

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM11 February 2021
10.00 am - 1.22 pm**Present****Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Baigent, Green, Page-Croft, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Councillor Martinelli (Ward Councillor)

Officers:

Area 3 Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Senior Planner Officer: Saffron Loasby

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin.

For Applicant:

R H Partnership Architects: David Ward

Loftus Family Property: Richard Loftus

CRU: Robert Perlman

Lawrence Heller

For Petitioners:

Resident of The Old Vicarage

2 residents of Portugal Place

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**21/3/DCF Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Baigent: Personal, Cambridge Cycle Campaign.

21/4/DCF Application and Petition Details (20/04261/FUL / Jewish Synagogue 3 Thompsons Lane Cambridge CB5 8AQ)

Application and Petition Details (20/04261/FUL / Jewish Synagogue 3 Thompsons Lane Cambridge CB5 8AQ)

Application No: 20/04261/FUL

Site Address: Jewish Synagogue 3 Thompsons Lane Cambridge CB5 8AQ

Description: Demolition of existing Synagogue and Jewish Community facility and erection of a new Synagogue and Jewish Community facility

including replacement parking spaces and new cycle storage and associated works

Applicant: The Trustees Agent: David Ward, R H Partnership Address: 94 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 1ER

Lead Petitioner: Resident of Thompson's Lane

Case Officer: Saffron Loasby

Text of Petition:

We the undersigned petition the council to Establish a Development Control Forum in respect of planning application 20/04261/FUL Residents support application 20/04261/FUL (redevelopment of synagogue), but petition for a Development Control Forum to discuss concerns & remedies.

Background noise level doubled in violation of pre-planning stipulations and Council Policies. Moreover, at time of measurements made by out-of-date acoustic report, there existed a disputed source of other noise pollution, thus background noise level unrepresentative of quieter current situation. Proposed Remedy - acoustic report be updated; with current designs; background noise levels re-measured excluding disputed neighbouring restaurant disturbance; noise estimates at bedroom heights.

Noisy, unshielded, roof-mounted mechanical equipment planned near neighbouring bedroom windows in grade II listed residential dwellings. 3 large units < 10 metres from Portugal Place & The Old Vicarage bedrooms, at same height with no acoustic screening. Sound power levels estimated up to 86 dBA, comparable to power lawn mower. Proposed Remedy - propose deletion of roof-mounted equipment; noisy plant confined to interior.

Consider making planning consent subject to following conditions:

1 – CUJS enter into Undertaking to operate the facility in a manner befitting more intensive use:

- Single point of contact be established, with formal role in governance; local community access to accountable parties with authority to address concerns;
- Suitable signage urging visitors to respect local residents when entering and leaving;
- Noiseless gates, secured against wind, kept in this condition;
- Overnight stay of people not permitted.

2 – 'Winter Garden' Roof Terrace with retractable roof, directly overlooks neighbours' bedrooms. Roof only allowed to be open from 10:00 to 21:00, no music to be played in the winter garden at any time when roof open, nor other

noisy activities e.g. film night, but excluding religious observances requiring opening of roof. Employ frosted glass all sides.

3 – Proposal impacts rights of way of The Old Vicarage, and compromise has been negotiated. However, access to eastern boundary wall blocked by proposed security fence. CUJS to enter into undertaking to allow access to eastern boundary for purposes outlined in pre-existing Deed, on basis not more restrictive than that to date.

4 – Smokers may congregate outside the proposed gate which is directly by main entrance to The Old Vicarage, or to the east of the building but adjacent to windows of Portugal Place. Smoking not to be allowed in vicinity of neighbouring properties nor in Roof Terrace.

5 – Proposed modifications to Construction Management Strategy regarding:

- Standard working hours in section 2.2 are Mon to Thu 8am to 6pm, inconsistency with section 3.9 (Mon to Fri);
- Dust assessment summary in section 4.1 incorrectly noted as low/negligible, based on erroneous Appendix D. Sensitivity of people to dust soiling effects assessed High, sensitivity of people to health effects of PM10 assessed High;
- Propose relocation of site welfare unit, or additional provision of impermeable barrier, or relocation of toilet & shower facilities for consistency with tree survey recommendations
- Propose monitoring of ground water levels;
- Propose reference party wall awards & neighbours' rights;
- Residents sandwiched between the contemporaneous Car Park work-site & proposed site, suffering superimposition of noise & dust, requiring additional monitoring. All local residents will suffer road disruption at both ends of only vehicular entrances to area, requiring additional coordination.

6 – Fire risk assessment to be carried out and fire suppression equipment installed.

7 - Trees T001&2&4 pose risk to life and property. 4&5 have suffered recent trauma with council consent, but further cropping proposed of canopy (5) and roots (4&5). No trees are within site boundary, belong to neighbours; convince neighbours that the proposed tree damage is within risk tolerance.

Case by Applicant's Agent

David Ward (R H Partnership Architects, Director) made the following points:

- i. Provided a summary of the application.

- The site catered for 1200 religious and non-religious students.
 - The building was used seven days a week from early morning to late night.
 - As well as a religious function there was also a social and cultural purpose; Friday nights were the most popular where up to 100 students would meet.
 - Built in 1937, the building sat in a conservation area but was not listed and was currently a single storey with a pitched roof.
 - The building did no longer meet the use of the community.
 - The proposal was to demolish the building and replace with a two-storey building, moving the front of the building closer to Thompson Lane.
 - The front elevation would be of brick and the roof zinc.
 - The three major elements would be the synagogue, the community space and kitchen. The community space and synagogue would have a moveable wall to meet the requirements
 - The building occupied the rear of the site closest to Portugal Place.
 - Access into the Old Vicarage (Thompson Lane) with a parking space for the Old Vicarage. The application site included this parking space, this space was preserved.
 - A basement would be accessed from the social space.
- ii. Around the site was Wyng Gardens, Portugal Place, St Clements Church, the Old Vicarage, with the Cambridge School of Visual Arts sitting on the northern edge of the site.
- iii. Properties on Portugal Place overlooked the rear of the site where the views of the synagogue were described as not noticeable' as from Bridge Street and the Cemetery, hidden by trees.
- iv. The Old Vicarage sat on the southern boundary of the site and acknowledged that long views of the Old Vicarage needed to be preserved.
- v. Two public consultation meetings had been held with residents (2018 and 2019) and two zoom meetings since the application had been submitted.
- vi. Response to the issues raised in the petition were as follows (a- m):
- a) Background noise:
- The windows to the proposed building would not have to be opened due to the design and ventilation of the building.
 - The plant ventilation of the plant would not run at night.

- Exploring the option of moving the roof mounted plant to the basement at the front of the building. This would supply heat to the building through floor trenches.
 - The ventilation would be supplied by the mechanical heat recovery ventilation units which would be placed around the building taking the air in. This would be circulated throughout the building, extracted to the outside and recover the heat until the air was exhausted.
 - Ducts up from the basement below would fix to the louvers on the elevations.
 - The MVHR units would be connected to grills in the external walls, these grills would not be placed on the elevation facing Portugal Place.
 - The plant was still in the development but assumed 4m floor to floor in the basement.
 - Was currently in discussion with acoustic engineers to ensure the louvers were within the set noise limits.
- b) Single Point of Contact:
- This will be established
- c) Signage:
- Signage would be placed around the building to remind students to be respectful of their neighbours when leaving the building.
- d) Noiseless gates
- To be secured against wind.
- e) Overnight stay of people.
- Would not be permitted.
- f) Winter Garden:
- Roof only allowed to be open from 10:00 to 21:00.
 - No music would be played at any time when roof open, nor other noisy activities.
 - Frosted glass to be used around all sides.
 - Investigating the possibility of changing the roof from glass to solid roof with opening roof lights.
- g) Right of Way of the Old Vicarage:
- This would be retained.
- h) Smoking on site:
- No smoking on site could be permitted.
- i) Construction Management Strategy

- Required further consideration but had submitted information to planning officers for review.
 - j) Trees:
 - Agreed that trees around the site should remain in good health. An arboricultural impact assessment had been submitted for review.
 - k) Party Wall:
 - Agreed there needed to be a party wall agreement.
 - l) Car Park Work:
 - Could not advise when the work would be undertaken.
 - m) Fire Risk Assessment:
 - This could be undertaken.
- vii. In summary the applicant agreed on the following issues raised by the petitioner:
- The use of the winter garden
 - Right of way
 - Party Wall and Trees
 - When programmes of work were established on the car park works and synagogue development further discussion would be undertaken with residents.
- viii. Wished to continue the good working relationship with residents and welcomed feedback and support from the planning authority.

Case by Petitioners

- i. Petitioners were in support of development subject to further changes that it was hoped would be addressed.
- ii. The site was surrounded by grade II listed buildings, one of which was the oldest churches in Cambridge and another, the oldest timber framed building in Cambridge, with period properties along Portugal Place.
- iii. Through continued engagement with the applicant the one hundred concerns presented over the last two years had been addressed with only a handful outstanding. Some of which had been addressed in the applicant's presentation.
- iv. The three major issues of concern were:
 - a) Background noise
 - The acoustic report had been based on an outdated design, there had been no night-time attenuation of noise.
 - The noisiest plant would have been 10m from bedrooms on Portugal Place and The Old Vicarage.
 - Requested an updated acoustic report based on the latest design which should also include the placement of the louvres.

- Proposed a new background measurement at new receptor locations. The new development should not exceed the newly measured background.
 - Consider glazing design around the winter garden.
 - Welcomed the applicant's comments that the roof mounted plant would be relocated to the basement.
 - Recommended the plant should be placed at the north west corner of the footprint, elongated east west away from the foundations of the Old Vicarage.
- b) Height, bulk, and massing.
- Pleased to note the street scape had been preserved in front of the development, the chimney stacks of the Old Vicarage and St John's Chapel.
 - Would lose 4 of 6 north-facing locations at the Old Vicarage due to the building brought forward but this was a reasonable compromise.
 - Those in Portugal Place would now have a two-storey building prior to the original single storey which would have more of an impact on residents.
 - No's 29-23 Portugal Place were owner occupied
 - Ask for updated drawings and visuals regarding the update on views from all window levels using professional photos.
 - Would like the applicant to repair and reinforce the boundary wall with Portugal Place.
 - Requested the applicant to consider the following:
 - Further lowering eastern roofline.
 - Elimination of flat roof now roof mounded equipment has been deleted and have a bevelled edge.
 - Consider elimination of some first-floor volumes, e.g. north-east egalitarian Worship/ quiet study area.
 - Alternative roof materials facing Portugal Place. The zinc roof would obscure a large amount of the views from Portugal Place looking out to Thompson Lane.
 - Consider elimination of some first-floor volumes, e.g. north-east egalitarian Worship/ quiet study area.
 - Reminded the Forum of the 1977 planning application; the scheme was rejected on the basis that the proposed replacement was detrimental to the visual amenities of this part of the conservation area.
- c) Proposed planning conditions which required written confirmation from the applicant.

- Single point of contact to be established as it was difficult for neighbours to contact the current governance structure.
- Suitable signage to ensure the noise levels were kept down when entering, leaving, and loitering around the site.
- Noiseless gates to be kept as a condition.
- Overnight stay of people not permitted.
- Access to eastern boundary for purposes outlined in pre-existing Deed is permitted. The right of way was not in dispute, but it would not be taken away by the erection of the proposed gate.
- Planning condition was to be applied to the winter garden. Roof only allowed to be opened from 10.00 to 21.00. No music to be played at any time when the roof is opened or other noisy activities excluding religious observances requiring opening of the roof. Frosted Glass is used on all sides with suitable acoustic properties.
- Planning condition for smoking not to be allowed in the vicinity of neighbouring properties or on the roof terrace.
- Construction Management Planning to be updated and kept evergreen between the Council, the applicant, and residents.
Proposed modifications to the following:
 - Standard working hours in section 2.2 were Mon to Thu 8am to 6pm, inconsistency with section 3.9 (Mon to Fri)
 - Dust assessment summary in section 4.1 incorrectly noted as low/negligible, based on erroneous Appendix D. Sensitivity of people to dust soiling effects assessed High, sensitivity of people to health effects of PM10 assessed High
 - Proposed relocation of site welfare unit, or additional provision of impermeable barrier, or relocation of toilet & shower facilities for consistency with tree survey recommendations
 - Propose monitoring of ground water levels
 - Propose reference party wall awards & neighbours' rights
 - Residents sandwiched between the contemporaneous Car Park worksite & proposed site, suffering superimposition of noise & dust, requiring additional monitoring. All residents would suffer road disruption at both ends of only vehicular entrances to area, requiring additional coordination between the council and 2 developers

- Fire risk assessment to be carried out before the application was considered. However, if this was not possible it should be made clear this should be subject to a successful risk assessment showing there was no incremental risk to the Old Vicarage.
- Requested a response from the Tree Officer on the works to be undertaken to the trees and consider balanced cropping of canopy to reduce the risk of becoming over heavy on one site. This should be stipulated as a planning condition.

Case Officer's Comments

- i. Application received 16 October 2020 with neighbours notified of the application on 2 November and site notice advertising the application placed on 13 November.
- ii. Representation had been received from 9 residents and Maudling College. The main objections were:
 - Over development.
 - Principle Development: Would harm the conservation area, neighbouring listed buildings and amenities.
 - Character design and appearance: The development was out of scale with its immediate neighbours, too high and overbearing.
 - Impact of residential amenities: Overbearing in terms of mass to those occupants living in Portugal Place and the Old Vicarage.
 - Loss of privacy and overshadowing.
 - Would lead to an increase in noise disturbance and light pollution to neighbouring residents.
 - Highway issues: Based on the complexity of the construction of the car park site. The impact of the construction on neighbouring occupiers and the effect of the potential road closures would have on the surrounding areas.
 - The impact the development would have on the neighbouring trees inside and outside of the site:
- iii. The following policy consultations had been received:
 - Local Highways Authority: supported the application subject to the condition for a separate traffic management plan; advised against surface water runoff into the highway and weight limitation on the road and surrounding network.
 - Environmental Heath: Requested further information on plant machinery and equipment, noise assessments, artificial lighting, installation, noise pollution and site investigation strategy. There

were ongoing discussions on what can and could not be conditioned.

- Sustainability Officer: Supported the application subject to receiving additional information on the proposed heat pumps, water efficiency and the roof plan details.
- Drainage Officer: Supported the application subject to a condition regarding infiltration testing.
- Conservation Officer: Supported the application subject to the conditions regarding sample and materials and required further information on the roof design. The impact on the Old vicarage was acceptable with views of the chimney stack retained. The new synagogue would make an improved contribution to the street scene.

iv. Waiting comments from the following consultees:

- Urban Design Team.
- Ecology Department.

Ward Councillor Comments.

- i. Congratulated the residents on their work liaising with the applicant / agent; the application had been improved over the last few months in response to comments made.
- ii. Welcomed the development but there were outstanding issues which needed to be addressed which were:
 - A single point of contact responsible for the day to day running of the Synagogue who would be able to respond to residents when required.
 - Preservation of the views particularly the Old Vicarage on Thompson Lane.
 - Further discussion was required regarding the loss of views concerning the listed buildings on Portugal Place; professional photos were required.
 - Welcomed the relocation of the SLC pumps being moved but further information was required.
 - Reduction in roof height and bulk of the proposed building was necessary.
- iii. Noted a few developments had been proposed for the surrounding area and it would be beneficial to align all the works to minimise disruption to residents.

Members Questions and Comments

- i. Stressed the importance of keeping the dialogue open between residents and the applicant / agent; thanked the applicant / agent for their continued consultation and willingness to listen to resident's proposals.
- ii. Congratulated the petitioner's level of detail regarding their petition.
- iii. Stated a site visit would be beneficial for Planning Committee members.
- iv. Expressed concern regarding the loss of light into the rear of Portugal Place.
- v. Noted the importance of retaining the trees where possible.
- vi. Requested further information on sustainable drainage due to the amount of open space that would reduce on the site.
- vii. Advised that the term 'Winter Garden' was misleading.
- viii. Questioned how the plants on the first floor would be maintained.
- ix. Stated the excavation of the basement should be as shallow as possible.
- x. Suggested a possible swap with Cambridge University to relocate to the existing building in return for land outside of the city centre where an all-purpose building could be housed; or sell the site to fund a build elsewhere.
- xi. Welcomed the sustainability that had been proposed by the applicant.
- xii. Questioned if a zinc roof would be in keeping with the surrounding area.
- xiii. Would hope that verified views and overshadowing diagrams would be produced for the Planning Committee to consider what, if any impact, the proposed development would have on the neighbouring properties.
- xiv. Queried if a second acoustic assessment would be undertaken for the new heat pumps.
- xv. Asked if the Case Officer could advise which conditions were considered possible to the application.
- xvi. Believed there was opportunity to reduce conflict for the following issues, however important to recognise that not all requests could be done under planning conditions:
 - Consider how much of the trees should be cut back to let in light but was also important to retain privacy.
 - Noise and congregation on site including smoking on site.
 - Views out of the site and into the site.
- xvii. Enquired why car parking was necessary on site.
- xviii. Sought clarification on who undertook the daylight and sunlight survey.

In response the Applicant /Agent said the following:

- i. It was important to ensure the large trees which were off site would not be compromised by the development.
- ii. Trees on the south of the development did cast a lot of shadow to both the site and Portugal Place. Had suggested to residents these could be trimmed back to increase the daylight.
- iii. Would consider producing shadow diagrams that did not include the trees.
- iv. Highlighted the conclusion of the daylight and sunlight report submitted with the application; overall the impact of the proposed development was small and full compliant with default BRE criteria.
- v. Alternative locations had not been considered as the site was well located and convenient for students; its purpose was to create a centre for the students.
- vi. The proposal was to keep the current three car parking spaces, one was a mobility space, the other for deliveries and the third belonged to the Old Vicarage. The removal of the spaces had not been considered.
- vii. The daylight and sunlight survey had been carried out by a specialist company; the slides were not included as the presentation had responded to the issues highlighted in the petition.
- viii. Advised that updates would be submitted on daylight and sunlight report, acoustic and tree reports.
- ix. The flat roof over the cycle store would be a green roof but not on the main building. The removal of the roof plant could now offer an opportunity for a brown or blue roof.

The Petitioners said the following:

- i. Members of the Planning Committee would be welcome to visit properties on Portugal Place to look at all aspects of the site. Significant to note that Portugal Place was not flat so each property would have a different view.
- ii. Important to preserve the trees in an urban environment.
- iii. The daylight and sunlight report suggested the biggest obstruction to the daylight (particularly for Portugal Place) was the bulk of the trees rather than the building itself; therefore, pruning of the trees on both sides would be beneficial.
 - Recent work had taken place on two of the trees undertaken by the City Council so had experienced “recent trauma”.
- iv. Had never suggested that the site should be relocated but that the building line should be set further back from the street, however, this was not possible.

- v. The Old Vicarage car parking space on the site was historical and provided vehicle and pedestrian access to the rear of the Old Vicarage.

The Chair noted the request for a site visit and would take this forward and agreed it would be beneficial for members of the Planning Committee to visit the gardens on Portugal Place.

After Member questions had taken place the Chair recommended the Forum hold a discussion around the proposed conditions as put forward by the petitioners:

- a) Single point of contact for residents.
 - The Chair suggested this could be outlined as a condition in a management plan as part of the planning permission.
 - The agent advised that this was being drafted but the applicant needed to confirm
 - The Petitioner advised that there was an issue with the legal status and was unable to find a counterpart to sign the undertaking, hence why this should remain as a planning condition.
 - Bin store to be installed but should be included in the management plan.
- b) Old Vicarage Access.
 - Cambridge University Jewish Society enter the undertaking with the Old Vicarage to allow access to eastern boundary for purposes outlined in pre-existing deed, on a basis not more restrictive than to date.
 - The Chair advised that this fell outside the remit of what could be secured within planning conditions as it related to a legal right of access within a non-planning deed. This would need to be resolved outside the planning process.
- c) Winter Garden Rood Terrace.
 - Roof only allowed to be open from 10:00 to 21:00.
 - No music to be played at any time when roof open not other noisy activities excluding opening of roof.
 - Employ frosted glass on all sides with suitable acoustic properties.
 - The agent advised there was no objection to the conditions proposed and would be in the application document.
 - The Planning Officer would review the comments made by the Environmental Health Officers in relation to the winter garden.
 - The Chair advised that these were not unusual proposals and could be secured by planning condition.
- d) Smoking.

- Not be allowed in vicinity of neighbouring properties or on the roof terrace.
 - The applicant was supportive of a non-smoking policy and could impose the policy on site but could not stop smoking in a public place such as on the street.
 - The Chair confirmed that it was not within the planning remit to stop smoking in the vicinity of neighbouring properties. Suggested there could be a commitment to manage the smoking outside of the site in the management plan.
 - A comment was made that if there was not a designated smoking area this could push those individuals who smoked to go out to the surrounding streets.
- e) Construction Management Strategy.:
 - Standard working hours in section 2.2 are Mon to Thu 8am to 6pm, inconsistency with section 3.9 (Mon to Fri)
 - Dust assessment summary in section 4.1 incorrectly noted as low/negligible, based on erroneous Appendix D. Sensitivity of people to dust soiling effects assessed High, sensitivity of people to health effects of PM10 assessed High.
 - Propose relocation of site welfare unit, or additional provision of impermeable barrier, or relocation of toilet & shower facilities for consistency with tree survey recommendations
 - Propose monitoring of ground water levels
 - Propose reference party wall awards & neighbours' rights
 - Residents sandwiched between the contemporaneous Car Park worksite & proposed site, suffering superimposition of noise & dust, requiring additional monitoring. All local residents will suffer road disruption at both ends of only vehicular entrances to area, requiring additional coordination between the council and 2 developers
 - The Chair advised that piling was a standard condition when a basement was involved in the construction work. The inconsistency in hours would be investigated. Party wall agreements would not be covered within the management strategy but could be dealt with by informative.
 - The applicant confirmed the new construction management plan reference the construction of the basement.
- f) Fire Risk Assessment.
 - The Chair advised that this would be a building control matter and not covered by planning condition but as an informative that a fire risk assessment should be undertaken.
- g) Trees.
 - Council Consultee responsible for trees to respond.

- Consider balanced cropping of canopy to reduce risk of becoming over-heavy on one side.
- Stipulate as Planning Condition.
 - The agent confirmed an arboricultural impact assessment had been submitted which concluded 'there were no overt or overwhelming arboricultural constraints that could be reasonably sighted to preclude the proposed construction'.
 - It was suggested the impact assessment should be looked at by the Tree Officer to determine what impact the proposed development would have on the trees. If the trees were protected the applicant would have a responsibility to the trees even if they were on neighbouring land.
 - The agent suggested that there was a tree preservation order on the trees, the Council would have the power to serve notice on the owners to trim them and / or carry out maintenance to preserve them.
 - The Chair advised that the Tree Officer was yet to respond to the proposed application, but the issues raised would be passed on for their information.
 - The petitioner reported the Tree Officer had confirmed Trees 1,2,3 and 4 were the Council's responsibility as they were in the historic churchyard; the Council had accepted responsibility of maintaining the land. Tree 5 belonged to Homerton College.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- i. Welcomed the meeting and discussion around the proposed development.
- ii. Would continue the good working relationship with the petitioners and residents.
- iii. Acknowledged further work was required on the proposed application, but this was already being looked at. This included the movement of the roof plant to the basement and the views from Portugal Place.
- iv. Most of the issues outstanding were capable of resolution but some of the issues raised were for the planning officers and planning committee to consider.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- i. Felt an alignment with the developer had been achieved on background roof mounted equipment in the process to the Development Control Forum; agreed with the agent that resubmitted plans should be submitted rather than restarting the application process.

- ii. Agreed to the development of the basement but should not disrupt neighbouring foundations; would like further discussion on what proposals would be done to monitor the situation.
- iii. Further discussion was required with the agent / applicant on the height, bulk, and massing issue.
- iv. Welcomed the discussion on the suggested planning conditions and anticipated there be would proposals brought forward as recommended by the Case Officer.
- v. Welcomed additional discussion on the scale up of the building and the proportions within the space.
- vi. Reiterated the invitation to visit the properties on Portugal Place to look at the incline that they sat on and the changes in the view.
- vii. Advised that a detailed description of the petition had been placed on the planning portal.

Final Comments of the Chair

- i. Summarised the main issues discussed.
- ii. Suggested a meeting between the case office, the applicant and petitioner to discuss some of the issues raised if required.
- iii. Would encourage the applicant to keep in touch with the petitioner throughout the process.
- iv. Would recommend a site visit for the Planning Committee when the application comes to the Committee for consideration.
- v. Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to the relevant parties and published on the City Council.
- vi. A copy of the minutes would be attached to the Planning Officer's report when the application would be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 1.22 pm

CHAIR