

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 4 Feb 2026

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

Circulation:	First	Item:	8
Reference Number:	25/02660/S73		
Address:	Unit 5 and 6 Christs Lane Cambridge		
Determination Date:	06.02.2026		
To Note:	<p>Additional representations have been received in advance of planning committee from four third party occupiers, these are summarised and addressed below.</p> <p>In addition, a representation has been received from the residents at Christ's Lane and Christs Lane Action Group. Their points can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>The representations comments on the executive summary within the report and suggests that this part of the report does not engage sufficiently with Policy 35.</p> <p>The summary section of the report reflects a concise summary of the full detailed report that is in the following pages of the report.</p> <p>To summarise, policy 35 outlines that development will be permitted where (a) it would not lead to significant adverse impacts to health and quality of life/ amenity from noise and vibration and (b) adverse impacts can be minimised and/or mitigated through planning conditions/ obligation.</p> <p>The report sets out that the proposal would not lead to adverse impacts to amenity due to the existing noise climate. To explain, the proposed noise sources would not be significant over and above the existing sources of noise within the Drummer Street Bus Station and therefore cannot be considered significantly harmful to amenity and therefore the proposal would not conflict with Policy 35.</p> <p>The representation also questions the need for the alteration to delivery hours and suggest this should not override the requirement to protect amenity. It is not</p>		

Officers suggestion that the need should override amenity impacts, instead the report sets out that there is policy support for supporting the viability of a business, and the proposal would not result adverse amenity impacts and therefore would comply with policies 10 and 35.

The representations also question the examination of the Applicant's noise assessment. The Environmental Health Officer explains within their comments that a BS4142-type survey is submitted within the original noise assessment which did demonstrate the potential for adverse noise impacts due to noise levels at one of the closest facades (Emmanuel College) from a delivery vehicle manoeuvring close to the windows. They go on to explain, however that the BS4142 survey places significant weighting on context and a judgement is to be made on whether commercial noise would significantly alter the noise climate when considering the nature and characteristic of the noise source. The Officer explains that the typical Sunday sees between 160 and 210 bus departures so those living in this area are already exposed to significant noise and disturbance from the movement of heavy duty vehicles passing close to their windows. As such, the noise impacts within this context would not lead to adverse amenity impacts.

In regard to point 3.2, the Environmental Health Officer has explained in their comments that they believe the Christs Lane flats will not be exposed to significantly different noise levels compared to the nearby college windows. The Environmental Health Team requirements for noise assessment are that the applicant assess to the nearest noise sensitive receptor location, and they have correctly applied this approach.

At point 3.3, the representation raises concerns that the proposal does not cap the number of deliveries. Officers will consider the imposition of an additional condition to limit the vehicular numbers, this can be considered as part of the Planning Committee meeting.

In addition, the representations request additional restrictions to prevent clustering, control vehicle size/ type, restrict manoeuvres, secure quiet operational standards and secure shielding and mitigation. As set out within the report, the original consent contains conditions to limit deliveries to the delivery bay and limit the size of delivery

vehicles. In addition, it is set out within the noise response that conditions were attached to ensure noise insulation would be installed around the residential envelope to protect them from external noise sources.

Officers will consider the imposition of an additional condition to limit the number of vehicles on Sundays, Bank Holidays and other public holidays to help to reduce the potential for noise disruption. The additional operations would follow the operation of the existing deliveries Monday-Saturday, however noting the concerns raised, an operational management plan condition could be added to ensure that equipment procedures would aim to keep disruption to a minimum and that deliveries can be appropriately managed throughout the day. The physical mitigation/ shielding is already in place and therefore it is not considered that an additional condition would be required in this regard.

The representation also raises questions about the consideration of the enclosed bay. The Environmental Health Officer explains that the noise assessment within the original application would have ensured the delivery bay was suitable for use Monday – Saturday. The additional deliveries on Sundays, Bank Holidays and other public holidays would therefore be mitigated in the same manner, and therefore would not be considered to result in significant adverse noise impacts above the other operational days.

The representation raises concerns about future units following suit. This application cannot prejudice or determine other applications which may come forward, each application would need to be assessed on its own merits and any future application would also be subject to a separate noise and amenity assessment. The condition is specific to Units 5 and 6 and therefore this change relates to these units only.

It is noted that the representations make reference to paragraph 198 of the NPPF (2024) which include the consideration of cumulative impacts on matters such as noise. Officers suggest that the proposal, taking account of the existing noise climate in this light would not adversely impact residential occupiers in a cumulative manner.

	<p>The representation raises additional concerns about the impact to the Conservation Area, they correctly outline that the Conservation Officer has no objection. The Conservation Officer does not just consider physical/ fabric harm, but would consider the character and appearance of the Conservation Area including its special historic interest in full. Officers have had regard for the special attention set out in Section 72 of the LBCA 1990 and Policy 61 of the Local Plan (2018), and remain of the position that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would result from the proposal. The concerns raise activity and tranquillity, however the application would not introduce deliveries to Christ's Lane and a condition is attached to ensure this. The deliveries would be only through the rear delivery bay in an environment of existing heavy vehicle movements.</p> <p>The representations set out their own planning balance, Officers remain of the position that the proposal complies with the Local Plan (2018) and should be approved subject to conditions. The representations suggest there is conflict without benefit/ justification and therefore recommend that the application be refused.</p>
Amendments to Text:	Paragraph 10.9 should be updated to reflect the condition wording set out at Condition 5 to be specific to units 5 and 6 only.
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	N/A
Decision:	Approve