

Exhibit S24_2: CLAG's transcript extract of the Council's webcast of its Planning Committee of 29 October 2025 on application 25/02161/FUL, the case officer's words on the daylight study, on the loss of light and on the public benefits, and two members' words on the benefits (the committee record)

Application 26/02109/FUL: Christ's College Library, St Andrew's Street, Cambridge. Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG). Exhibit S24_2, 25 September 2026. Filed with CLAG's design and development plan paper, which cites it as "the committee record" by entry number; CLAG's alternatives, justification and public benefits paper and CLAG's case officer letter cite it by the same name.

To: planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org and PlanningComments@greatercambridgeplanning.org, for the attention of Dominic Bush (case officer); copy Vanessa Blane (Senior Planning Lawyer, 3C Shared Services) and legal@3csharedservices.org.

From: Christ's Lane Action Group (residents@christs-lane.com).

Filed Friday 25 September 2026.

1. The record and the conventions

1. The recording is the Council's published webcast of its Planning Committee of 29 October 2025, at which application 25/02161/FUL was determined. CLAG holds a copy downloaded on 30 October 2025, which runs 7 hours 45 minutes. The places given below are hours, minutes and seconds in that copy.
2. The words are transcribed by CLAG from the recording. Fillers ("um", "uh") and false starts are left out. Place names are written in their standard spelling ("Christ's Lane", "Bradwell's Court", "the Bodley Library"). Where a word is not clear on the recording, the entry marks the gap with an ellipsis and quotes nothing for it. Nothing else is changed, and every quotation in the papers named above is taken from the words below.
3. Officers are identified by office and members of the committee are not named. The document on the screen during entries 1 to 3 is the applicant's "Christ's Lane Daylight Study", which is document 9439767 on the register of application 26/02109/FUL: three pages of perspective images along the lane at 09.00, 12.00, 15.00 and 18.00 on the summer solstice, the spring equinox and the winter solstice, in two rows headed "EXISTING" and "PROPOSED".

2. The entries

1. At 2:56:16. The case officer, answering a member of the committee on the daylight study, with the summer solstice page of the study on the screen: "So a daylight study has been provided for Christ's Lane during the process of the application, showing the impact during summer solstice, spring equinox and winter solstice." The officer then said that the page showed the summer, with the existing condition along the top row and the proposed along the bottom row.
2. At 2:56:41. The case officer, on the same page, after saying that the Bradwell's Court building on the opposite side of the lane is predominantly to the south of the site: "this is

the main factor that overshadows Christ's Lane itself. But it's acknowledged that the proposed library shown here does have an impact, especially within this six o'clock image here."

3. At 2:57:00. The case officer, continuing: "The shadowing is considered to be mainly within the building of Christ's Lane rather than Christ's Lane itself at ground level. Officers therefore considered that the impact was not significant and acceptable." The officer then moved to the winter solstice page, "which shows little to no impact", and to the spring equinox page, "which is the same".
4. At 3:23:27. The case officer, answering a member's question on the loss of light to the public realm, after the public benefits: "The overshadowing, officers don't consider there to be any harm arising from overshadowing or loss of light. I've covered the impact upon Christ's Lane itself. I think there was a daylight sunlight study provided regarding the residential units within the Bradwell's Court redevelopment on the other side of Christ's Lane, which identified a failure of the BRE guidance on one single window. But this already fell well below the BRE guidance because of the covered walkway to the front of the building." The officer then said that officers considered the overall overshadowing impact "insignificant and acceptable".
5. At 3:20:15. A member of the committee, opening the members' debate on the balance: "so there's a balance to be made here between the benefits, which I think we all have to agree are to the benefit of Christ College." The member went on that the College is "an educational institution to which members of the public can apply and become undergraduates in", and that there is "a very slight benefit, I think, to the public realm along Christ's Lane".
6. At 3:22:37. The case officer, asked by the chair to speak to the public benefit and the loss of light: "there is a balance to be made in that there is harm identified to an aspect of the overall grade one listed college site. That being said, ... the overall heritage harm is considered to be neutral, in that the harm to the setting of the Bodley Library is outweighed by other heritage benefits." The ellipsis stands for the officer's reference to a colleague by name.
7. At 3:23:02. The case officer, continuing: "because there is ... harm identified to the heritage assets, public benefits need to be provided, including securing the viable use of the site. The public benefits ... are the enhancements to the public realm along Christ's Lane, including the provision of a public bench and public art with increased public views from Christ's Lane and through. Given the overall neutral heritage impact, these are considered to be sufficient to outweigh the harm in the planning balance." The first ellipsis stands for one word that is not clear on the recording; the second for the officer's reference to the report.
8. At 3:24:17. A member of the committee: "I'm really not convinced by the claimed benefit to the public realm in this application. I think if we're just talking about a bench compared to what is surely a, I assume a hundred million plus project, that seems very trivial and almost insulting to some residents." The member went on to invite the applicant "to think about some ways that could be truly valid offers to the city in the public realm".