

## **JDMC Delegation meeting 27<sup>th</sup> March 2026**

### **Agenda**

- Time: 9.30am to 10am
- Meeting held: via Teams

**Attendees:** Peter Fane (Chair of Planning Committee (JDMC)), Simon Smart (Vice-Chair of Planning Committee (JDMC)), Michael Sexton (Team Leader), Melissa Reynolds (Senior Planner)

Main issues to consider:

- Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns
- Significant implications for adopted policy
- The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development
- Planning history
- Degree of public involvement

### **Development**

#### **25/04604/FUL – 1 Kings Meadow (Melissa Reynolds)**

Single storey front extension, single storey side and rear extension and first floor side extension to create change of use from residential (Use Class C3) to a large 7bed HMO (sui generis) and associated works.

### **Reason for Inclusion**

Number of objections

Over 5 objections relating to over-intensification of use, harm to residential character and amenity, parking and highway safety risks, inadequate waste servicing arrangements, and the property's conflict with an existing restrictive covenant.

### **Discussion**

The case officer presented the application, highlighting that the site falls within the Cambridge East Area Action Plan boundary, although outside of the Land North of Cherry Hinton Road development, summarising the context of the site, proposed development and the nature of the representations made.

Parking and safety, intensification of use (HMO), noise and disturbance, residential character and community, waste and servicing are all raised as material

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

considerations. Reference to covenants was made for clarity but noted that matter falls outside of the planning remit.

PD rights were removed as part of planning history for extensions to the property, but not to the change of use to an HMO C4 use for example. Neighbouring property has extended in a similar fashion, albeit not as an end use of an HMO.

#### *Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns*

Intensification of use as a 7-bed HMO was noted alongside potential parking pressures and associated amenity impacts, with a requirement to consider relaxing a condition of a recent planning permission to remove permitted development rights and the case precedent this would create. Whilst these were acknowledged as a relevant material planning consideration, they would not give rise to significant planning concerns that would warrant referral in isolation.

#### *Significant implications for adopted policy*

No significant issues of policy arise and would not warrant referral.

#### *The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development*

The proposal is for relatively minor works to an existing house alongside a change of use. Notwithstanding the removal of permitted development rights, the proposal is neither complex or of such a scale or nature to warrant referral.

#### *Planning history*

Notwithstanding the removal of permitted development rights, there is no complex history on this site to warrant referral

#### *Degree of public involvement*

The number of objections received has triggered consideration by the Delegation Panel. 15 objections have been received, which indicates concern has been raised from a more than local segment of the population. This is the first house within the recently constructed scheme to be subject to a change of use application for HMO use. Given the context of the application, the degree of public involvement warrants referral.

## **Decision**

Refer to Planning Committee (JDMC)