

To: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk

Copy: planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org and
PlanningComments@greatercambridgeplanning.org, for the register of application
26/02109/FUL; Dominic.Bush@greatercambridgeplanning.org;
Stephen.Kelly@greatercambridgeplanning.org; Vanessa.Blane@3csharedservices.org

From: Christ's Lane Action Group, [REDACTED]

Date: Wednesday 30 September 2026

Subject: 26/02109/FUL, Planning Committee 7 October 2026, item 6: officer report not open to inspection; request that the item is withdrawn

Dear Democratic Services,

1. The report for item 6, "26-02109-FUL Christs College Library Final" (document s73709), is an empty file. An independent checker, redbot.org, recorded the Council's server answering "HTTP/1.1 200 OK" with "Content-Length: 0" at 8.43 pm, 11.14 pm and 12.59 am, and at 2.20 am, 3.44 am and 6.56 am, on the night of 29 to 30 September 2026. The six captures are attached as one document. CLAG's own thirty seven requests, from 7.51 pm on 29 September to 7.48 am on 30 September 2026, returned the same empty file; CLAG's log records the Council server's own date header for each and will be supplied on request. The appendices for the item, Appendix 1 (s73711, 16.4 MB) among them, opened in full at the same times. An empty file is not a copy of a report open to inspection.
2. The Council says the report exists. Its weekly response to CLAG of 29 September 2026 states that "the officer report for the committee meeting on the 7th October was sent to Democratic Services at lunchtime on the 25th September", and that CLAG's representations of 25 September 2026 "are not able to be incorporated into the report" and will be "referenced within the amendment/ update sheet circulated prior to the meeting". A report written by 25 September and published as an empty file on 29 September has not been open to the public on any day.
3. Section 100B(1) and (3) of the Local Government Act 1972 require copies of any report for the meeting to be open to inspection by the public "at least five clear days before the meeting". The Council's Constitution requires "the agenda and reports" to be available "at least five clear days before the meeting" (Access to Information Procedure Rules, rule 2.5) and defines the count: "Clear Working Days Normal working days, excluding weekends, Bank and Public Holidays. It also excludes the date on which notice is given and the day of the meeting" (Glossary, page 4). The High Court states the rule as "at least five clear working days before the meeting" (R (Joicey) v Northumberland County Council [2014] EWHC 3657 (Admin), paragraph 43). For Wednesday 7 October 2026 the five clear working days are 30 September and 1, 2, 5 and 6 October. The report had to be open on Tuesday 29 September 2026. It was not.
4. The Council has stated the same period on this application. Statement of Community Involvement, paragraph 4.29: "Agendas and reports for Planning Committee are publicly available at least five working days before the meeting". The minutes of the

Development Control Forum of 29 July 2026, paragraph 114(vi), Appendix 11 to the report itself: “The Committee report would be publicly available five clear days before the Committee meeting.” CLAG asked for the period in writing on 13 August 2026 (documents 9495599 and 9490021) and again on 25 September 2026.

5. Section 100B(3) lets public copies wait for one thing only, until “copies are available to members of the council”. Either members have had the report since 25 September 2026 and the public has not, or no one has had it. On either course the public has not had the period the Act and the Constitution require.
6. The consequence is set by the High Court: “the claimant will be entitled to relief unless the decision-maker can demonstrate that the decision it took would inevitably have been the same had it complied with its statutory obligation to disclose information in a timely fashion” (Joicey, paragraph 51). In Joicey the document was uploaded the day before the meeting, “a serious breach by the Council of its statutory obligations” (paragraph 59), and the permission was quashed (paragraph 74). A decision on 7 October 2026 would be taken on a report that was not open to the public on the day the Act required, on the Council’s own statement that the report existed by then.
7. CLAG asks:
 - (a) that item 6 is withdrawn today, Wednesday 30 September 2026, and listed for the next available committee once the report has been open to inspection for five clear working days from the day it first opens as a readable document;
 - (b) that the Council states in writing when the report was sent to members, and the day and time at which document s73709 first opened to public inspection on the website and at the designated offices;
 - (c) if the Chair intends to take the item on 7 October 2026, that the Council states the basis on which it treats section 100B(3) and rule 2.5 as satisfied, with its computation of the five clear days. CLAG will place that statement before members and, if a decision is made, before the Court;
 - (d) that this letter and its attachment are placed on the register of the application and circulated to every member and alternate member of the Committee.
8. Withdrawing the item today and relisting it once the period has run resolves the matter. CLAG asks for the Council’s written answer by 12 noon on Thursday 1 October 2026, the working day after receipt, the time within which the Council displayed the applicant’s letters of 5 and 27 August 2026 (documents 9486713 and 9506331). We do not oppose a new library.

Yours faithfully,

Christ’s Lane Action Group



Attached: the six redbot.org captures of document s73709 of 29 and 30 September 2026, in one document (7 pages).