

## **17 June 2026 JDMC Speaker Statements**

### **#6 – 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 2m<sup>2</sup>), 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.

.....

**#6 – 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow – Kings Meadow Resident**

We write to formally object to the proposed planning application. Our objections are outlined below.

**1. Parking and Traffic**

The property currently provides two parking spaces, which are already fully utilised. An increase in occupancy to eight residents will inevitably generate additional vehicles from occupants and visitors. This will place significant pressure on on-street parking within the cul-de-sac, leading to congestion and inappropriate parking.

The surrounding roads are not designed to accommodate this level of additional parking demand. Overspill parking would obstruct visibility, restrict access for emergency and service vehicles, and interfere with refuse collection. The increased parking stress would also create safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly young children who often play in the streets surrounding 1 Kings Meadow, in what is currently a quiet residential environment.

**2. Impact on Neighbouring Community**

As the immediate neighbouring property, we would be disproportionately affected by the proposed 7-bedroom HMO. The intensity of use associated with multiple occupants would significantly increase day-to-day activity, including noise, movement to and from the property. In a

closely built residential setting, such activity would erode the sense of a stable, family-oriented neighbourhood and harm the living conditions of surrounding residents. Having made a long-term commitment to this home as our “forever home”, the proposal would significantly diminish our ability to enjoy it and adversely affect our residential amenity and quality of life compared with a single-family dwelling. The proposal also conflicts with **Cambridge Local Plan Policy 48**, which states that HMOs will only be supported where they do not cause harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area.

### **3. 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 7-bedroom HMO (sui generis), involving multiple unrelated occupants, directly conflicts with this covenant.

### **4. Increase in Management Costs**

The intensification of use associated with an HMO is likely to increase the need for estate management, maintenance, and enforcement. It would be unreasonable for neighbouring residents to bear additional management fees or costs arising from a development that conflicts with the original terms and intent of the covenant and alters the established residential character of the area.

### **5. Waste Management**

Even with the proposed additional waste storage, an 7-bedroom HMO will generate significantly more waste than a single-family dwelling. There is a risk of overflowing bins, unpleasant odours, obstruction on pavements, and visual clutter, all of which could negatively affect neighbouring properties and the character of the street.

For the reasons outlined above, we strongly urge the council to **refuse this application**. The proposal would materially harm neighbouring residents, conflict with planning policy, and contravene an existing restrictive covenant.

.....