

15 April Joint Development Management Committee
Speaker Statements

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

We are writing to formally object to the proposed planning application referenced 25/04604/FUL at 1 Kings Meadow, Cambridge, CB1 3FF. As immediate neighbours, we have invested heavily in our home with the intention of making it our forever home. The potential issues highlighted below are deeply concerning and distressing for us:

1. Increase in traffic and parking disruption – With only two allocated parking spaces per property, a 7-bedroom HMO would inevitably create parking overflow and disruption. We already experience parking issues, which would be worsened by this approval.
2. Increase noise, waste, and potential anti-social behaviour – Multiple unrelated occupants could create disturbances affecting neighbours.
3. Loss of privacy and safety – Our garden adjoins the HMO, as a family with a 6-year-old daughter, our privacy and her ability to play safely outside and enjoy the garden would be significantly affected.
4. Increase in management fees – RoseTree Management has highlighted that an HMO would increase service charges, which is unfair to existing residents.
5. Loss of community – This is a small, low-density residential area with only a handful of dwellings. All residents on our road would be affected. Our children play and cycle outside, and the scale of a 7-bedroom HMO is inappropriate for the character and safety of the community.
6. Lack of on-site management – The owner does not intend to live in the HMO and already manages a separate B&B, meaning there would be no one on-site to prevent or manage potential disturbances.

7. Breach of Restrictive Covenant - The property is subject to a restrictive covenant in the Transfer of Part (TP1) restricting its use to a single-family dwelling. The proposed change to an 8-bedroom HMO (sui generis), involving multiple unrelated occupants, directly conflicts with this covenant.

For all of these reasons, we respectfully request that the council refuse this application. This proposal would significantly affect our family's daily life, peace, and enjoyment of our home, which we have worked hard to make a permanent family home.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

We object to the proposed change of use from a single dwelling to a seven-bedroom HMO.

The proposal represents clear over-intensification within a small, private cul-de-sac of single-family homes. The introduction of seven unrelated occupants would result in a materially higher level of activity, including regular comings and goings from residents, visitors, deliveries, and services. This level of activity is incompatible with the existing constrained cul-de-sac environment and would materially harm residential character and amenity.

Parking provision is wholly inadequate. The application relies on a tandem parking arrangement that may be marginally suitable for a single household but is unsuitable for seven unrelated occupants with independent schedules. In practice, this provides only one reliably usable parking space, resulting in a significant shortfall. This will inevitably lead to displaced parking on the surrounding estate roads, increasing congestion in a constrained cul-de-sac environment. This raises clear concerns in relation to highway safety, pedestrian conflict, and obstruction of access routes, including for emergency and refuse vehicles.

The internal layout reinforces concerns of overdevelopment, with a high-density subdivision of a modest dwelling into seven bedrooms within a constrained floor area. The property provides very limited built-in storage (under 2m²), and most bedrooms (Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) are tightly constrained at the lower end of functional size. When furniture and circulation space are considered, these rooms offer limited practical usability, reinforcing the concern that the proposal represents an over-intensive use of the property.

Lastly, it is noted that the properties on this estate are subject to restrictive covenants requiring single-family residential use only, which reinforces the long-established low-density residential character of the area. The proposed change is fundamentally incompatible with the intended and so far prevailing family housing context.

Taken together, the proposal represents over-intensification of use, poor-quality internal living conditions, increased pressure on local parking and access, and unsafe servicing arrangements and harm to residential character.

We therefore respectfully request refusal of the application.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

We're writing to object to this application for the following reasons:

1. Community - we feel that the change of use to an HMO does not match the feel of the neighbourhood. Kings Meadow is all single dwelling family houses (see local planning policy 48).

2. Parking - the property only has 2 parking spots, with a 7 room HMO this will not be enough. There are already parking issues in the neighbourhood, they will be made worse (or impossible) with this application. The additional parked vehicles in the area will make a nearby dangerous corner worse (2 collisions since the estate was built in 2018). The additional parked vehicles could also prevent access for

emergency services such as fire engines to the end of the cul-de-sac (see local planning policy 80, 81 and 82)

3. General disturbance - with 7 individuals coming and going there will be a lot more noise during the day and night as people come and go. Also they will less likely be long term residents, with a high turnover it makes it harder to get to know our neighbours as we currently do. (see local planning policy 48)

4. Bins - there will likely be more bins required and nowhere suitable to store them other than on the street (which will also be full of cars - see point 2). See local planning policy 55 and 56.

5. Restrictive covenant - assuming the contract for 1 Kings Meadow is similar to our own and everyone else on the street, there is a restrictive covenant preventing the use of the property for anything other than a single dwelling.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

We strongly object to the proposed change of use from a single dwellinghouse to a seven-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation.

This proposal would introduce a clearly excessive intensity of occupation into a small private cul-de-sac consisting of single-family homes. A seven-bedroom HMO would generate a materially higher level of activity than a family dwelling, including more frequent resident movement, visitors, deliveries, servicing, refuse collection demands, and associated noise and disturbance. That level of occupation is wholly out of keeping with the established character of this quiet and constrained residential setting and would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

The parking arrangements are plainly inadequate for the scale of occupation proposed. The application relies on a tandem arrangement which may be workable for a single household sharing vehicle movements, but it is not a realistic or effective solution for seven

unrelated occupants with separate routines, working patterns, and transport needs. In practice, tandem parking often reduces usability and is likely to function as only one dependable space. The inevitable consequence will be overspill parking on surrounding estate roads, increasing congestion and creating additional pressure within an already restricted cul-de-sac. This in turn raises legitimate concerns regarding highway safety, pedestrian conflict, and obstruction for refuse and emergency access.

The proposed internal arrangement also demonstrates overdevelopment. A modest family dwelling is being subdivided to provide seven bedrooms within a restricted floor area, resulting in a cramped and poor-quality form of accommodation. Storage provision is extremely limited, with less than 2 square metres of built-in storage across the whole property. In addition, a number of the bedrooms - particularly Rooms 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 - appear to sit at the very lower end of what could reasonably be regarded as functional living space. Once ordinary furniture, storage needs, and circulation space are taken into account, the usability and overall standard of accommodation are significantly compromised. This reinforces the conclusion that the proposal represents an over-intensive and unsuitable use of the building.

It is further noted that the estate has historically been occupied as a low-density family residential environment, and the properties are understood to be subject to restrictive covenants requiring single-family use. While such covenants are a private legal matter, they nevertheless reflect the long-established character and expectations of the area. The proposed HMO use would be fundamentally at odds with that character.

Taken together, the proposal would result in an unsuitably intensive form of occupation, substandard living conditions, increased parking and access pressures, and harm to the residential character and amenity of the cul-de-sac. It is an inappropriate form of development in this location.

For those reasons, we respectfully request that planning application 25/04604/FUL be refused.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

I am writing to formally object to the new planning application for the proposed 7 bed HMO application at 1 Kings Meadow. Several points have been made by me and other neighbours on the application portal, and we are concerned about the impact this proposal would have on our local area.

Firstly, the applicant's property has provision for two off-street parking spaces, which are already fully occupied. The proposed occupation by up to seven residents (and potential partners/guests) would represent a significant increase in parking demand that cannot be accommodated within the site. On-street parking within the development is not permitted, and breaches of this restriction already occur and is causing us significant stress. The introduction of a high-occupancy HMO would be likely to exacerbate this situation, leading to increased unauthorised on-street parking and tension for residents in the development.

Further, the proposed seven-bedroom HMO would represent a significant intensification of residential use when compared with a single-family dwelling. Occupation by multiple unrelated adults is likely to result in increased levels of noise and disturbance throughout the day and evening, arising from differing work patterns, comings and goings, and social activity. The introduction of a high-occupancy, short-term living arrangement is likely to undermine community cohesion and reduce levels of long-term residency. In an established residential area characterised by family housing, such a change would be harmful to the prevailing character of the neighbourhood. Approval of the proposal would also risk a harmful cumulative impact by setting a precedent for further intensification of use that would be inconsistent with the existing residential environment of Kings Meadow.

The proposed use of the property as an HMO appears to be inconsistent with the covenant restricting use to a single dwelling occupied by one family. I appreciate that the enforcement of restrictive covenants is a matter of private law and not for the local planning authority. However, I

understand that it is appropriate for the Council to have regard to whether a proposed development may be incapable of lawful implementation due to existing legal restrictions. I therefore ask that this covenant be noted as part of the consideration of the application.

For the reasons outlined above, I request that you refuse this planning application.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

As a resident of Kings Meadow, I have serious concerns about the proposed change of use from a single-family dwelling to a seven-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

The proposal represents an over-intensive use of a property located within a small and quiet cul-de-sac of family homes. The introduction of seven unrelated occupants would significantly increase levels of activity, including regular movements of residents, visitors, and delivery and service vehicles. This would be out of keeping with the established residential character of the area and would harm the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Parking provision is clearly insufficient. The proposed tandem arrangement may be adequate for a single household but is not suitable for multiple occupants with independent routines. In practice, this is likely to result in a shortfall of usable parking spaces, leading to overspill parking on surrounding roads. This would increase congestion within the cul-de-sac and raise concerns regarding highway safety, pedestrian access, and obstruction for emergency and refuse vehicles.

The internal layout also suggests overdevelopment. Subdividing a modest dwelling into seven bedrooms results in limited living space, minimal storage, and several rooms at the lower end of acceptable size. This raises concerns about the quality and suitability of the accommodation being provided.

Furthermore, the properties within this development are understood to be subject to restrictive covenants requiring single-family use, reflecting the long-established character of the area. The proposed change would be inconsistent with this context.

Overall, the development would lead to over-intensification, inadequate parking, and a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.

I therefore respectfully request that the application be refused.

.....

#4 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident

I am the owner of a Kings Meadow property and I have the following objections regarding the application

- **Noise, waste and potential anti-social behaviour** associated with multiple unrelated occupants living in a single property.
- **Loss of privacy and reduced sense of safety**, particularly as our garden directly adjoins the proposed HMO.
- **Significant increase in traffic and parking disruption**, creating congestion and reducing available spaces for existing residents.
- **Unfair rise in service charges**, as the managing agent has already indicated that an HMO would increase estate management fees for all residents.
- **Inappropriate for the character of the community**, which is a small residential area where children play outside; a 7-bed HMO with no on-site owner oversight risks undermining community cohesion and safety.