management and flood risk

- 14.1 Representations raised in the objections noted that no foul water drainage strategy has been submitted alongside this application. The site falls within Flood Zone 1, indicating a very low risk of flooding, and does not lie within an area of surface water flood risk. Therefore, no flood risk is identified for the site, and any further flood risk assessment is considered unnecessary.
- 14.2 Given the scale of works, it is considered that the matter of connecting to foul water drainage can be adequately dealt with through building regulations.
- 14.3 The proposal is compliant with Policies 31 and 32 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018) subject to conditions.

15. Highway safety and transport impacts

- 15.1 Policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seeks to prioritise sustainable transport. Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact and Paragraph 116 of the NPPF seeks to protect the safety of the public highway.
- 15.2 Policy 82 states that planning permission will not be granted for developments that will be contrary to the parking standards as set out in Appendix L. This will be assessed further in Section 15 of this report.

- 15.3 The site is accessed via Ross Street. There is also a pathway, accessible from St Philip's Road, that runs adjacent to the rear boundary of the site. This allows access to the rear garden of the property via a gate.
- 15.4 The proposed development does not seek to alter the highway in any way. The Local Highway Authority raises no objection to the application with regard to the development's impact on highway safety. The proposal is compliant with Policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

16. Car and cycle provision

Cycle parking

- 16.1 As referenced in Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan, dwellings with up to 6 bedrooms should have five cycle parking spaces.
- 16.2 An amended plan has been submitted showing the location of a cycle store in the rear garden. An example of the type of cycle store, providing up to six bikes (measuring 2.7m x 1.5m) has been shown on this plan. No specific detailed plans have been submitted for this store. A condition will be attached to any consent granted to require submission of further details of the cycle store prior to first use of the HMO.
- 16.3 The Cambridge City Council Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments recommends that for multi-occupancy dwellings cycle stores should be located within 20m of the relevant building entrance. The proposed cycle store shown on the bike and bin store location plan is approximately 27m from the main front entrance of the dwelling. Whilst, this is not in keeping with the 20m requirement, the proposed cycle store is located on the rear boundary of the site, next to the gate that provides access to the site via a pathway off St Philip's Road. Therefore, given the fall-back position of the change of use from a dwelling (C3) to a small HMO (C4) and that the development is not considered to be a new residential development, Officers consider the location of the proposed bike store to be acceptable.
- 16.4 The proposed cycle parking is compliant with Policy 81 and 82 of the Local Plan subject to conditions.

Car Parking

- 16.5 The application site is situated in a highly sustainable location, located close to facilities on Mill Road and within walking and cycling distances to Cambridge Train Station and various bus stops.
- 16.6 As referenced in Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan, dwellings with up to 6 bedrooms (outside of a controlled parking zone) should have no more than a mean of 0.5 spaces per dwelling (maximum of 2 spaces).
- 16.7 The proposal would not provide additional off-street parking.
- 16.8 It is noted that the Highway Authority have highlighted that there may be increased parking competition in the surrounding streets as a result of the change of use from a dwelling to a small HMO.
- 16.9 The site is located within an uncontrolled parking zone. This means that there is no effective means to prevent residents from keeping their car on the local streets. Therefore, any additional demand for car parking is likely to appear on-street in competition with existing residential uses. Consequently, the development may impose additional parking demands on Ross Street and the surrounding streets, which could impact on the residential amenity of the wider area.
- 16.10 The parking capacity of the wider area is not subject to assessment under this application.
- 16.11 Given the sustainable location of the site, it is considered that future occupants of the proposal would not necessarily depend on cars for regular travel. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a significant increased pressure on existing on-street car parking capacity. Again, the change of use from a dwelling (C3) to a small HMO (C4) of up to six persons can be done under permitted development.
- 16.12 The proposed car parking arrangement is compliant with Policy 81 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

17. Amenity

- 17.1 Policies 35, 48, and 58 of the Local Plan seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and/or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing.

Neighbouring properties

Impact on No. 64 Ross Street

17.2 The proposed extension is situated along the southern boundary of the site, shared with No.64, and is proposed to project approximately 3.1m from the host dwelling. The eastern elevation of No.64 has two windows at ground floor level. A site visit was undertaken to No.64 to establish what rooms these windows serve. From the site visit, it was identified that one of these windows serves a toilet and the other serves a bathroom. These are not habitable rooms. Therefore, Officers do not consider there to be any overshadowing or overbearing harm to No.64 from the proposed development.

Impact on No.68 Ross Street

17.3 No.68 Ross Street is situated to the north of the development. A new door and window are proposed on the northern elevation of the existing outrigger, serving the kitchen/lounge area; and a new window is proposed on the northern elevation of the extension, serving bedroom 3. These proposed windows would create a new opportunity for overlooking onto No.68. However, the windows are at ground floor level and Officers consider that the intervening boundary between No.66 and No.68 will stop any direct overlooking onto No.68.

17.4 A site visit has been undertaken. Given the adjacent context, location, size, and design of the proposal it is unlikely to give rise to any significant amenity impacts in terms of overlooking, loss of daylight, enclosure or other environmental impacts. The proposal is compliant with policies 35, 48, and 58 of the Local Plan.

Future Occupants

17.5 The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Bedroom	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of bedroom (m ²)	Difference in size (m ²)
1	1	7.5	7.6	+0.1
2	1	7.5	8.9	+1.4
3	1	7.5	6.2	-1.3
4	1	7.5	9.8	+2.3
5	1	7.5	5.9	-1.6
6	1	7.5	6.0	-1.5

Table 2 Table showing size of residential units in comparison with the policy requirement

- 17.6 As set out in Table 4, three of the proposed bedrooms do not provide the 7.5m² internal floor area required for a single bedroom. Therefore, Bedroom 3, 5, and 6 fail to meet Nationally Described Space Standards and the size requirements outlined in Policy 50 of the Local Plan.
- 17.7 The internal replan of the existing dwelling includes a shared lounge/kitchen area measuring approximately 13.4m². For six occupants this space is considered somewhat limited.
- 17.8 The proposal is for a change of use of a domestic dwelling to a 6-person, 6-bedroom HMO. Based on the floorplans provided, without the extension provided, a change of use to a 5-person, 5-bedroom HMO could occur under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This would include bedroom nos.5 and 6. Therefore, whilst bedroom nos. 4 and 5 are below space standards, because these are not contained within the operation development of the extension, officers do not consider it would be reasonable to refuse the proposal on the amenity of these two rooms.
- 17.9 However, bedroom no.3 would be on the ground-floor and located within the proposed extension which is the operational development. Therefore, officers consider that it is reasonable to apply the space standards set out in Policy 50 of the Local Plan to this room. As set out in table 4 above, this rooms is circa 1.3sqm below the required room size to meet these standards. Officers therefore consider the proposal fails to provide an acceptable living environment for the future occupier of this room.
- 17.10 The external amenity space is approximately 41.9m² which is considered reasonable for a 6 person HMO. The development would benefit from a communal amenity space which would provide space for a table and chairs, outdoor activities, drying washing, circulation space, and bike and bin storage.
- 17.11 Overall, the proposed development is considered to provide a poor quality living environment for the future occupant of bedroom no.3 and as such would be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) and Policies 48, 50 and 58 of the Local Plan (2018).

Construction and environmental health impacts

- 17.12 The Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the proposal and does not raise any objections.
- 17.13 It is noted that representations have been raised in objection to the application, concerning increased comings and goings and amplified noise and disturbance. The proposal site is considered to be well laid out to minimise noise and disturbance, and the entrance faces onto Ross Street so that there is some separation from adjacent occupiers.
- 17.14 The proposed use of the garden by up to six persons is not considered likely to give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance. The property is located within a residential area, where the use of private gardens for domestic leisure and social activities is common. The level of activity associated with a small HMO of this size would be comparable to that of a family dwelling. Therefore, Officers consider that the use of the garden by up to six persons would not introduce a degree of noise or intensity of use that would be out of character with the surrounding residential area or cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 17.15 A representation has been raised in objection to the application regarding anti-social behaviour from future residents. Given that the change of use of the site to a small HMO could take place without the need for planning permission, it is not reasonable to control this by way of a condition. Notwithstanding this, anti-social behaviour is a police matter and if it were to occur it should first be raised with the police.
- 17.16 The level of occupation is not considered to be excessive for this building or location, and as such, the proposal is not considered to lead to substantial harm to surrounding occupiers.

Summary

- 17.17 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours. The associated construction and environmental impacts would be acceptable. Subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with policies 35, 48, 55, 56, and 58 of the Local Plan in terms of impacts on neighbours.

18. Third party representations

- 18.1 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third party comment	Officer response
Building control	<p>Concerns have been raised regarding the building works. A planning permission does not override the requirement for Building Regulations to be obtained which help ensure works are safe, structurally sound, water and fire protected.</p> <p>Building Control Officers have been informally consulted on the application and raised that under building regulations, if the maximum number of people sharing the house is six then the application will be treated as a shared family dwelling. If the number of occupants exceeds 6 then it would be viewed as a commercial premises requiring consultation with the fire service and higher fire safety standards.</p>
Loss of family homes	<p>The loss of a family home as a result of a conversion of a dwelling to an HMO is not in itself a material planning consideration. The planning system regulates the use and development of land in the public interest, and not in the tenure, ownership, or perceived type of occupier of a property. Paragraph 6.23 of the Policy 48 states that proposals for smaller HMOs will be considered in the same way as a proposal for C3 residential use. Therefore, a small HMO is residential in character, and it is the HMO's impact on the wider area (residential amenity harm, parking, overconcentration etc...) that is assessed rather than the impact on the area from the reduction in family homes.</p>

Table 3 Officer response to third party representations

19. Other matters

Bins

- 19.1 An amended plan has been submitted showing the location of a bin store in the rear garden. An example of the type of bin store, providing up to three bins has been shown on this plan. No specific detailed plans have been submitted for this store. A condition will be attached to any consent granted to require submission of further details of the bin store prior to first use of the HMO.
- 19.2 The proposal is compliant with Policies 48, 55, 56 and 58 of the Local Plan.

20. Planning balance

- 20.1 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

Summary of harm

- 20.2 Bedrooms 3, 5, and 6 do not meet the size requirements outlined in Policy 50 of the Local Plan.
- 20.3 The internal replan of the existing dwelling includes a shared lounge/kitchen area approximately 13.4m², which is considered to be limited for six people.
- 20.4 Bedroom 3, being in the operational development of the proposed works, would fall below the space standards set out in Policy 50 of the Local Plan (2018) and provide an unacceptable living environment for the future occupant of this room.

Summary of benefits

- 20.5 The proposed single storey rear extension is small in scale and would not result in any harm to the residential amenity, the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the Mill Road Conservation Area.
- 20.6 The site is in a highly sustainable location, where car-free development is supported as it is not necessary to rely on motorised travel to meet everyday needs.
- 20.7 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

21. Recommendation

- 21.1 **Refuse** for the following reason:

1. The proposed operational development in the form of the single-storey rear extension would create a bedroom (bedroom no.3) that would fall

below the nationally described space standard for a room of the size. It would measure approximately 6.2sqm whereas a 7.5sqm size room is required for a bedroom of this size. As such, the proposal fails to provide an acceptable living environment for the future occupant of this room and the development would be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Policies 48, 50 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).