

Exhibit T1 to CLAG's determination timing letter (23 September 2026): CLAG's copy of the Council's response of 26 August 2026

Filed with CLAG's determination timing letter (23 September 2026), for the public register of application 26/02109/FUL.

The exhibit is CLAG's copy of correspondence the Council sent to it. Every page carries its item number, its page within the item and its page in this exhibit; the document itself is reproduced below the stamp at a slightly reduced size. The header under which the email was passed on within CLAG, at the top of the first page, is masked, and the place is marked. The document is otherwise unchanged. The response is not on the register in its own right.

1. Item T1.1 (exhibit pages 2 to 5): the Senior Planning Lawyer's response of 26 August 2026 to CLAG's email of 20 August 2026, as sent to CLAG. CLAG's email of 20 August 2026 is on the register as document 9501516. The response sets the Council's answers below each numbered item of that email, in red on the original. The time printed on CLAG's copy is the receiving client's, in a zone five and a half hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time. The letter quotes:
 - (a) from the answer to item 2 (exhibit page 2): "The three submissions to which you refer will be addressed, as appropriate, in the Officer report.";
 - (b) from the answer to item 8 (exhibit page 3): "An EOT has not, as yet been agreed with the Applicant, beyond the current statutory period of 9 Sept, any agreed EOT with the Applicant is for the Council to manage.";
 - (c) from the answer to item 9 (exhibit page 4): "The planning application will be put before the planning committee when the Council considers it reasonable to do so in light of the current reconsultation, whether that falls before the 20 October or not. The Council does not consider that in putting the 2026 application before Planning Committee it would contravene any enactment or rule of law. Christ Lane Action Group is once again reminded that Application 26/02109/FUL is a fresh application and whilst it is substantially the same as the application subject to the Judicial Review, it is a new application and will be considered on its own merits."

31/08/2026

[Masked by CLAG: the header under which this email was passed on within CLAG.
The Council's email begins below and is unchanged.]

From: SPOCChristLane <SPOCChristLane@greatercambridgeplanning.org>
Date: 26 August 2026 at 17:40:11 GMT+5:30
To: residents@christs-lane.com
Subject: FW: Christ College - 26/02109/FUL (2555204)

Dear Christ Lane Action Group,

Further to your email of 20 August, the Council responds as detailed in red below.

1. Thank you for the email of 18 August 2026. It records that the Council "considers it necessary to undertake a fourteen-day re-consultation exercise (including neighbours)" following publication of the updated National Planning Policy Framework, and that the committee "is likely to be delayed until after the 2 September". We have now seen the Council's notice dated 19 August 2026 on the register. It describes the amendment as: "To allow further representations to be made on the implications of the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (17th August 2026) relating to the proposal", and sets a deadline of 3 September 2026. The exercise opened the day after the email, before any of the questions below were answered. – **The Council notes your comment.**

2. Three CLAG submissions sent on 13 August 2026 remain unanswered beyond written acknowledgment. They are: the letter on the superseded supporting documents, which asked for corrected documents, re-consultation on them, and written reasons for any decision to proceed without correction; the letter answering the Council's letters on conditions, which asked for three confirmations in terms; and the conditions submission with its enclosures. We request answers to each of these. **The three submissions to which you refer will be addressed, as appropriate, in the Officer report.**

3. The notice of 19 August records no amendment, and none has been made. No drawing, statement or assessment on the file has changed. The public is being asked to comment on what the new Framework means for documents that describe a different building. The Council's own conservation officer has recorded that the resubmitted Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement describe the superseded taller design; our comparison of the file, set out in our letter sent on 13 August 2026, shows the Planning Statement does the same. The Framework now in force requires decision-makers to be "satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals" (HE5(4)). No officer report could record that satisfaction without first identifying the discrepancies the Council's own conservation officer has recorded, and resolving them with reasons. A re-consultation on these documents repeats the defect it exists to cure, now under a Framework that makes accuracy the decision-maker's own responsibility. **The Council notes your comments.**

4. The absence of amendments answers one question and raises another. The applicant has filed nothing for this exercise. Please confirm in writing whether the applicant stands on the current document set. The Council need not wait to be told: it may require "such particulars as they think necessary" and "such evidence in support of anything in or relating to the application as they think necessary" (section 62(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). One consequence should be

31/08/2026

recorded now: if corrected or revised documents arrive during or after this window, the public will not have seen them, and the exercise will have to be run again.

The Council has invited the applicant to comment on the revised NPPF dated August 2026. The Council is not minded to further consult on any representations made by any party in respect of the NPPF.

5. CLAG has reviewed the new Framework against this application in detail. Several changed policies bear on it directly. Some have no predecessor in the previous Framework. CLAG will file its assessment, with updated expert material, within the window. The Council must take the material considerations those representations raise into account (section 70(2) of the 1990 Act).

The Council notes your comment.

6. The period should run 21 days, to Thursday 10 September 2026. The Order works in 21 days, not fourteen. Where notice of an application is served on an adjoining owner or occupier, the authority must not determine it until 21 days after service (article 34(9)(e) of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, as substituted); fourteen days attaches only to newspaper and website publicity (article 34(9)(f)). Please confirm the statutory basis on which the notices now served were given, and the date of service. A statutory consultee has 21 days from receipt to respond, unless it agrees another period in writing (article 22(3)), and the Planning Practice Guidance confirms this applies on re-consultation: "where the local planning authority decides that it is necessary to re-consult a body which is under a duty to provide a substantive response the timescales in paragraph 011 will apply" (paragraph 026, Reference ID 15-026-20190722). Article 18(5)(b) then bars determination until that period ends. Consultation must also allow adequate time to respond (*R (Moseley) v Haringey LBC* [2014] UKSC 56): the subject here is a rewritten national framework, not an amended drawing, and the original publicity allowed 21 days. If the Council contends that a shorter period applies on any basis, please identify that basis in writing. The extension costs the timetable nothing, because no final report or recommendation can be completed until the last statutory response is in.

Whilst under no statutory requirement to re-consult, the Council has re-consulted and considers that the 14-day period to be a fair and reasonable timeframe for consultees to respond. Should any party consider that they require further time to respond, including statutory consultees, they can make such a request to the Council to consider. It is noted that CLAG have indicated that they will respond within the timescale given.

7. The notice records neighbour notification only. Please confirm that Historic England, the Council's conservation officer and the other statutory and specialist consultees have been re-consulted, so that the advice before members is given under the Framework that will govern the decision, and place the consultation letters, and the response date given to Historic England, on the file.

The Council can confirm that the parties have been re-consulted following the revised NPPF dated August 2026.

8. On our calculation the statutory period for determination expires on 9 September 2026. The Council's exercise closes on 3 September; a report cannot be completed, published the required five clear days ahead, and heard in the days that remain. Please confirm the expiry date the Council is working to; whether an extended period has been agreed with the applicant in writing under article 34(2)(c); and, if so, its date and the period agreed, with the agreement placed on the file.

An EOT has not, as yet been agreed with the Applicant, beyond the current statutory period of 9 Sept, any agreed EOT with the Applicant is for the Council to manage.

9. The committee date should be fixed when the exercise is complete, not the exercise cut to fit a date fixed first. In fixing it the Council should take into account the substantive hearing in AC-2025-LON-004656, listed since 28 May 2026, on notice to the Council, for 20 October 2026 at the Royal Courts of

31/08/2026

Justice. Section 70(2) requires regard to material considerations as they stand at determination, and a reasoned High Court judgment on the lawfulness of the Council's determination of this same scheme is such a consideration (R (Kides) v South Cambridgeshire District Council [2002] EWCA Civ 1370: a resolution must return to committee where a new consideration capable of affecting the outcome arises before the decision issues). An October meeting would sit a fortnight or less before the hearing, and nothing is gained on either branch: a resolution that must return, or a decision notice raced out days before the Court rules. The Council's decision to re-consult has already accepted that this application is not urgent, and the cost of waiting sits on the court record: the College "chose to enter contracts before the permission was legally secure". Because the timing of the determination is a question of lawfulness and not convenience, we ask that this email be placed before the Monitoring Officer, whose duty under section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 arises where a proposal of the authority is likely to give rise to a contravention of any enactment or rule of law. The natural listing is the first committee after judgment.

The planning application will be put before the planning committee when the Council considers it reasonable to do so in light of the current reconsultation, whether that falls before the 20 October or not. The Council does not consider that in putting the 2026 application before Planning Committee it would contravene any enactment or rule of law. Christ Lane Action Group is once again reminded that Application 26/02109/FUL is a fresh application and whilst it is substantially the same as the application subject to the Judicial Review, it is a new application and will be considered on its own merits.

10. We ask the Council to confirm in writing by Wednesday 26 August 2026: (a) its answers to each submission of 13 August 2026, the filing confirmations in paragraph 2, and the date of the Environmental Health response; (b) whether the applicant stands on the current document set; (c) that the period runs to 10 September 2026; (d) that Historic England, the conservation officer, national amenity societies, and the specialist consultees have been re-consulted under the August 2026 Framework, with the consultation letters on the file; (e) the expiry date the Council is working to, and whether an extended period has been agreed under article 34(2)(c), with its date and length; (f) the revised committee date once fixed, and that it will be fixed when the exercise is complete, taking the hearing of 20 October 2026 into account; and (g) that this email has been placed before the Monitoring Officer. CLAG will file its representations within the current window in any event; these requests are no reason to delay them. Each defect named above is curable now, in days, at no cost to the timetable. If any is left uncured, CLAG will say so, and rely on it, in its representations, before the committee, and where necessary before the Court.

Your comments are noted and where appropriate will be dealt with in the Officer's Report. This email has been placed before the Council's Monitoring Officer.

11. CLAG's position is unchanged: the application should be refused, and nothing should be determined until the High Court has ruled. Our requests of 13 August 2026 stand. Please place this email on the public planning file and acknowledge it in writing.

The Council notes your comments. A copy of the email has been placed on the public portal and has been noted by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

Kind regards

Vanessa Blane

Vanessa Blane
Senior Planning Lawyer

31/08/2026

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived