

CLAG: the minutes letter (25 September 2026)

The Council's printed minutes of the Development Control Forum of 29 July 2026 (the DCF), published on 21 September 2026 in 114 numbered items ("the minutes", cited by item number), will be appended to the case officer's report to committee on this application ("the report"), as the chair, a delivery manager of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, said at the DCF. They record the members' questions (items 82 to 100) and none of the answers Christ's College ("the applicant") gave or the undertakings the chair made, and nine items record something other than what the Council's own recording carries. The Council's own notes of the Development Control Forum of 11 September 2025 on the earlier application, 25/02161/FUL ("the 2025 DCF"), appended to the 2025 committee report (the public reports pack, pages 205 to 213; "the Council's 2025 notes"), recorded each question with its answers, and the case officer undertook on 31 July 2026 that the record would be accurate. CLAG asks the Council to record the answers and undertakings, to correct the nine items, and to state when the minutes were uploaded and by whom: a written answer by Tuesday 29 September 2026, and the corrected minutes before the report is written. Every item is given with its time in the Council's own recording.

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. Speakers at the DCF are named by office. One exhibit is filed with it: Exhibit M1, CLAG's copy of the case officer's email of 31 July 2026, masked. CLAG's DCF record, filed with this letter ("the DCF record", cited by entry), carries every passage cited here with its place in the recording.

To: Democratic Services, Cambridge City Council (democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk), the office whose committee manager drafted the minutes; planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org and PlanningComments@greatercambridgeplanning.org, for the attention of Dominic Bush (case officer); 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. The Council will append its minutes of the DCF to the officer's report, its 2025 notes recorded the members' questions with the answers, and its case officer undertook that the record would be accurate, so the minutes are corrected before they are appended
 2. Record the answers the applicant gave and the undertakings the chair made in the members' half hour and the summing up, which the minutes leave out at items 86 to 101, as the Council's 2025 notes recorded them
 3. Correct the nine items that record something other than what was said, items 31, 32, 67, 77, 92, 98, 101, 108 and 114(v), each against the recording at the time given
 4. State when the minutes were uploaded and by whom, keep the recording available to members with the report, and say of any item not corrected why not, so that the report's account of the DCF can be checked
 5. A written answer by Tuesday 29 September 2026 and the corrected minutes before the report is written keep the appended minutes accurate; without them, the report goes to members with the questions and none of the answers, and the recording stands against it
-

1. The Council will append its minutes of the DCF to the officer's report, its 2025 notes recorded the members' questions with the answers, and its case officer undertook that the record would be accurate, so the minutes are corrected before they are appended

1.1 The chair closed the DCF by saying what would become of its record: "the committee manager will draft up the notes of the meeting, and these will be published on the Development Control Forum meeting webpage, and they will also be appended to the planning officer's report." (The Council's recording of the DCF, published on its YouTube channel as "DCF Meeting 29/07/2026 10am", <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wKx49TGqIIIE> ("the webcast"), 1:56:49 to 1:57:05, a place in it given in hours, minutes and seconds from its start; the minutes, item 114(i).) The minutes were published on 21 September 2026, fifty four days after the DCF. They will go to members as part of the report.

1.2 The Council's own standard for that record is in three of its own documents. Its notes of the 2025 DCF recorded each member's question with the answers given, speaker by speaker, in numbered sub items (the Council's 2025 notes, pages 209 to 212). Its case officer wrote to CLAG on 31 July 2026, with Democratic Services in copy: "A record of the DCF has not yet been provided but when it has I will also ensure that this accurately reflects my comments." (Exhibit M1, exhibit page 2.) Its Statement of Community Involvement gives the aim of a Development Control Forum as "to allow early discussion of the planning issues raised by petitioners and to seek to resolve concerns" (paragraph 4.22).

1.3 The minutes do not meet that standard. Items 82 to 100 record the members' questions and no item records an answer the applicant gave or an undertaking the chair made in the members' half hour (section 2). Nine items record something other than what the recording carries (section 3).

1.4 CLAG asks the Council for three things. The first is to record the answers and undertakings (section 2). The second is to correct the nine items (section 3). The third is to state when the minutes were uploaded and by whom, to keep the recording available to members with the report, and to say of any item it does not correct why not (section 4). CLAG asks for a written

answer by Tuesday 29 September 2026, four days from this letter and within the six days the Council took to answer CLAG's letter of 7 August 2026 (document 9490029, answered on 13 August 2026). CLAG asks for the corrected minutes before the report is written, and in any event before the report is published, which the chair put at "five clear days before the committee meeting" (webcast 1:58:48; item 114(vi)).

1.5 This letter argues nothing about the scheme. The DCF record stands on the recording whether or not the minutes are corrected, and CLAG's papers cite it. What this letter asks is that the Council's own document, the one it will append to the report, says what was said.

2. Record the answers the applicant gave and the undertakings the chair made in the members' half hour and the summing up, which the minutes leave out at items 86 to 101, as the Council's 2025 notes recorded them

The minutes record what members asked and not what they were told. Items 82 to 100 give each question; no item gives the applicant's answer or the chair's reply, and item 101 leaves out one sentence of the summing up of the Master of the College, the applicant's presenter ("the Master"). The Council's 2025 notes recorded each question with the answers, speaker by speaker. The report will be written on the minutes as appended. If the answers and undertakings are recorded, the report carries what members were told; if they are not, the report carries the questions alone and the DCF record on the register carries the answers.

1. Item 94 records "Has the College considered public access to the library." The Master answered "We will." (1:41:59). A councillor said "Great to see that in the application." (1:42:10). The chair undertook twice that officers would follow the point up (1:42:42; 1:43:04): "Officers will follow up on that particular point." The follow up produced the applicant's letter of 5 August 2026 (document 9486713), so the undertaking is the origin of a document on the register. (The DCF record, entry 4.29.)
2. Item 93 records "The existing library already had a partial basement." The Master answered: "The new building will follow the existing line of Bath Court. So there will be no extra digging. There is a slight difference between the level of Bath Court and Christ's Lane, which is why the petitioner says there's a basement, but there is no digging in the new building." (1:41:01 to 1:41:22.) No answer is recorded. (The DCF record, entry 4.6.)
3. Item 99 records "Would the new basement be at the same level as the existing building." A councillor said "It might arrive at the same level but there would be digging." (1:48:24), and the chair said "Officers can deal with that quite clearly as part of the officer presentation." and "There are excerpts that the objectors have pointed to today showing cross sections of the scheme across Christ's Lane into Bath Court. But we will make that information available to members." (1:48:34 to 1:48:50.) The undertaking is not recorded. (The DCF record, entry 4.16.)
4. Items 91 and 92 record the requests that the public benefit be defined and the 14 metres clarified, and a councillor asked for "some understanding of any mitigations undertaken in the light of comments from I think it's a Victorian Society and English Heritage" (1:39:48), which no item records. The chair said "We've made a note of all of those requests." (1:40:08.) The note is not recorded. (The DCF record, entry 4.25.)
5. Items 86 and 87 record the ward councillor's question on the frontage. The Master answered with three things: a wall that "will be beautiful and varied with different windows"; "there will be a bench for public use that runs along it"; and a commissioned "filigree iron gate design which will allow the public to see into Bath Court for the first time" (1:20:44 to 1:21:51). No answer is recorded. (The DCF record, entry 4.20.)

6. Item 97 records "Would the proposals create a canyon effect." The Master answered "We do not believe that there is a canyon effect." (1:32:11.) No answer is recorded. (The DCF record, entries 4.48 and 4.50.)
7. Item 88 records "If no decision was to be made, what was the reason for holding this meeting." The chair answered that the meeting's purpose was "to try and enable the engagement between petitioners and the applicants and possibly achieve amendments to the scheme", that "there will be dialogue between the case officer and the applicants after this meeting", and that "It's entirely up to the applicants whether they want to engage with the process and make amendments" (1:26:00 to 1:27:12). No answer is recorded. (The DCF record, entry 3.4.)
8. At the close the Master said: "I will follow up in writing but when our opponents materially misrepresent our own master plan, I give you notice we will reply in writing. That was a total misrepresentation" (1:57:24 to 1:57:36). The applicant's letter of 1 August 2026 (document 9481026) is that reply; on the masterplan it quotes nothing said at the DCF and does not say which statement was wrong. Neither the allegation nor the notice is recorded, and the minutes should record both. (The DCF record, entry 4.9.)
9. Item 101 records the Master's summing up on the chimneys. Between "The height of these was to aid ventilation" and "cut back as much as possible" the Master said "That height can begin beneath the ground. But as I've said many times, we do not want to dig into the ground." (1:49:35 to 1:49:42.) The first sentence is not recorded. (The DCF record, entry 4.13.)
10. No item records the chair's undertaking on the harm assessments, given in the members' half hour. The chair said: "you've heard this morning that different heritage experts have arrived at different assessments as to the level and extent of harm to the heritage assets that are in play here. But all of this will be set out quite clearly within the officer report when the application is reported to Planning Committee." (1:46:07 to 1:47:43.) The undertaking is that the report sets out the level and extent of harm each assessment found; the minutes carry no item for it. (The DCF record, entry 4.27.)

CLAG asks the Council to record each answer and undertaking above at its item, in the form of its 2025 notes, and to publish the corrected minutes before the report is written. If the Council does, the minutes it appends carry what members were told. If the Council does not, the report goes to members with the questions, none of the answers and no undertaking in the Council's own document, the DCF record on the register carries the answers with their times, and the report must say which document it follows and why.

3. Correct the nine items that record something other than what was said, items 31, 32, 67, 77, 92, 98, 101, 108 and 114(v), each against the recording at the time given

Nine items record words that the recording does not carry, or carry words under the wrong speaker. Each is given below with the words spoken and the time. If the Council corrects them, the appended minutes carry the words of the recording. If it does not, the report rests on a document the Council's own recording contradicts at nine places, and the DCF record on the register shows each.

1. Items 31 and 32 record as Historic England's own statements what the applicant's planning and heritage consultant, Turley ("the applicant's consultant") read from Historic England's comments on the 2025 application. Item 31: "Historic England had been involved in other a year of discussion and were confident when they said that the college

had acknowledged the benefits of removing the basement and glazing from the court and the architectural merits of the current scheme. With this in mind, they did not wish to object to the application.” Item 32: “Historic England also welcomed the revisions introduced to the scheme and retained its position of no objection.” The consultant said (0:39:37 to 0:40:10): “we also acknowledge the benefits of removing the basement and glazing from the court and the architectural merits of the current scheme. With this in mind we do not wish to object to the application.’ That was their first comment. In the second comment they said ‘Historic England welcomes the revisions introduced to the scheme and retains its position of no objection.’” The confidence was the College’s, the acknowledgement Historic England’s, and both comments were on the earlier application. The items should record that the consultant read those passages of Historic England’s earlier comments, in the words read. (The DCF record, entry 4.36.)

2. Item 67 reverses the sense of the petitioners’ presenter’s words on the comparator streets. Item 67: the streets “were not pedestrian streets, and did not have vehicular access”. The presenter said: “These are not pedestrian streets. These are vehicle streets.” (1:08:57 to 1:08:59.) The item should carry the second sentence as spoken.
3. Item 77 gives a total the case officer has since corrected. Item 77: “there had been a total of 108 comments of which 61 were in support and 47 in objection with approximately 19 representations received from the Christ’s Lane action Group.” The case officer wrote on 31 July 2026: “I can confirm that the figures I stated within my presentation to the Development Control Forum on the 29th July were written on the basis that the 47 representations in objection were in addition to the submissions from Christ’s Lane Action Group.” (Exhibit M1, exhibit page 2.) The item should state the figures on the basis the case officer confirmed: the submissions from CLAG are in addition to the 47 in objection and to the 108. (Document 9482121 carries CLAG’s request of 31 July 2026.)
4. Item 92 turns a question about which part of the building a dimension belongs to into a question about the chimneys. Item 92: “clarity was needed on the height of the chimneys and detail of the wall and the public benefit needed to be defined.” The councillor said: “So I’d like some clarity on the heights. People keep talking about 14 metres. I’d need like to know if that was the chimneys or the whole structure.” (1:38:59 to 1:39:05.) The item should carry the question as asked. (The DCF record, entry 4.30.)
5. Item 98 records as a question what was spoken as a presumption. Item 98: “Is the land in the proposal in the ownership of the applicant.” The councillor said: “So in general, I presume the land on which the development is proposed is in the ownership of the applicant.” (1:31:16 to 1:31:22.) No one at the DCF answered or corrected it. The item should carry the words as spoken. (The DCF record, entry 4.49.)
6. Item 101 gives the College’s wish not to dig as one of the purposes of the chimneys, and carries a misprint. Item 101: “The height of these was to aid ventilation and to avoid further digging into the ground. The heigh had also been cut back as much as possible.” The Master said: “the chimneys need to be a certain height in order to achieve that ventilating effect. That height can begin beneath the ground. But as I’ve said many times, we do not want to dig into the ground. So in order to get this green effect, the chimneys need to be the height they are.” (1:49:16 to 1:49:58.) The item should carry the Master’s words, including the sentence at section 2, item 9, and “heigh” should read “height”. (The DCF record, entry 4.13.)
7. Item 108 gives the Master’s own figure to the petitioners. Item 108, under the petitioners’ summing up: “Students only used the library for 26 weeks of the year.” The Master said in the applicant’s summing up: “But there are 52 weeks in the year and our students are only there for about 26.” (1:51:01.) The petitioners’ presenter then said: “And the master

himself has just said students only use the library 26 weeks a year” (1:53:24). The Master’s sentence should be recorded under item 102, the applicant’s summing up, and item 108 should carry the petitioners’ sentence with its attribution. (The DCF record, entry 4.24.)

8. Item 114(v) records a committee the chair did not name. Item 114(v): “Application to be considered at a future Joint Development Management Committee.” The chair said: “Presently the application is targeted for the second of September planning committee, but that won’t be settled until the officer report is settled and we feel comfortable taking it to that committee.” (1:58:33 to 1:58:47.) The item should carry the chair’s words. (The DCF record, entry 3.3.)

CLAG asks the Council to correct each item above to the words of the recording, and to publish the corrected minutes before the report is written. If the Council does, the appended minutes and the recording agree. If the Council does not, the report rests on a document its own recording contradicts, and the DCF record on the register shows each place.

4. State when the minutes were uploaded and by whom, keep the recording available to members with the report, and say of any item not corrected why not, so that the report’s account of the DCF can be checked

4.1 CLAG asks the Council to state the date on which the minutes were uploaded to its democracy site and the office that uploaded them. The minutes carry no date of publication, and the DCF record cites them as published on 21 September 2026, the day CLAG found them.

4.2 CLAG asks the Council to keep the recording available to members with the report. The chair said at the opening that the meeting “is automatically recorded and will be available for public viewing for six months from the date of the meeting” (webcast 0:17:33), that is until 29 January 2027. If the report is considered after that day, or the recording is withdrawn before it, members and the public cannot check the minutes against it. (The DCF record, entry 3.1.)

4.3 CLAG asks the Council to say, of any item in sections 2 and 3 that it does not correct, why not. An answer that names the item and the reason lets the report be checked against both documents; silence leaves the report resting on the minutes alone.

5. A written answer by Tuesday 29 September 2026 and the corrected minutes before the report is written keep the appended minutes accurate; without them, the report goes to members with the questions and none of the answers, and the recording stands against it

5.1 If the Council records the answers and undertakings, corrects the nine items and publishes the corrected minutes before the report is written, the document it appends to the report carries the questions with the answers and the words of the recording. The report is then written on it.

5.2 If the Council does not, the appended minutes carry the members’ questions and none of the answers, and nine items its own recording contradicts. The DCF record on the register carries the answers and the corrections with their times, and the report must say which of the two documents it follows and why.

5.3 A written answer by Tuesday 29 September 2026, and the corrected minutes before the report is written and in any event before it is published five clear days before the meeting, resolve

this letter. CLAG asks that the answer and the corrected minutes be placed on the register with this letter.

Christ's Lane Action Group