

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 7 JANUARY 2026**

### **Amendment/De-brief Sheet**

Circulation:	First	Item:	5
Reference Number:	25/02643/FUL		
Address:	Castle End Mission		
Determination Date:	-		
To Note:	<p>Summary of Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Additional third party comment;</li><li>- Amendment to wording of reason for refusal 1.</li></ul>		
Amendments to Text:	<p>Third Party Comment Received which raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Impact on No.4 Pound Hill;</li><li>-Loss of Iron Hall;</li><li>-Poor Design and Overdevelopment;</li><li>-Parking;</li><li>-Increased noise and traffic</li></ul> <p>A third party comment was received on 2nd January after the report was published. This was from a previous objector and whilst summarised here, the comment raises no additional concerns. The comments were made public on 5th January</p>		
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	<p>Wording to reason for refusal one amended to state (changes underlined):</p> <p>The proposed development, by reason of the demolition of the 'Iron Hall' would result in the total loss and significant harm to the non-designated heritage asset and would result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial harm' to the retained elements of the Building of Local Interest and the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. In addition, the proposed first floor extension to the gym building would result in a low level of 'less than substantial harm' to the retained elements of the Building of Local Interest and the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. Subsequently, the cumulative impact of the proposal on the conservation area and non-designated heritage assets <u>would be a moderate level of 'less than substantial' harm</u>. The harm to the designated and non-designated heritage assets has not been fully</p>		

	justified and the identified benefits do not outweigh the identified harm. The application is therefore contrary to Policies 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and paragraphs 212, 213, 215 and 216 of the NPPF (2024).
<b>Decision:</b>	

Circulation:	First	Item:	<b>6</b>
Reference Number:	25/04141/S73		
Address:	639 Newmarket Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB5 8WL		
Determination Date:	23/01/2026		
To Note:	<p>An amended Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) was submitted, dated 23 December 2025.</p> <p>The applicant has requested that the application be determined based on the submitted plans and supporting documentation, including the updated NIA, without further amendment or being withdrawn and re-submitted.</p>		
Amendments to Text:	<p><b>Paras. 6.4-6.12 (Environmental Health comments):</b> Due to the timing of the receipt of the amended NIA, the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has not had an opportunity to review it or comment. A verbal update will be provided to Members, and the relevant officer will attend the meeting to answer any relevant queries they may have.</p> <p><b>Paras. 10.6-10.11 (Highway Safety and Transport Impacts):</b></p> <p>The amended NIA states: 'For the proposed hours, it is estimated that the majority of customers will use the drive-thru' (para 7.2.3). At 6.2 it notes that, based on existing customer counts during 2024, the average number of customers between 07:00-08:00 hours was 68. It goes to add: 'No prediction for the number of hypothetical customers between 06:00 hrs and 07:00 hrs has been received, and so a fair assumption for a worst-case is that it will be no greater than the following hour (patterns of McDonalds trade reliably inform the hour between 07:00 hrs – 08:00 hrs is busier than between 06:00 hrs and 07:00 hrs)'.</p> <p>Based on this, officers have taken that the worst-case trip generation between 06:00-07:00 hours to be 68 cars – over one car per minute.</p> <p><b>Paras. 10.12-11.4 (Amenity):</b></p>		

The main form of noise mitigation proposed is a 3m high noise barrier for the full length of the northern and eastern boundaries and along the site's southern frontage to Newmarket Road. Officers are concerned about the deliverability of this barrier for the reasons set out below:

- There are trees within and adjacent to the site that have potential to be impacted. No details of the trees or the construction method for the barrier have been provided. It would be a large in form and mass and foundations are likely to be substantial in order to build it, potentially impacting on tree roots but also branches currently overhanging the top of the existing acoustic fence. The trees provide a screening between the commercial site and its residential interfaces and are of amenity and character value.
- At 3m high, the barrier in the indicative location proposed would have an overbearing and visually dominant impact on the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers and cause light loss from overshadowing of the private outdoor amenity area to the north of the site and residence at 641 Newmarket Road.
- A 3m high noise barrier would be detrimental to the openness of the area and domestic setting by enclosing it with an unusually high and solid boundary treatment to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

Officers remain unconvinced that a noise barrier can be delivered without causing significant harm.

**Para. 11.1:**

The report states 'The installation of a noise barrier would require planning permission in its own right, as it falls outside of the description of development approved under application ref. C/00/0222/FP'. The agent has indicated that they consider this to be incorrect. Officers have suggested that alternative options are available, which would be to include the full details of this primary mitigation measure within a revised Section 73 application which could seek to vary condition 11 and / or seek to add an additional condition to require compliance with the new barrier details (in the event the details of the noise barrier and its justification were acceptable).

Officers remain concerned, however, that such an application would not be supported and that such

conditions would not meet the six tests for planning conditions, as it may render the permission unimplementable if the barrier cannot be satisfactorily detailed to overcome noise, amenity, tree and character issues.

**Para. 11.3:**

Officers note that detail of the indicative position of a 3m high noise barrier has been shown at Figure 9 of the amended NIA. This would extend the full length of the northern and eastern boundaries and along the site's southern frontage to Newmarket Road. This is not a detailed plan and, due to it being overlaid on an aerial photograph and not to scale, is considered indicative only.

**Planning Balance:**

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**

No confidence can be drawn from the proposal that trees within and adjacent to the site would not be harmed by the proposal to install a noise barrier.

At 3m, in its indicative location, the barrier would have an overbearing and visually dominant impact on the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers and cause light loss from overshadowing of the private outdoor amenity area to the north of the site and residence at 641 Newmarket Road.

The area is characterised by open frontages, domestic height boundaries and is largely residential. The proposed 3m barrier would result in an unusually high and solid boundary treatment to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Without mitigation, neighbours would suffer noise and light pollution during the nighttime hours.

It has not been demonstrated that harm would not arise from additional external artificial lighting during the extended (nighttime) hours on local residential quality of life / amenity. These impacts have not been sufficiently assessed.

	<p>Summary of benefits</p> <p>The extension of operating hours for the restaurant would create additional employment positions and additional working hours for existing employees at the site. These positions help to reduce unemployment and increase earnings and disposable income which benefit other businesses.</p> <p>The increased hours will enable the restaurant to better meet the demands of customers and allow more opportunities to generate sales leading to increased revenue, which will contribute to the local economy.</p> <p><i>Overall</i></p> <p>It is clear from third party representations that the existing operation of McDonalds has given rise to a range of amenity issues for neighbouring residents and that, because of the proximity of residential neighbours to the site, particularly the drive-thru element, any increase in opening hours is likely to be perceived as harmful. Having considered the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm that is likely to arise from the proposal.</p>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	<p>Additional reason for refusal:</p> <p>The lack of detailed plans and supporting evidence for the proposed acoustic barrier means it has not been fully possible to ascertain whether the necessary noise mitigation can be achieved without adverse harm to neighbouring residential amenity, the character of the area, and existing trees. The proposal is contrary to policies 1, 34, 35, 55, 56, 59 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010) and Trees and Development Sites SPD (2009), NPPF (2024) and NPPG.</p>
<b>Decision:</b>	

Circulation:	First	Item: <b>7</b>	
Reference Number:	25/02888/FUL: Demolition of existing Synagogue and Jewish Community facility and erection of a new Synagogue and Jewish Community facility including		

	parking spaces, new cycle storage, landscaping and associated infrastructure works.
Address:	Jewish Synagogue, 3 Thompsons Lane, Cambridge
Determination Date:	-
To Note:	<p>Summary of amendment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Para 2.3, 10.92 and 10.93 amended to replace reference to CVSPA Building with Discovery House Building (no.5 Thompsons Lane).</li> <li>- Condition 23 amended to include reference to approved document.</li> <li>- Condition 6 amended to include reference to amended NIA.</li> <li>- Condition 20 amended to include reference to religious festival of sukkot.</li> <li>- Clarification outlined where required.</li> <li>- No amendments considered to alter officer recommendation or facilitate need for further consultation with Third Party (technical changes).</li> </ul>
Amendments to Text:	<p>Para 2.3 now states:</p> <p>North of the site consists of an educational facility operated by Discovery House, an educational institution based in the United States. The building is currently under renovation and alteration to be a study and seminar centre for post-graduate students. Further north of the site consists of a four-storey student apartment complex and Bishop Bateman Court, which fronts the corner of Thompsons Lane and New Park Street.</p> <p>Para 2.3 clarification:</p> <p>This amendment is not considered to alter the officer assessment, given the prevailing use of the building remains as an adult education facility.</p> <p>Amended Para's 10.92-10.93</p> <p>10.92 - Concerns have been raised regarding the absence of the Discovery House building (no.5 Thompsons Lane) from the applicant's daylight/sunlight</p>

	<p>assessment, however, the CVSPA building does not constitute a residential building and so it is not common practice to require full daylight/sunlight assessments to be conducted.</p> <p>10.93 - The Discovery House building (no.5 Thompsons Lane) is situated to the north of the application site. The first-floor rooms constitute a mezzanine/study space with small rear facing windows, 1 front facing window and rooflights. It is considered that the rooflights are the primary source of light for this room, furthermore, neither the rear or front facing windows are affected by the proposed scheme. A 25- and 45-degree rule of thumb assessment as outlined in BRE guidance was undertaken, and neither the front facing windows (at ground floor and first floor) or the rear facing windows at second floor were breached by the proposed development. Therefore, the development is not considered to allow for adverse impacts to the Discovery House building (no.5 Thompsons Lane) concerning loss of light.</p>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	<p>Amended Condition 6:</p> <p>The development shall be delivered and maintained strictly in accordance with the submitted Noise Impact Assessment: AS11989.250716.NIA.5 (received 19/12/2025).</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of protecting the amenity of neighbouring properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)</p> <p>Clarification conditions 6/7:</p> <p>Condition 6 is required to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted noise impact assessment, which pertains to noise levels associated with the completed development. The noise impact assessment associated with condition 6 is for matters such as plant, on site events, and use of amplified sound during the use of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Condition 7 requires the submission of a noise impact assessment for matters associated with demolition and construction, to ensure neighbouring amenity is not adversely affected throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Amended condition 20:</p>

	<p>The openable roof shall always remain closed outside the hours of 8am-9pm (except during the celebration of the sukkot festival).</p> <p>The playing of amplified music, acoustic instruments or amplified sound will be strictly prohibited at times when the roof form is open.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of protecting the amenity of neighbouring occupiers from noise (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)</p> <p>Amended Condition 23: 23 – Ecology (Compliance)</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of the development, the ecological mitigation shall be carried out in full in accordance with the details contained within: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Root Assessment - MKA Ecology, MKA ECOLOGY LTD - 84719 JEWISH STUDENT CENTRE, CAMBRIDGE - BAT EMERGENCE SURVEY 1.0. The ecological measures shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the Development.</p> <p>Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 57, 59 and 70) Clarification conditions 23/24:</p> <p>Condition 23 is associated with ecological mitigation (i.e. preventing harm to existing wildlife).</p> <p>Condition 24 is required to ensure ecological enhancements can be provided on site (i.e. bird/bat boxes, hedgehog holes)</p>
<b>Decision:</b>	