

CLAG: the committee papers letter (25 September 2026)

CLAG files its papers on this application after the period for further representations on the National Planning Policy Framework of 17 August 2026 closed on Thursday 3 September 2026. The Council's own documents say that late papers count. Its Statement of Community Involvement, the Greater Cambridge Statement of Community Involvement adopted in March 2024 ("the SCI"), says that late representations may be considered up to the point of determination. Its notice of 19 August 2026 says that comments received after 3 September 2026 will be taken into consideration if the application has not been determined. Its Senior Planning Lawyer at 3C Shared Services ("the Senior Planning Lawyer") wrote on 26 August 2026 that CLAG's submissions will be addressed in the officer's report. On the earlier application for the identical scheme, 25/02161/FUL, reported to the Planning Committee of 29 October 2025 ("the 2025 application"), the practice was different. The case officer wrote on 21 October 2025 that a letter received after the deadline "will therefore not be referenced in the report", and on 22 October 2025 that the experts' reports could not be appended. On 24 October 2025 the case officer agreed to update the sheet of late items and changes that the Council publishes before the meeting ("the amendment sheet") on comments the planning consultants of Christ's College ("the applicant") had sent on the published report. That exchange reached the public through a Freedom of Information request. CLAG asks the Council to confirm by Tuesday 29 September 2026 that the case officer's report to committee on this application ("the report") itself will deal with every paper of this filing and with the experts' reports. This filing is CLAG's other letters and papers filed with this letter, each named by its title. CLAG asks it to confirm that each document the report relies on will be listed as a background paper and open to inspection. CLAG asks the Council to confirm that the report will be open to inspection five clear working days before the meeting, and that any comment from the applicant on the report, and any officer reply, will be placed on the register before the meeting.

Submitted for the public register of application 26/02109/FUL, to be recorded under the heading above and displayed on the day it reaches the Council, Friday 25 September 2026: the Council's notice of 19 August 2026 states that views are "published onto the website promptly" (document 9499001), and the applicant's letters of 5 and 27 August 2026 were displayed within a day (documents 9486713 and 9506331).

Application 26/02109/FUL: Christ's College Library, St Andrew's Street, Cambridge. Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG). It states every point it relies on, so that it stands on its own. Quotations are verbatim from the document cited, and documents are cited by their numbers on the register of this application unless another register is named. Three exhibits are filed with it. Exhibit TP1 is the case officer's emails of 21 and 22 October 2025 on late representations, masked. Exhibit TP2 is three pages of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Summary Grounds in claim CO/2372/2021. Exhibit TP3 is the exchange of 23 and 24 October 2025 between the applicant's planning consultants and the case officer, masked, cited as held in the Council's response to request FOI00020035 under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

To: planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org and PlanningComments@greatercambridgeplanning.org, for the attention of Dominic Bush (case officer); Democratic Services, Cambridge City Council (democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk), for the proper officer who compiles the list of background papers under section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972; copy Vanessa Blane (Senior Planning Lawyer, 3C Shared Services);

copy Stephen Kelly (Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning); copy legal@3csharedservices.org (the 3C Shared Legal Practice, the address the Council has stated as its accepted point of service).

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

Filed Friday 25 September 2026.

Contents

1. CLAG asks the Council to confirm by Tuesday 29 September 2026 that the report will deal with every paper of this filing and the experts' reports, list what it relies on as background papers, be open to inspection five clear working days before the meeting, and be changed on no comment from the applicant that is off the register
 2. The Council's own statement says late representations may be considered up to the point of determination, and in 2025 the case officer wrote that a late letter "will therefore not be referenced in the report", so CLAG asks now that the report itself deal with its papers
 3. Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 makes every document the report relies on a background paper, to be listed with the report and open to inspection, so the experts' reports and the consultees' responses have to be listed, and an amendment sheet does not take their place
 4. The report has to be open to inspection five clear days before the meeting, and the Council's own statement promises five working days, so technical material issued "2 or 3 days prior to the committee meeting" is not published in time for the public to answer it
 5. In 2025 the case officer agreed to update the amendment sheet on comments the applicant's planning consultants sent on the published report, in an exchange the public saw only through a Freedom of Information request, so CLAG asks now that every such comment and reply be placed on the register
 6. If the Council gives the confirmations, members decide on a report that carries the whole record; if it does not, it repeats the practice of 2025 after being asked in advance not to, and each omission is a matter for judicial review
 7. A reply by Tuesday 29 September 2026 giving the confirmations at section 1 resolves this letter
-

1. CLAG asks the Council to confirm by Tuesday 29 September 2026 that the report will deal with every paper of this filing and the experts' reports, list what it relies on as background papers, be open to inspection five clear working days before the meeting, and be changed on no comment from the applicant that is off the register

1.1 CLAG asks the Council to confirm in writing, by Tuesday 29 September 2026, that:

- (a) the report itself will deal with every paper of this filing and with the experts' reports, and will state the substance of each (section 2). The experts' reports are eb7's letter of 16 October 2025 (document 7392055 on the register of 25/02161/FUL), eb7's further letter of September 2026, which CLAG files separately, and the expert heritage appraisal by

Alec Forshaw IHBC MRTPI on the register (document 9458570). They include the Create Streets review of October 2025 (Christ's College Library: Critical review and alternative design proposal), filed again with CLAG's alternatives, justification and public benefits paper as Exhibit D10;

- (b) no paper received before the report is published will be left to the amendment sheet, and any paper received after the report is published will be put before members in full, not summarised with officer commentary (section 2);
- (c) the list of background papers will be compiled on the test in section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act 1972, will name each document the report relies on, and each listed document will be open to inspection with the report (section 3). The documents include the consultees' responses, the papers at (a) and the Council's own correspondence so far as the report relies on it. If the report compares the two designs, they include the approved drawings of the consented design and the Council's 2016 report on it;
- (d) the report and its background papers will be open to inspection at least five clear working days before the meeting, and no material of substance will be issued for the first time in the amendment sheet two or three days before it (section 4);
- (e) any written comment on the draft or published report, or on the recommended conditions, from the applicant or those acting for it, and any officer reply, will be placed on the register when received (section 5). Where the report or the amendment sheet is changed on such a comment, the comment will be listed as a background paper.

1.2 The date is set so that the confirmations are on the file before the report is written. The Council answered CLAG's letter of 7 August 2026 (document 9490029) on 13 August 2026, six days later, and CLAG asks for this answer within four days.

1.3 Nothing in this letter accepts that the application can be reported before the matters in CLAG's determination timing letter are dealt with; that letter states them and this letter does not repeat them.

2. The Council's own statement says late representations may be considered up to the point of determination, and in 2025 the case officer wrote that a late letter "will therefore not be referenced in the report", so CLAG asks now that the report itself deal with its papers

CLAG files this letter and this filing after the period for further representations on the National Planning Policy Framework of 17 August 2026 closed on Thursday 3 September 2026. The SCI says that late representations "may be considered up to the point of determination of the application", and the Senior Planning Lawyer has written that CLAG's submissions "will be addressed, as appropriate, in the Officer report". On the 2025 application the case officer wrote that a letter received after the deadline "will therefore not be referenced in the report", and that the experts' reports could not be appended. If the Council confirms that the report on this application will deal with every paper of this filing and with the experts' reports, members decide on a report that states the substance of each. If the practice of 2025 is repeated, the report goes to members without material considerations that were before the Council when it was written, on a register that shows CLAG asked in advance for them to be dealt with.

1. The SCI says that comments may be made until the decision. Its paragraph 4.18 says that the procedure order requires the opportunity to comment "at any time before a decision is made on a planning application". Its paragraph 4.19: "Late representations

may be considered up to the point of determination of the application, however it is highly recommended that they are received during the consultation period indicated. They can only be taken into account if they relate to material planning considerations.” (The SCI, paragraphs 4.18 and 4.19.)

2. The Council's own notice for this application says the same. The notice of 19 August 2026, which invited further representations on the National Planning Policy Framework of 17 August 2026: “You should ensure that your written comments are received by 3 September 2026. Comments received after this date will be taken into consideration only if the application has not already been determined.” (Document 9499001, page 2.)
3. The Council has said in writing that CLAG's submissions will be dealt with in the report. The Senior Planning Lawyer's response of 26 August 2026, on CLAG's three submissions of 13 August 2026: “The three submissions to which you refer will be addressed, as appropriate, in the Officer report.” (Exhibit T1 to CLAG's determination timing letter, filed with this letter, exhibit page 2.)
4. The Council told Full Council on 16 July 2026 that it learns from what it receives. In reply to public question 7, which asked whether any Council safeguard had identified the failures in officer advice, consultation or public participation before residents did, the Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said, as minuted: “The Shared Planning Service always sought to learn from all complaints and comments received through the planning process or decisions that had been made.” A report that deals with each paper of this filing is that practice; a report that leaves them to the amendment sheet, after this letter, repeats the practice of 2025 against the Council's own assurance to Full Council. (The Council's published minutes of its meeting of Thursday 16 July 2026, public question 7 and the reply.)
5. In 2025 a letter that arrived after the deadline was kept out of the report. The case officer wrote on 21 October 2025, of the formal objection CLAG's planning consultants (hgh Consulting) had sent that day: “I am afraid that as the letter was received after the consultation deadline of the 17th October, the officer report is finalised and has been sent to be published, your letter will therefore not be referenced in the report. An amendment sheet will be published next Mon / Tues on the agenda for the meeting. Your letter will be referenced on that as a late document for members to consider with some officer commentary.” The meeting was on 29 October 2025. (Exhibit TP1, exhibit page 3.)
6. In 2025 the experts' reports were not appended, although CLAG's consultants asked for that in terms. The consultants wrote on 21 October 2025: “I am content for it to be referenced on the amendment sheet, but request that it be appended in full.” The case officer answered on 22 October 2025: “These documents are all uploaded to the application and are visible on the public portal. Given that the documents remain publicly visible, and will be acknowledged within the amendments sheet, I am afraid we are not able to append all late representations received in full.” (Exhibit TP1, exhibit pages 2 and 3.)
7. The other council of the shared planning service has taken the other course. In 2021 South Cambridgeshire District Council did not issue a permission its members had resolved to grant, in part because “a late representation had also been received by a resident (not the Claimant) the evening before the January meeting which had not been passed to officers nor reported to Members”. The application “was reported back to Committee”, and the objector's correspondence, “with an index running to 109 pages”, was “appended to the Officer Report”. (South Cambridgeshire District Council's Summary Grounds in claim CO/2372/2021, paragraphs 12, 13 and 25, Exhibit TP2, another

council's pleading in another claim; the two councils of the shared service are named in document 9499001, page 24.)

8. The published standard for an officer's report is the same. "Reports should be accurate and should include the substance of any objections and other responses received to the consultation." (Probity in Planning, Local Government Association and Planning Advisory Service, December 2019, page 17.)
9. The SCI binds the Council. A statement of community involvement is "a paradigm example of such a promise and a practice", the promise and practice that found a legitimate expectation that the statement will be followed (R (Majed) v London Borough of Camden [2009] EWCA Civ 1029 at [14]).
10. The duty runs to the decision. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Council to have regard to "any other material considerations", and where a new one arises before the decision notice, "section 70(2) requires the authority to have regard to that consideration" (R (Hayle Town Council) v Cornwall Council [2023] EWHC 389 (Admin) at [40], stating what the Court of Appeal held in R (Kides) v South Cambridgeshire District Council [2002] EWCA Civ 1370).

What CLAG asks the Council to confirm is at section 1, items (a) and (b): the report itself deals with each paper of this filing and each expert's report, stating its substance, and no paper is left to the amendment sheet.

If the Council confirms this, the merits record is in the document members decide on, and the officers' answer to each point can be read before the meeting. If the Council does not, and the report leaves those papers to the amendment sheet, the report leaves out of account considerations that were before the Council in time. The 2025 report is the measure of what that practice produced: it headed the statutory consultee's advice "Historic England - No Objection" (page 131 of the reports pack of 29 October 2025) while the Council's report on the listed building application, in the same pack, recorded the same letter as "Concerns raised" (page 224). The Council and the College signed a draft consent order on 28 April 2026 agreeing that the permission be quashed on all four grounds of the judicial review, R (Christ's Lane Action Group) v Cambridge City Council, Christ's College Cambridge interested party, AC-2025-LON-004656, the first of which is that members were materially misled as to Historic England's advice (the Council's letter to the Court of 28 April 2026, document 9462822, page 18, paragraph 6; the Statement of Facts and Grounds within CLAG's objection of 10 July 2026, document 9475597; CLAG's case officer letter, filed with this letter, section 1). Where a consideration is so obviously material that no rational decision maker could leave it out of account, leaving it out is an error of law (R (Friends of the Earth Ltd) v Heathrow Airport Ltd [2020] UKSC 52 at [116] to [121]).

3. Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 makes every document the report relies on a background paper, to be listed with the report and open to inspection, so the experts' reports and the consultees' responses have to be listed, and an amendment sheet does not take their place

The report will rest on the consultees' responses, on the papers of this filing and the experts' reports, and on the Council's own correspondence about how the application is to be handled. If the report compares the design applied for with the consented design, it rests on that design's drawings and the Council's 2016 report as well. Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 makes each document the report relies on to a material extent a background paper, to be listed in every copy of the report and open to inspection. Visibility on the register, the Council's answer in 2025, is not the statutory duty. If the Council compiles the list on the statutory test, the public and members have, with the report, each document it rests on. If a document relied on is not

listed or not open to inspection, that is the error for which the permissions in Holborn Studios and Whitewebbs were quashed.

1. The statute names the documents and the duty. Section 100D(5): “For the purposes of this section the background papers for a report are those documents relating to the subject matter of the report which— (a) disclose any facts or matters on which, in the opinion of the proper officer, the report or an important part of the report is based, and (b) have, in his opinion, been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, but do not include any published works.” Section 100D(1) requires every copy of a report that is open to inspection or published electronically to include a list of the background papers, compiled by the proper officer. It requires at least one copy of each listed document to be open to inspection at the Council’s offices. Section 100E(1) applies sections 100A to 100D to a committee of the Council “as they apply in relation to a principal council”. (Local Government Act 1972, sections 100D(1), 100D(5) and 100E(1).)
2. The proper officer’s opinion leaves little room. Whether a report was based on the facts in a document, and whether they were relied on to a material extent, “is one to which there will often only be one possible rational answer”, and once that is so “There is no further or residual discretion at that stage and the document must be published.” (R (Wild Justice) v Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority [2025] EWHC 2249 (Admin) at [58].)
3. A permission has been quashed for the same failure. In Holborn Studios the viability material on which the report’s conclusions depended was neither listed nor available: “There was, therefore, information which should have been listed and of which copies should have been provided for inspection.” The permission was quashed. (R (Holborn Studios Ltd) v London Borough of Hackney [2020] EWHC 1509 (Admin) at [61] and [72].)
4. A specialist’s report whose content the officers’ report did not correctly represent has been held a background paper, and the permission quashed. “I agree with Ms Wigley that a local planning authority may not avoid a document being a background paper by “salami slicing” its content, relying in the officers’ report on the convenient parts and concealing from the committee the inconvenient parts.” The committee “was materially misled by omitting his views on the BNG issue from the officers’ report”. (Guardians of Whitewebbs Park CIC v London Borough of Enfield [2026] EWHC 1916 (Admin) at [104], [108], [130] and [178].)
5. In 2025 the Council treated visibility on the register as enough. The case officer’s email of 22 October 2025 (section 2, item 6) answered a request to append the experts’ reports by saying that they were “visible on the public portal”. Section 100D(1) requires a list in every copy of the report and each listed document open to inspection; a document on the register that the list does not name is not a listed background paper. (Exhibit TP1, exhibit page 2.)
6. The Council’s conservation officer compares the design applied for with the consented design in the consultation comments of 13 July 2026 and 26 August 2026. If the report makes that comparison, it is based on the drawings approved under permission 16/0405/FUL of 7 September 2016 and on the Council’s report to its Planning Committee of 31 August 2016 on that application (document 2008719 on that application’s register). Both then belong on the list. (Documents 9462719 and 9505685.)
7. The Council has said what its report will carry on the handling of the application. The Senior Planning Lawyer’s email of 28 July 2026: “Officers are minded to include explanatory text within the report for members setting out the advised approach in how the new application is to be handled and determined in light of the existing JR, including advice concerning conditions.” The correspondence that records that approach is then

relied on in preparing the report. CLAG asked on 13 August 2026 that the letters of 28 July and 13 August 2026 be listed among the background papers, and repeats that request here. (Document 9495878; document 9495605, section 4 and section 6, item 2.)

What CLAG asks the Council to confirm is at section 1, item (c): the list is compiled on the test in section 100D(5), names each document the report relies on, and each listed document is open to inspection with the report.

If the Council confirms this, the public and members have, with the report, each document it rests on, and the experts' reports are among them. If the Council does not, and a document the report relies on is not listed or not open to inspection, the omission is the error found in *Holborn Studios* at [61] and *Whitewebbs* at [104]. CLAG states now that its representations to members would be directed at that material (*R (Wild Justice) v Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority* [2025] EWHC 2249 (Admin) at [62]).

4. The report has to be open to inspection five clear days before the meeting, and the Council's own statement promises five working days, so technical material issued "2 or 3 days prior to the committee meeting" is not published in time for the public to answer it

Section 100B of the Local Government Act 1972 requires the report to be open to inspection at least five clear days before the meeting, and the SCI promises five working days. In 2025 the case officer wrote that papers received after the deadline "will be reflected within the amendment sheet 2 or 3 days prior to the committee meeting". A paper of substance issued for the first time two or three days before the meeting is not published in time for the public to digest it and answer it. If the Council confirms that the report and its background papers will be open to inspection five clear working days before the meeting, they can be read and answered before it. If the item is taken without that period, section 100B(4) says it "may not be considered", save on a ruling of urgency recorded in the minutes.

1. The statute fixes the period and the consequence. Section 100B(3) requires the agenda and reports to be open to inspection "at least five clear days before the meeting", with exceptions for a meeting convened at shorter notice and an item added to the agenda. Section 100B(4): "An item of business may not be considered at a meeting of a principal council unless either— (a) a copy of the agenda including the item (or a copy of the item) is open to inspection by members of the public in pursuance of subsection (1) above for at least five clear days before the meeting or, where the meeting is convened at shorter notice, from the time the meeting is convened; or (b) by reason of special circumstances, which shall be specified in the minutes, the chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency." (Local Government Act 1972, section 100B(3) and (4); section 100E(1) applies both to a committee.)
2. The Council's own statement promises more than the statute. "Agendas and reports for Planning Committee are publicly available at least five working days before the meeting and are also published online." (The SCI, paragraph 4.29.)
3. The Council has tied publication of this report to the statute. The Senior Planning Lawyer's email of 28 July 2026: "The officer report containing all the relevant information will be uploaded to the Council's website under the Planning Committee pages before 2 September in line with statutory provisions." (Document 9495878.)
4. Publication has to be timely, and technical material needs more time. "Information must be published by the public authority in good time for members of the public to be able to

digest it and make intelligent representations". "In practice whether the publication of the information is timely will turn on factors such as its character (easily digested/technical), the audience (sophisticated/ ordinary members of the public) and its bearing on the decision (tangential/ central)." (R (Joicey) v Northumberland County Council [2014] EWHC 3657 (Admin) at [47].)

5. In 2025 the Council's practice put late papers in the amendment sheet two or three days before the meeting. The case officer, 22 October 2025: "Any representations that were received last week, up to Friday 17th have been reflected in my officer report. However, any that were received later than this will be reflected within the amendment sheet 2 or 3 days prior to the committee meeting." (Exhibit TP1, exhibit page 2.)
6. CLAG has already asked for the five clear days on this application. CLAG's letter of 13 August 2026: "Under section 100B of the Local Government Act 1972 the agenda and reports for the meeting of 2 September 2026 must be open to inspection at least five clear working days before the meeting." (Document 9495599, paragraph 13; document 9490021, paragraph 7.)

What CLAG asks the Council to confirm is at section 1, item (d): the report and its background papers are open to inspection at least five clear working days before the meeting, and no material of substance is issued for the first time in the amendment sheet two or three days before it.

If the Council confirms this, the report and its papers can be read and answered before the meeting. If the Council does not, and material of substance first appears two or three days before the meeting, it is not published in time on the test in Joicey at [47]. An item taken without the five clear days is one that section 100B(4) says "may not be considered".

5. In 2025 the case officer agreed to update the amendment sheet on comments the applicant's planning consultants sent on the published report, in an exchange the public saw only through a Freedom of Information request, so CLAG asks now that every such comment and reply be placed on the register

On the 2025 application the applicant's planning consultants (Turley) wrote to the case officer on 23 October 2025, after the reports to committee had been published, with comments on the reports and on the recommended conditions. The case officer answered on 24 October 2025 that the amendment sheet would be updated on them. CLAG holds the exchange from the Council's response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000; whether the exchange was placed on the register of the 2025 application, and when, is in the Council's records. A comment the report or the amendment sheet is changed on is a document relied on in preparing it, and section 100D(5) makes it a background paper. If the Council confirms that every such comment and reply on this application will be placed on the register when received, the public and members can see whose words the report carries. If the practice of 2025 is repeated, members are given changes to the report without being told where they came from, and the public cannot answer them.

1. The applicant's planning consultants sent comments on the published reports for the amendment sheet. Their email of 23 October 2025 to the case officer, headed "CHRIST'S COLLEGE LIBRARY": "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." The comments proposed wording for paragraphs 1.11 and 11.4 of the planning report on the heritage balance and commented on further

paragraphs of both reports. An attachment carried comments on the recommended conditions. (Exhibit TP3, exhibit pages 5 and 6.)

2. The case officer agreed to update the amendment sheet on them. The reply of 24 October 2025: "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." On the conditions: "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." (Exhibit TP3, exhibit page 4.)
3. The two practices of the same week differ. CLAG's consultants' late letter of 21 October 2025 was to be "referenced on that as a late document for members to consider with some officer commentary", and the experts' reports were not appended (section 2, items 5 and 6). The applicant's comments of 23 October 2025 on the published reports were to be taken into the amendment sheet as changes. (Exhibits TP1 and TP3.)
4. The published standard requires changes to the report to be recorded. "Any oral updates or changes to the report should be recorded." (Probity in Planning, Local Government Association and Planning Advisory Service, December 2019, page 17.)
5. A change made on a document makes that document a background paper. A document that discloses facts or matters on which the report is based, and that has been relied on to a material extent in preparing it, is a background paper under section 100D(5); the amendment sheet is a report for the meeting under section 100B(1). A comment on which the amendment sheet is changed meets that test. (Local Government Act 1972, sections 100B(1) and 100D(5); section 3, item 1.)

What CLAG asks the Council to confirm is at section 1, item (e): every written comment from the applicant or those acting for it on the draft or published report or the recommended conditions, and every officer reply, is placed on the register when received. Where the report or the amendment sheet is changed on it, the comment is listed as a background paper.

If the Council confirms this, every change to the report can be traced to its source on the register before the meeting. If the Council does not, and the report or the amendment sheet is changed on a comment that is not on the register, the comment is a background paper that is not listed, and members are given wording whose source they are not told.

6. If the Council gives the confirmations, members decide on a report that carries the whole record; if it does not, it repeats the practice of 2025 after being asked in advance not to, and each omission is a matter for judicial review

The confirmations at section 1 ask for nothing beyond the Council's own statement, its own notice and the statute. Each was on the register before the report was written, in this letter and in CLAG's letters of 7 and 13 August 2026. If the Council gives them, the report members decide on carries the papers of this filing, the experts' reports and the consultees' findings, lists what it relies on, and is published in time. If the Council does not give them, the practice of 2025 is repeated after CLAG asked in advance that it not be, and each omission is recorded against a request on the file.

1. If the report leaves the papers of this filing or the experts' reports to the amendment sheet, the Council leaves out of account material considerations that were before it in time. That is against section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Friends of the Earth at [116] to [121]; section 2).

2. If the report states a consultee's or an expert's conclusion without the findings that support it, or omits it, members are misled by omission (Whitewebbs at [130]; section 3, item 4).
3. If a document the report relies on is not listed or not open to inspection, the list fails section 100D(1), the error for which the permissions in Holborn Studios ([72]) and Whitewebbs ([178]) were quashed (section 3).
4. If the report and its papers are not open to inspection five clear days before the meeting, the item "may not be considered" without a ruling of urgency recorded in the minutes (section 100B(4); section 4).
5. If the report or the amendment sheet is changed on a comment from the applicant that is not on the register, members are given wording whose source they are not told, and the comment is an unlisted background paper (section 5).
6. The prejudice is stated now. CLAG's representations to members will be directed at the report and its background papers. Material first issued two or three days before the meeting, or not listed, cannot be answered in time, and a party who shows that its representations would have been different or additional has suffered material prejudice (Wild Justice at [62]).

7. A reply by Tuesday 29 September 2026 giving the confirmations at section 1 resolves this letter

A written reply by Tuesday 29 September 2026 giving the five confirmations at section 1, in terms, resolves this letter. The date is set so that the confirmations are on the file before the report is written, on the Council's own time for answering CLAG's letter of 7 August 2026 (section 1, item 1.2). CLAG asks that the reply be placed on the register with this letter.

Christ's Lane Action Group