Exhibit TP3 to CLAG's committee papers letter (23 September 2026): the exchange of 23 and 24 October 2025 between the applicant's planning consultants and the case officer on the published reports to the committee of 29 October 2025, from the Council's response to request FOI00020035

Filed with CLAG's committee papers letter, for the public register of application 26/02109/FUL. The exchange is cited as held in the Council's response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, reference FOI00020035; the names in it were redacted by the Council before release, and CLAG has masked the case officer's telephone number.

The six pages below are pages 4 to 9 of the Council's response of 307 pages to request FOI00020035, and are printed 1 to 6 within that response. They carry one email chain on application 25/02161/FUL, headed "CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY", printed latest first: the case officer's email of 24 October 2025 at 17:40 (exhibit page 2); the applicant's planning consultants' email of 24 October 2025 at 10:57 (its header at the foot of exhibit page 2, its text on exhibit page 3, a page held as an image in the response); the case officer's email of 24 October 2025 at 10:21 (its header at the foot of exhibit page 3, its text on exhibit page 4); the consultants' email of 23 October 2025 at 15:45, sent after the reports to committee had been published (its header on exhibit page 5, its text on exhibit pages 5 and 6); and the consultants' firm's email footer (exhibit page 7). The firm is named in that footer; the Council redacted the individuals' names and addresses before release, and those redactions, the black boxes, are the Council's.

CLAG has made two changes. The case officer's telephone number is masked with a black box at two places, and the text beneath each box is removed from the file. Highlight marks present on CLAG's copy of three of the pages are removed. Nothing else on the pages is changed. Each page carries its item number, its page within the item and its page in this exhibit; the page itself is reproduced below the stamp at a slightly reduced size.

The letter quotes these sentences:

1. The applicant's planning consultants, 23 October 2025 (exhibit page 5): "I have provided some minor comments below which I hope are of use, either should any questions arise from Members or if you did want to reflect in the amendment sheet."
2. The case officer, 24 October 2025 at 10:21 (exhibit page 4): "Thank you for your email and your comments on the report/ conditions."; "I will take all into account and update the amendment sheet as needed."; "11. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet."; "12. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet."; "15. Agreed, will update on amendment sheet to apply to new library and bath court."; "16. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet."

The item in this exhibit:

1. Item TP3.1: the exchange of 23 and 24 October 2025 between the applicant's planning consultants and the case officer, pages 4 to 9 of the Council's response to request FOI00020035, masked as stated (6 pages).

Dominic Bush

From: Dominic Bush
Sent: 24 October 2025 17:40
To: [redacted]
Cc:
Subject: RE: CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Good afternoon [redacted],

Thank you for getting back to me.

I had imagined that the timing suggested had developed from the pre-application discussions with Highways. Fully appreciating your concerns regarding the conflict between consultees and wanting to flag this.

My personal view is that of the two issues (highways and neighbouring amenity) highways is the one that could be overcome by mitigation/ planning within the CTMP. There is not, to my knowledge, a reasonable solution to protecting the amenity of the neighbours from deliveries at these early hours. Hence the current suggested conditions that I have applied.

I will speak with [redacted] regarding this but for the time being will proceed with the conditions are currently recommended for this reason.

Kind regards,
Dominic

Dominic Bush | Senior Planning Officer

Pronouns (He/Him)

[redacted]

Carbon Literate Organisation Bronze

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service

South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA

The Guildhall | Market Square | Cambridge | CB2 3QJ

e: Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org | **t:** [redacted]

www.greatercambridgeplanning.org | www.cambridge.gov.uk | www.scambs.gov.uk | Facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

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

When you contact us, we will do our very best to help you. Please note our colleagues have the right to be treated with respect while they try to help you, threatening behaviour or verbal abuse will not be tolerated. We reserve the right to terminate contact if these guidelines are not followed.

My working days are: **Tuesday - Friday**

From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 October 2025 10:57

To: Dominic Bush <Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org>; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Morning Dominic

Thank you for the below, I think [redacted] is off today, so I just wanted to reach out on a point that I am worried about,

Condition 28 & 32, relating to delivery timings. Appreciate your note on protection of neighbourly amenities and not delivering pre 6am, which makes sense.

My worry is that we engaged a quite a length with [redacted] and his team and he was fairly robust in saying that St Andrew's St delivery timeline could not be adjusted due to his concerns relating to cyclists, buses, and pedestrians. If we adapt the condition to reflect the below and what we would consider "standard delivery timings" and he then refuses any deliveries from St Andrews at all within the CEMP / Traffic management plan, due to the below adjusted timings, then the scheme would become undeliverable logistically (as you cannot get large materials in from Drummond St & the rest of the site is landlocked).

Really trying to avoid a situation where we are stuck between two authorities and wanted to flag that now really.

Kind Regards

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Dominic Bush <Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org>
Sent: 24 October 2025 10:21
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

[redacted]

Good morning [redacted]

Thank you for your email and your comments on the report/ conditions.

I will take all into account and update the amendment sheet as needed.

Just to clarify regarding the impact upon the listed buildings per para 1.11 & 11.4. There were lengthy discussions around how we assess the harm that has been identified and it was concluded that we need to make clear that there is some harm to an element of the Grade I listed buildings. Hence the application of Para 215 later in the report. Officers view is in line with that of the Conservation officer that the overall Heritage impact is neutral however for the reasons stated.

With regards to the conditions:

3. From my understanding, any demolition that is required in order to inform the WSI can be agreed in writing with the County Councils archaeology officer. This is not uncommon.

4. whilst mostly relating to the listed building, it was considered that this condition has the potential to be applicable to the works that required FUL planning permission, hence it was added to this application.

5. Agree and noted

11. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet.

12. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet.

13. with this condition, I think from experience, the level of information would vary depending upon the scale of the public art scheme proposed. I think that it would need to remain as it is drafted.

14. Think this condition needs to remain as is given that it potentially applies to all aspects covered in the FUL.

15. Agreed, will update on amendment sheet to apply to new library and bath court.

16. Agreed, will update on the amendment sheet.

19. As with No.4, whilst also relating to the renovation, it to me suggests that this condition could apply to the new library building which would fall under the FUL, hence it is recommended on this application.

20. Whilst cross over is noted with 16, they are attached for differing reasons, 16 being sustainability and 20 being conservation. I think they therefore need to remain separate.

21. Whilst certain elements relate to the LBC, this is considered to be a cleaner way of conditioning. Reasoning for being applied to the FUL same as No.19.

28 & 32. I had noted that these conflicted with the times within the CEMP. I did however speak to colleagues, including EHO, there is somewhat of a discrepancy between being preferable for highways and protecting neighbouring amenity. In this case, with suitable management I think that the highways impact can be controlled whereas the time restrictions are all that can be used to protect amenity.

LBC

4. I think there is a material difference between this condition and 19 on the **FUL.** Cond 19 applies to new joinery, hence applied to the FUL whereas Cond 4 just applies to timber framing of the listed buildings.

Kind regards,
Dominic

Dominic Bush | Senior Planning Officer

Pronouns (He/Him)

[redacted]

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service

South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA

The Guildhall | Market Square | Cambridge | CB2 3QJ

e: Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org | **t:** [redacted]

www.greatercambridgeplanning.org | www.cambridge.gov.uk | www.scambs.gov.uk | Facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | X

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

When you contact us, we will do our very best to help you. Please note our colleagues have the right to be treated with respect while they try to help you, threatening behaviour or verbal abuse will not be tolerated. We reserve the right to terminate contact if these guidelines are not followed.

My working days are: **Tuesday - Friday**

From: [redacted]
Sent: 23 October 2025 15:45
To: Dominic Bush <Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Dear Dominic

Many thanks for your work on the Committee Reports which we feel are admirably thorough and well-balanced.

I have provided some minor comments below which I hope are of use, either should any questions arise from Members or if you did want to reflect in the amendment sheet.

Heritage generally and LBC report

The main comment I have relates to heritage aspects and how you address these. The Council has formed its view about harms and benefits, so this is not me asking you to reassess this, but to ensure the correct 'audit trail' of testing is being carried out. I am sorry if this sounds pedantic, it is the product of many hours on the witness stand!

Can I suggest that in the Listed Building report, you need to make sure that you reference S16 of the Planning (LB &CA Act). That is the relevant part of the act when considering LBC applications as opposed to S66 when considering planning applications affecting LBs. Please look at 11.20, 11.39, 11.41, 13.1 of your report.

In my opinion, the assessment of the impact of the proposals should relate to the acceptability of physical works to LBs and which impact their setting. I don't think you should be including reference to S72 (duty with regards conservation areas) or comments about the con area (eg 11.4, 11.17 and 11.18) here. 11.20 might be moved to earlier in the report (or in this section) to make it clear that the S66 and 72 duty is covered in the planning report).

At the risk of making it sound like I am trying to influence your judgement, I am a little surprised that there is no mention of the benefits to the LBs and their settings from the better design of the Bath Court ditch (preventing physical damage to the south range of First Court) the reopening of the blocked doorway into the buttery in that range and the removal of the unsightly additions at the east end of it. Perhaps they are implied in 13.3 but could be spelled out in 11.14?

To be clear, in 11.39, there is no physical harm to the Bodley Library, only (allegedly!) to its setting. I think you are saying that the physical works to the LBs are overall neutral ie there is low level of harm to the setting of the Bodley Library, but that is balanced by the physical enhancements and optimum viable use point (14.23 of planning report?). I would suggest that your version of this assessment should go into Section 13.1 – but referencing S16 of the Act too.

There is a minor typo in 11.30 – 'lift' not 'list'.

Minor comments on the Full Planning Report

1.11 – would it be fairer / more consistent to say that in term of the impact of works on the fabric and setting of LBs is neutral, but positive in terms of Con Area and RPG?
11.4 – again, would it be fairer to say that this harm to the setting of the Bodley is offset by other benefits to the LB fabric and setting (inc the optimum viable use) with enhancement to Con Area and RPG? This is what I understand by 14.23 and 14.24 of the report.
11.13 could be read that we are building in Bath Court, whereas in fact we're enhancing it.
12.4. Surely the 'extensive views' are from the walkway not the residential dwellings?
14.7 – I am not sure I get this. Bath Court has been in largely its current form since the mid 1970s. The RPG was designated in 1985. It's not mentioned in the RPG description, rather than it not being in existence when designation took place. This doesn't affect your assessment though.
14.20 – if you agree with the clarification about the enhancement works to First Court / Bath Ct, they could be mentioned here?
18.8 – should it come up, we did do several pre-app meetings with the Highway Authority too.
19.2 – there is extensive cycle parking within the College which students can use; they are not relying on public cycle parking in the street.

I hope this make sense, but please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

On the attachment to this emails are some comments relating to the conditions. Same again, any questions, please let me know.

With best wishes – and thanks again.

[redacted]

[redacted]

-transmit,
truction ar

bank account details via email. If you are in any doubt, please do not send funds to us electronically without speaking to a member of our team first to verify our account details. We
payments into an incorrect bank account.Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 6 Atherton St
Terms and Conditions

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 by Mimecast, a leader in email security and cyber resilience. Mimecast integrates email defenses with brand protection, security awareness training, web security, compliance and other essential capabilities. Mimecast helps protect large and small organizations from malicious activity, human error and technology failure; and to lead the movement toward building a more resilient world. To find out more, visit our website.

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