

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING of 07 October 2026

Amendment Sheet

Item number 4: National Scheme of Delegation

Amendment to text of report:

Para 3.11 in relation to Variation or Modification of S106 Planning Obligations to read (new text in bold, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~):

'With regard to the variation or modification of S106 obligations, under the GCSPS June 2026 scheme of delegation these types of applications were considered under delegated powers, unless officers considered referral in the wider public interest. It is therefore proposed that new arrangements replicate this approach. This approach is considered proportionate and consistent with Government guidance because these application types rarely raise strategic planning issues and have historically been determined under the GCSP Scheme of Delegation.

~~it is proposed that these are determined in accordance with the application Schedule categorisation type to which they relate. Again, there is a presumption of officer determination but potential committee referral could be required if the prescribed referral tests are met.'~~

Amendment to Appendix 2 the Scheme of Delegation, page 26, para 16, last bullet point:

- All applications for modification, discharge or variation of planning obligations unless a schedule 2 application and the Director considers it in the wider public interest to refer the application to Planning Gateway Meeting for consideration by the Planning Committee.
~~relating to Schedule 1 development.~~

Commentary: The effect of the change is a presumption that all such applications are delegated, unless in the wider public interest a referral is made by the Director to the Planning Gateway Meeting and it is determined that Planning Committee make a decision. The regulations allow for a filtering of applications - such as these - for practical operational reasons. Most proposals for modification, discharge or variation of a planning obligation (whether related to schedule 1 or 2) relate to either technical matters relating to the wording or function of a S106

or confirmation of compliance with its terms, they are not strategic in nature. Most of these application types are not of any wider public interest. The proposed variation to the SoD removes most schedule 2 related modification, discharge and variation applications through a delegated and assumptive triaging, from being reported to the Gateway Meeting.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: As above.

Major Applications

Item number: 5

Planning reference number: 26/00039/FUL

Site address: Land at Ekin Road, Cambridge

Description of development:

Demolition of existing dwellings and redevelopment to provide 134 No. new dwellings, parking, open space, landscaping and associated works.

Summary of amendment(s):

- Amendment to summary of consultee responses to state 'No Objection' from the Council's tree officer.
- Additional text to reference the net loss of affordable homes within the executive summary, affordable housing and planning balance sections of the report (paragraphs 1.5, 2.2, 10.8 and 21.9).
- Additional third-party comment
- Amended condition wording (Construction Management Plan)
- Additional informative to encourage the applicants to consider membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

1)An error was included within the summary of consultee responses in the published Committee Report. For the avoidance of doubt, the Council's Tree Officer does not object to the proposed development. The summary of consultee responses should therefore be read as indicating no objection from the Tree Officer (please see amended table below).

Summary of Consultee responses

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment
Tree Officer	Objection No Objection

2) Amendment to Paragraph 1.5

- 1.5 Although the development would result in the loss of some existing trees, embodied carbon associated with demolition, temporary impacts of during construction and some impacts on neighbouring amenity **and a net reduction in affordable housing provision on the application site through the replacement of 91 Council owned dwellings that were occupied prior to the estate decanting programme with 34 affordable homes secured through the planning permission**, officers conclude that these harms are outweighed by the public benefits arising from the regeneration of the estate, the delivery of new homes, affordable housing, enhanced public realm, biodiversity net gain and sustainable design measures. Officers therefore recommend that the application be **approved**, subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
-

3) Amendment to Paragraph 2.2

- 2.2 The site **as existing** comprises a mix of residential building types, including flat blocks, bungalows, and terraced and semi-detached houses, ranging in height from one to three storeys. The site as existing also consists of small parking courts, garage blocks, trees, and areas of soft landscaping. **Prior to the commencement of the decanting programme, the estate contained 108 dwellings comprising 85 Council social rented homes, 6 temporary accommodation homes and 17 leasehold/freehold properties. At the time of writing this report, only 13 properties remain occupied, of which 2 are Council social rented homes and the remaining 11 are leasehold/freehold properties or occupied as temporary accommodation. The majority of the estate has therefore already been vacated in advance of the proposed redevelopment.**

4) Amendment to Paragraph 10.8

10.8 Whilst the proposal does not deliver the policy compliant requirement of 40% affordable housing, this must be considered in the context of both the site's existing condition and the findings of the submitted and independently reviewed viability evidence. **The proposal would involve the replacement of 91 previously occupied Council-owned dwellings and their replacement with 34 affordable homes secured through the planning permission, representing a net reduction of 57 affordable homes on the application site. Officers acknowledge that this attracts negative weight within the planning assessment. However, it must also be acknowledged that only 13 dwellings remain occupied and that the estate has already largely been decanted due to the condition of the housing stock, including significant damp, mould, water ingress and structural issues identified by the applicant.** The existing dwellings have reached the end of their operational life and the estate is no longer considered capable of meeting modern housing standards. In the absence of comprehensive redevelopment, the condition of the estate will continue to deteriorate, resulting in increasing management, maintenance and investment costs. The independently assessed viability evidence demonstrates that the scheme cannot viably support the delivery of 40% affordable housing due principally to the significant demonstrable costs associated with the regeneration of the estate. Notwithstanding this position, the redevelopment provides an opportunity for the Council to seek and maximise external funding from Homes England towards the delivery of additional affordable housing, although any such funding would be secured outside of the planning process.

5) Amendment to Paragraph 21.9

21.9 Officers acknowledge that the redevelopment would result in the loss of several Category B and Category C trees and embodied carbon emissions associated with the demolition and temporary impacts on retained neighbouring properties during the construction phase. In addition, the development would give rise to some localised impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, as assessed within this report. Lastly, the proposal would not secure the minimum percentage of affordable housing ordinarily secured by Policy 45 **and would result in a net reduction in affordable housing provision on the application site through the replacement of 91 existing Council-owned homes with 34 affordable homes secured through the planning permission.** These harms are afforded moderate weight in the planning balance.

6) Addition to Section 7 (Third Party Representations)

An additional comment has been received requesting an additional amendment to the proposed boundary treatment plan in relation to the Ditton Lane properties.

Officer response: During the course of the application, the applicant has confirmed that additional boundary treatment will be provided along the boundaries with 6-8 Ditton Lane, where these properties adjoin the proposed car parking area serving Flat Block 3. The design and height of the boundary treatment will be secured through Condition 31, ensuring an appropriate level of residential amenity is maintained for existing occupiers.

7) Amendment to condition 7 (Traffic Management and Construction Management Plan)

7. Prior to the commencement of development, an addendum to the approved Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Construction Management Plan (CMP), submitted and uploaded on 20 August 2026, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Local Highway Authority. The addendum shall include:

a) Details of the location of any temporary bus stop and confirmation that any relocated bus shelter will be provided for the duration of the temporary relocation

b) Confirmation that all temporary parking bays will be provided at minimum dimensions of 2.5 metres by 5.0 metres;

c) Confirmation that all construction access arrangements will be implemented prior to the commencement of any works,

d) Details demonstrating how closure of the south-eastern pedestrian access will be minimised, including arrangements for maintaining pedestrian connectivity, together with confirmation that any closure has been agreed with the Local Highway Authority;

e) Details of the proposed double yellow line restrictions on Ekin Road, including the duration of the restrictions

f) Details of the engagement and consultation undertaken with the occupiers of the retained properties within Ekin Road and Ekin Close regarding the proposed demolition and construction works, including measures taken to

address concerns raised, arrangements for ongoing communication throughout the construction period, the provision of a dedicated contact point for residents, and details demonstrating how safe and uninterrupted access for residents, visitors, refuse collection vehicles and emergency service vehicles will be maintained to all retained properties throughout the demolition and construction phases;

g) A phasing and access strategy demonstrating how the new road network, utility diversions and associated infrastructure will be delivered in a manner that minimises disruption to the occupiers of retained properties within Ekin Road and Ekin Close, including the sequencing of construction works, temporary access arrangements, measures to maintain safe pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access, and details of how emergency vehicle access will be maintained at all times during each phase of development.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved Traffic Management Plan and Construction Management Plan and the approved addendum unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, the safe and efficient operation of the highway network, and to minimise disruption to pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and local residents during the construction period in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Policies 35 and 81.

8) Additional Informative:

Considerate Constructors Scheme

The applicant is strongly encouraged to register the development with the Considerate Constructors Scheme (or any successor accreditation scheme) for the duration of the construction period. Participation in the scheme would demonstrate a commitment to minimising the impact of construction activities on neighbouring residents, businesses and the local environment, whilst promoting high standards of site management, community engagement, workforce welfare, safety and environmental performance.

Item number: 6

Planning reference number: 26/02109/FUL

Site address: Christ's College Library, St Andrews Street, Cambridge

Description of development:

Demolition of 1970s library and replacement with new library, social and study spaces including re-provision of bridge to the Bodley Library. Alterations to kitchen, Upper Hall and adjacent areas including new plant, access improvements and alterations to wc, provision in the south east range of Second Court. Re-landscaping of Bath Court and ancillary works, installation of temporary kitchen and dining facility in Second Court for the duration of the works.

Summary of amendment(s):

1. On the 25th September at approximately 4:30pm more than 10 additional representations, with attachments, were received from Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG). These representations were received following the finalisation of the officer report which was sent to Democratic Services around midday on the 25th. The representations were after the expiry of the last consultation period which ended on 3 September 2026 and which was undertaken to invite further comments on the relevance of the new NPPF to the proposal. The latest representations from CLAG were therefore not able to be incorporated into the main body of the report. The representations received have all been uploaded to the public portal, and a summary of their details are set out below:

- *Email to Historic England (HE) asking for clarification regarding their comments. Requested confirmation of the degree of heritage harm HE consider the application results in. Including clarification of HE position in light of the 2026 NPPF.*

Officer response: A response from HE has been received (28 September 2026), reiterating that their previous comments reflect their assessment of the scheme, including taking into account the 2026 NPPF.

- *Letter directed to the case officer (25 September) setting out points that the officer report must include and take into account.*

Officer response: The points raised within this letter are noted. Whilst the letter was received after the officer report was finalised, it is considered that the report sets out the Council's recommendation in light of all necessary policy and statutory duties.

- *A Harm register setting out CLAGs view of the heritage harm arising from the scheme, including an assessment of the conclusions drawn by the applicant and statutory consultees.*

Officer response: The officer report takes into account the view of all statutory consultees and draws its own conclusion as to the level of heritage harm that would arise from the scheme. The letter received is not considered to change this conclusion.

- *A Letter (with a relevant exhibit) following an FOI request submitted to Historic England (HE). This argues that HE, during the pre-application process suggested ways to reduce or avoid heritage harm and that the applicant chose to not undertake these changes. It also reiterates alternative schemes that demonstrate a less harmful solution to the College needs*

Officer response: The applicant was given advice to mitigate/ avoid harm to the Bodley Library during pre-application discussions. The applicants have chosen to proceed with the scheme in front of members. This scheme has been assessed in the context of alternative schemes put forward by CLAG. This letter does not change the officer recommendation.

- *A letter (with 3 relevant exhibits) detailing the map record of the site showing Christ's Lane to be an important historical route with the site a historic garden within the College. The letter reiterates the view that the proposal is too large and fails to respond to its context.*

Officer response: The officer report sets out the planning constraints of the site, including the relevant Conservation Area Appraisal. The report also sets out in full the officer assessment of the scale and design of the proposal in its context. This letter does not change the officer recommendation.

- *Letter setting out CLAGs view in respect of conditions in relation to the application. This sets out that conditions cannot address heritage harm, that conditions should not be recommended unless necessary to make the development acceptable and that the report should specifically state how each recommended condition makes the development acceptable. The letter also raises comments from the Council's Environmental Health Officer that referring to previous discharge of conditions applications and information and that a condition is not itself capable of closing a public highway as required by the construction phase of development.*

Officer response: The officer report sets out the Council's view on the discharge of conditions applications under the previous scheme that is subject to Judicial Review (see paragraph 4.2). It is considered that all of the conditions recommended meet the tests set out in DM6 of the NPPF. This letter does not change the officer recommendation.

- *Letter (in addition to 3 exhibits) addressed to the Council's Conservation Officer setting out what CLAG consider four errors within the Conservation Officers comments on the application. These errors are that the identified heritage harm is stated only after positive effects have been weighed against it, the benefits to the conservation area are based upon the applicant's own assessment, contradicting the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal. The letter also considers the Conservation Officer was incorrect in stating that the proposed building is "smaller overall than the earlier approved scheme" with no reasoning for narrowing the assessment of harm to the stair tower.*

Officer response: Updated comments from the Council's Conservation Officer are not required. As a consultee, their comments are set out and considered within the officer report. This report sets out in full the officer heritage assessment response to all of the points raised within this letter. The letter does not change the officer recommendation.

- *Letter sent to the Council's Environmental Health Officer requesting updated comments reflecting the lack of change within the odour and plant noise assessments that fail to account for the reduction in height of the chimneys by 900mm. In addition to the lack of assessment of air quality benefits following the reduction in chimney height, and lack of assessment of artificial lighting upon Christ's Lane.*

Officer response: Whilst the odour and plant noise assessment have not been updated post the reduction in height of the chimneys, it is not considered that either document sets out mitigation that would be impacted by the reduction in height. The 900mm reduction in height of the chimneys would not, therefore significantly impact the conclusions drawn within these documents with the proposal representing a significant improvement over the current configuration of kitchen exhaust/ ventilation. A condition regarding artificial lighting is recommended and remains appropriate to ensure that this element of the scheme is acceptable (note further commentary from Env. Health on this issue below).

- *Letter (in addition to an additional exhibit) sent to the Council's Sustainability Officer raising contradictions within the applicants reasoning for no longer proposing an extension to the basement but increasing the building and concrete above ground. Failure of the proposed building against local plan sustainability requirements, only met by proposed generation which does not require a building of this size. And lack of sustainability assessment against council standards with this application.*

Officer response: A sustainability statement has been provided in support of the application. The applicant has also explained the reasoning for no longer pursuing an extension to the basement below the current library. A bespoke sustainability strategy has been agreed by the Council's Sustainability Officer given the mix of uses within the site and combination of new-build and refurbished elements. Whilst the proposal does rely upon renewable generation, this is compliant with policy requirements and therefore must be considered with the overall sustainability strategy conclusions.

- *Letter (with 2 relevant exhibits) relating to “the design and development plan”. Identifies conflict with the Local Plan heritage, context, design and tall buildings policies and that a decision should be refused as such. Contends that the proposal should be assessed against Policy 60 of the Local Plan as a tall building with the proposal also failing daylight testing on properties on the opposite side of Christ’s Lane. The letter concludes that the proposal should be refused due to failure to comply with the updated NPPF and Local Plan Policy.*

Officer response: The officer report sets out a full assessment against all relevant heritage, context and design policies including an assessment of Policy 60 (tall buildings) and its applicability. The report acknowledges harm, however, remains overall, in compliance with local and national policy.

- *Letter (with 7 relevant exhibits) relating to the lack of need for this particular design which results in there being no viable justification for the heritage harm identified. The letter states that there is no benefit provided that would outweigh the harm identified and that the scheme rather has a negative public impact.*

Officer response: The proposal has, as CLAG note, been submitted as the College requires updated library and study spaces for its students. Officers have, within the report assessed the alternative schemes, including the Rick Mather scheme approved previously. It is considered, as set out within the officer report, that substantial weight is given to heritage harm, but that the public benefits outweigh this harm with lack of a suitable alternative being demonstrated to meet the College's needs. The size of the building is clarified within the officer report. The proposed public access to the buildings is recommended to be secured by way of a condition to ensure it provides a public benefit.

- *Letter with (1 exhibit) relating to the 2026 Development Control Forum (DCF). This letter raises discrepancies with the published minutes from the*

Development Control Forum with a request that this is rectified. Raised concerns with the applicant's statement with regards to consultee comments including the Victorian Society. Failure by the applicant to set out justification of not proceeding with a basement or test other alternatives. Lack of measures to secure public access also raised by CLAG along with consideration that the bench and gate should not be considered public benefits.

Officer response: The Council do not consider that the published DCF minutes are materially inaccurate. They are appended to the officer report to committee. The officer report sets out its own summary of all consultee comments received with full comments visible on the public portal. The report also tackles the alternative schemes put forward and the decision by the applicant to no longer pursue the basement extension. The planning balance sets out the public benefits of the scheme including the public access which is proposed to be secured by way of a condition.

- *A Letter relating to the avoidance of harm and justification of harm identified. The letter sets out that no information provided by the applicant explores the potential for a lower building to avoid harm or that the bulk of the building is necessary. This includes failure to fully consider the previously consented scheme with a request that the applicant publishes the architectural competition held for the scheme.*

Officer response: The officer report sets out the full heritage assessment of the scheme including alternatives put forward. The Council must consider the application before it, which it has done in the report before members. It is not considered reasonable to require the applicant to put forward information relating to the architectural competition.

- *Letter relating to the accuracy of documents provided in support of the application. It is raised that certain documents provided with the application do not take into account the reduction in height of the chimneys made under an amendment of the previous application including the heritage statement, design and access statement, planning statement, Townscape and Visual Appraisal and Sustainability Statement.*

Officer response: Whilst not all documents provided have been amended to reflect the reduction in height of the chimneys, the sought approved plans remain accurate to the proposal. The documents mentioned within CLAGs letter remain appropriate to base an assessment upon and in most cases set out a worse scenario, before the reduction in height of the chimneys. Consultee comments are all considered to accurately assess the proposed scheme including the reduced height chimneys.

- *Letter (with a relevant exhibit) relating to the determination of the application whilst it contends that inaccurate advice has been received from multiple consultees. It also requests confirmation that the officer report will confront the first decision currently under Judicial Review.*

Officer response: The Council is of the view that consultee comments received on the application are accurate and sufficient in order for a decision to be made. The report also sets out responses to each of the grounds raised under the Judicial Review of the previous application.

- *Letter (with 3 relevant exhibits) relating to the publication of certain documents that CLAG contend was contrary to its statement of community involvement. Also raised concerns regarding the publication dates of documents on the public portal.*

Officer response: The record of the public meeting held on the 6 July 2026 was not initially uploaded as it contained quotations from a third-party who had not consented to it being uploaded. A version of this record, submitted by CLAG has since been uploaded and considered in the officer recommendation. All other documentation raised by CLAG in this letter has been uploaded and has been visible on the public portal for an extended period of time, well beyond the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement.

- *Letter (along with 3 relevant exhibits) sent to officers and Democratic Services relating to the publication and consideration of documents prior to the planning committee determination of the application. Specifically CLAG request that the officer report take into account every paper within the filings sent on the 25th September and that the officer report be published five clear days before the meeting.*

Officer response: As set out above in this amendment sheet, the representations that CLAG refer to were received by the Council after 4pm on Friday 25th September. The finalised officer report was sent to Democratic Services around midday on the 25th September. It has not therefore been possible to consider these representations in the report itself. However, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the representations have been published on the public portal and all responded to within this amendment/ update sheet. The officer report was published in line with the (SCI) at least 5 days prior to the committee meeting.

- *Letter (with 1 exhibit) sent to officers and Democratic Services relating to the attachment of the DCF minutes to the officer report and that the points raised at the meeting will be responded to either within the report or officer presentation. The letter also repeats the request to correct the published minutes from the DCF.*

Officer response: The published minutes from the DCF meeting of the 29th July are appended to the officer report before committee. The officer report has been prepared following the meeting and has taken into account the discussion raised by members at the meeting. One of the matters that arose out of the DCF was a commitment from the College to allow public access to Bath Court and the new library. This is secured by condition 32.

2. Further representations have been received from CLAG as follows:

- *Letter (with an attached record of the planning committee agenda website) stating the officer report was not visible on the website on the 29th September. And that as this fails to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act and the item should therefore be withdrawn from the committee meeting.*

Officer response: Whilst there was an error with the visibility of the standalone officer report on the website, noted during the morning of the 30th September. The report was visible within the "reports pack" available to all members of the public on the 29th September. The publication of the officer report therefore complies with the requirements of the Local Government Act and there is no basis to withdraw the item for this reason.

3. CLAG sent, with a request to upload, the High Court Order of the 29 September, confirming that the Judicial Review hearing of the previous application (25/02161/FUL) is going ahead.

Officer response: This court order has been uploaded to the application and is attached to the update sheet in full (Appendix 1). It is not considered to change the officer recommendation or ability to determine the application.

4. On the 29th September CLAG issued a "Notice of intended proceedings on application 26/02109/FUL, in the form of Annex A to the Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review". Stating why, in their view, a decision cannot be made on this current application and that if it is a Judicial Review will be applied for.

Officer response: The contents of this notice are acknowledged; Officers remain of the view that a decision can be lawfully made on the current application with the Judicial Review of the previous application (25/02161/FUL) ongoing.

5. On Sunday 4th September a letter was received from HGH Consulting on behalf of Christ's Lane Action Group raising 8 core criticisms of the officer report with a request that the application is therefore refused or deferred until the High Court judgement is handed down on the Judicial Review of the previous application.

Officer response: Whilst the criticisms are noted, The Council remain of the view that the officer report, taken with this amendment sheet provides members with a lawful recommendation that will allow a decision to be made. Changes made in light of this representation are as follows:

To note, the wording of Condition 11 has been updated to require further details of removal and restoration of the temporary facilities to tighten the control over restoration of the site to its original condition and the timing of the removal of the facilities.

Additional wording is also proposed to paragraph 15.7 to clarify that condition 11 would also secure protection of trees through details of the temporary facilities.

Amendment to paragraph 1.25 to clarify that the level of harm is an assessment of the officer and not Historic England.

Amendment of paragraph 16.38 to remove reference to Historic England's agreement.

For the purposes of clarity, paragraph 16.39 of the officer report is amended in respect of public accessibility and how this is construed as a benefit:

6. On Monday 5 September a letter (with attachments) was sent by CLAG to Cllr Porrer, chair of Planning Committee setting out grounds for which they suggest Cllr Porrer should defer the item on the 7th October.

Officer response: The letter is noted and in the view of officers is not considered to require deferral. Chair could not unilaterally make this decision.

7. On Monday 5 September CLAG submitted a “supplementary notice of intended proceedings (in addition to attachments) requesting deferral of the application and setting out grounds for Judicial Review.

Officer response: The contents of this notice are acknowledged; officers remain of the view that a decision can be lawfully made on the current application with the Judicial Review of the previous application (25/02161/FUL) ongoing.

8. On Monday 5 September EB7 (on behalf of CLAG) submitted a letter raising concerns with the lack of sufficient information regarding daylight and sunlight impacts and the policy context of this in light of the updated NPPF.

Officer response: As is raised within this letter, paragraph 130C of the NPPF was removed as part of the 2026 update. Policy DP3 of the updated NPPF now refers to daylight and sunlight impacts of proposals. It is noted that this policy requires consideration to be given to levels of daylight and sunlight for “neighbouring residents and occupiers”. It is therefore, considered that it remains appropriate to apply the guidance within BRE209 where occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight. As set out in the officer report, the impact of the proposal upon both the redevelopment on the south of Christ’s Lane and upon Christ’s Lane itself is considered acceptable.

9. On Monday 5 September Alec Forshaw submitted, on behalf of CLAG additional comments on the application in response to the officer report. This sets out additional harm identified by the scheme and changes that should be made to the officer report to reflect this. Whilst the officer recommendation is considered unchanged, an amendment is proposed to paragraph 26.7 to clarify the scale of the proposed staircase turret.

10. Additional third-party representations have been received in objection to the proposed development; this raised the following concerns:

- Impact upon the public realm along Christ’s Lane contrary to the emerging local plan and National Planning Policy Framework.
- Inappropriate scale and design within a tightly constrained site.
- Reiterated the request that this application be deferred until the Judicial Review is decided.
- Disputing the conclusion that the proposal would not harm the Conservation Area. And that the existing building, to be demolished is not “negative” within the Conservation Area

- Failure of the proposal to enhance the public realm along Christ's Lane, rather, it closes its back on those using the space.

These comments are not considered to change the officer recommendation.

11. Additional comment in support of the proposal raising the following points:

- Supports the proposed development which is "excellent".

12. Amendments to the consultee summary table to reflect the overall conclusions and correct paragraph references.

In addition to clarification within the summary of Consultee Comments the Gardens Trust have concluded their comments that they "have no comments to make on the proposal" and that this is therefore an overall position of **No comment**.

13. Updated comments received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer clarifying their position in light of the CLAG representation of the 25 September. Confirming, in their professional judgement that the conditions relating to odour and plant noise remain appropriate, but with additional wording suggested to strengthen the artificial lighting condition (No.22)

14. A representation in respect of the applicability of the BNG metric in respect of the temporary kitchen facility. Officers require additional time to investigate this matter and will report any further update orally on the day of planning committee.

Amendment to text:

Paras:

1.25. As considered by Historic England and the Council's Conservation officer the proposed replacement library would result in harm. **Officers consider this harm to be** (at the lower end of the scale) to the setting of the Grade I listed Bodley Library, forming a part of the College site. In the view of officers there is considered to be an overall harmful impact in heritage terms. This harm is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the scheme.'

1.31 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application subject to conditions.

Consultee	Object / No objection/ No comment	Paragraph Reference
Anglian Water	No comment received No objection	6.1
Conservation Officer	No objection - Harm identified	6.3 4
Archaeology	No objection	6.10 5
County Highways Development Management	No objection	6.12 8
County Transport Assessment Team	No comment received	6.13 9
Designing out crime Officer	No objection	6.15 21
Ecology Officer	No objection	6.16 22
Environment Agency	No comment	6.18 24
Environmental Health	No objection	6.19 25
Gardens Trust	No comment	6.27 35
Historic England	No objection – Harm identified	6.31 40
Landscape Officer	No objection	6.48 58
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection	6.49 60
Natural England	No comment received	6.52 65
Public Art Officer	No objection	6.53 66
Sustainable Drainage Officer	No comment received	6.54 67

Sustainability Officer	No objection	6.55 68
S106 Officer	No comment received	6.58 71
Tree Officer	No objection	6.59 72
Urban Design Officer	No objection	6.62 75
Victorian Society	Objects	6.65 78
Waste Officer	No comment- objection	6.67 80
Third Party Representations (32)	62 in support and 57 in objection	7.1
Local Interest Groups and Organisations / Petition (2)	Representations received from Christ's Lane Action Group and CPPF	8.1 9.1

Gardens Trust - ~~No Objection~~ No comment

6.35 It should be noted that the Garden's Trust are proposed to be removed as a statutory consultee under Government Reforms announced on the 17th August. However, given they remain a statutory consultee until secondary legislation is passed, their comments are considered as such.

15.7 The Tree Officer has requested a compliance condition in accordance with the provided TPS. However, in line with the Council's stance on information provided to discharge conditions on the previous permission (25/02161/FUL), it is recommended, as it was on the previous application that further details regarding the nature of the temporary kitchen and its impact upon surrounding trees and the lawns of Second Court can be secured by way of an Arboricultural Method Statement/ Tree Protection Plan condition **as well as condition 11 that relates to details of the temporary kitchen facilities.**

16.38 Whilst the proposed library would enclose Bath Court to a greater extent than the existing library, the high-quality design, combined with enhancements to the landscaping of Bath Court are considered to mitigate the impact of the increase in scale upon the other aspects of the listed buildings such that they do not result in any further harm beyond that identified to the Bodley Library. It is

considered that this view is consistent with ~~that of both Historic England and the~~ Council's Conservation Officer.

Para '16.39. Whilst the Council's Conservation Officer considers the proposal would sustain the ongoing use of the Grade I listed buildings within the College-
Planning officers consider that **more specifically** the proposed development, through the provision of a modern library building would ~~also~~ help to sustain the ongoing use of the Grade I listed College buildings by providing improved, accessible library facilities for students, ~~and however~~ this is a public benefit of the scheme rather than a direct heritage benefit.'

26.7 Nevertheless, there is a level of harm identified to the setting of the Bodley Library. A degree of heritage harm arises from the space requirements of the College and its students in the circumstances of this application. For example, the large staircase turret that is highly visible within the setting of the Bodley provides a form of fire escape ~~to the upper levels~~ **and is the sole point of access to the roof** and therefore has a minimum height requirement.

Condition 11: No development shall commence (including demolition) to the existing kitchen/ dining facilities until details of the proposed temporary kitchen/ dining facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details provided should include the timespan for which the facilities are required ~~and how the land will be restored to its original condition.~~, **how and when the facilities will be removed including details of the restoration of the ground to its original condition.**

The approved development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would be acceptable with regards to its impact on relevant heritage assets and protected trees within the site, in accordance with Policies 61, 62 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Condition 22: Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting an artificial lighting impact assessment and scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Internal lighting within the proposed covered Library Court shall **and external light spill from all Library windows onto to Christs Lane and to residents' windows etc of Bradwell's Court across Christs Lane, shall be assessed.** The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken

(horizontal / vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels). Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Recommended Maximum Values of Light Parameters for the Control of Obtrusive Light contained within the 'Institute of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Note 01/21: the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01/21', (or as superseded). Any mitigation measures to reduce and contain potential artificial light spill and glare as appropriate shall be detailed.

The artificial lighting scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 34)

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: N/a

Decision:



**In the High Court of Justice
King's Bench Division
Administrative Court**

AC-2025-LON-004656



AC-2025-LON-004656

In the matter of an application for judicial review

THE KING

on the application of

CHRIST'S LANE ACTION GROUP

Claimant

-and-

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Defendant

-and-

CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

Interested Party

UPON considering the draft consent order and statement of matters, signed by the Defendant and the Interested Party, whereby the impugned decision is to be quashed, by reference to the four grounds of challenge

AND upon considering the refusal of the Claimant to sign the draft consent order, on the basis that it contends the grounds of claim raise general issues, necessitating the Court to give a reasoned judgment on them

ORDER BY HON. SIR PETER LANE

1. The substantive hearing fixed for 1 day on 20 October 2026 shall remain listed.
2. The parties can expect the Court on that day to consider first whether, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed as the Claimant contends.

REASONS

1. Given the short period of time before the substantive hearing, and in view of the fact that an order on the papers quashing the decision on the basis of the statement of matters is likely to be the subject of an application by the Claimant for the issue to be revisited at a hearing, the most practicable course is to keep the listing for 20 October.
2. Should the Court determine there is no merit in the Claimant's position, the parties will be able to make submissions as to what consequences should follow in terms of costs.

Signed: *Peter Lane*

Date: **29 September 2026**

The date of service of this order is calculated from the date in the section below

For completion by the Administrative Court Office

Sent to:

The Claimant / The Claimant's solicitors []

The Defendant / The Defendant's solicitors []

The Interested party / The Interested Party's solicitors []

Date: 29/09/2026

Ref No.