

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM
4 November 2021
1.00 - 3.00 pm

Present

Planning Committee Members: D. Baigent, Page-Croft, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Bradnam, Daunton, Hawkins and Hunt

Ward Councillors:

Sarah Baigent

Simon Smith

Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

For Applicant:

Colin Brown (Carter Jonas)

Eric Holding (JTP Architects)

Laurie Handcock (Iceni Projects)

For Petitioners:

Resident of Howes Place

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/1/JDCCDCF Introduction by Chair to the Forum

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. They stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

21/2/JDCCDCF Apologies

Apologies were received from SCDC Councillors Chamberlain and Cone and City Ward Councillor Payne.

21/3/JDCCDCF Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	21/4/JDCCDCF	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Hunt	21/4/JDCCDCF	Personal: Member of CAMRA but not an active member.
Councillor S.Smith	21/4/JDCCDCF	Personal: Would speak as a Ward Councillor and would not speak / take part as a member of the JDCC.

21/4/JDCCDCF Application and Petition Details

Application ref: 21/03609/FUL

Site Address: National Institute Of Agricultural Botany Huntingdon Road
Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0LE

Description: Retention of the former NIAB Headquarters building, the demolition of all other buildings and structures, and the erection of buildings with basements for 291 Build to Rent units (Use Class C3) including affordable housing and a 202 bed Apart-Hotel (Sui Generis) and associated facilities along with access, car and cycle parking, landscaping and infrastructure works.

Agent: Peter Mckeown

Address: One Station Square Cambridge CB1 2GA

Lead Petitioner: Resident of Howes Place

Case Officer: Rebecca Ward

Text of Petition:

The grounds for asking for a Forum on this application are as follows:

- HARM to the context of the local heritage asset of Howes Place and the amenity of existing residents through the overbearing massing and height of the proposed development and location of a micro-brewery and bar alongside local the heritage asset.
- HARM to specific elements of the built and landscape heritage assets. This harm would arise from proposals for the selective demolition of two

houses at Nos. 14 and 15 Howes Place and felling of at least ten (10) pleached limes trees which are protected under TPO 10/1991. These houses and trees are essential parts of the built environment and the landscape setting of the local heritage asset.

- HARM to the setting of the local heritage asset by making Howes Place the back yard of the proposed development for commercial vehicles, drops-offs and pick-ups and cut through for pedestrians and cyclists, including electric cycle and scooter traffic, transitioning to and from the development and parts of Darwin Green to the city centre. Noting that Howes Place is a private, unadopted, unlit and narrow access. This imposes unnecessary harm to the setting as the development site is already served by purpose-built footpaths and cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver Road and a traffic light controlled junction with Huntingdon Road.
- HARM to the health and well-being of existing neighbouring residents and future residents of the proposed development through the under provision and inappropriate provision of amenity space within the proposed development.
- Proposed under provision of 'Affordable Private Rent' dwellings.
- Proposed under provision of parking spaces for residents, visitors to the Apart-Hotel and employees of the Apart-Hotel, retail units, cafe, micro-brewery and bar and building maintenance contractors.

Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns?

Yes

- Significant reduction in the massing and height of the proposed development and removal of the micro-brewery and bar from the proposed development.
- Retention of Nos.14 and 15 Howes Place and all of the pleached limes trees which are protected under TPO 10/1991 with sympathetic integration of these built and landscape heritage assets into the proposed development.
- Removal of any points of access from Howes Place to the proposed development to ensure that all vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed development is from the purpose-built roadways, footpaths and cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver Road and the traffic light controlled junction between Lawrence Weaver Road and Huntingdon Road.
- Provision of appropriate amenity space within the proposed development in terms of scale, location and accessibility.

- Provision of the minimum of 20% 'Affordable Private Rent' dwellings in the proposed Build to Rent development.
- Provision of sufficient parking spaces for residents, visitors to the Apart-Hotel and employees of the Apart-Hotel, retail units, cafe, micro-brewery and bar and building maintenance contractors.

Case by Applicant

- 1) A mixed use development was proposed including 291 build to rent homes as well as a range of residents' amenities and a 202 room aparthotel.
- 2) Application was lodged in July 2021 and registered in August 2021.
- 3) Consultation responses from statutory consultees were positive. Some minor issues had been raised and the Applicant was due to submit some amendments to pick up on some of the matters.
- 4) Had had meetings with the Planning Design Team and amendments were shortly to be submitted.
- 5) The principle of development and uses proposed were in accordance with the Local Plan 2018.
- 6) Research carried out by the Council demonstrated there was a lack of stock and affordability in the private sale market and the consequence was that the private rented sector was now the largest tenure in Cambridge. 20% of this stock did not meet basic health and safety standards.
- 7) The aparthotel was supported by policy 77 of the Local Plan.
- 8) The development was meant to be exemplar in terms of sustainability. The applicants had engaged closely with the Council's Sustainability Officer.
- 9) Biodiversity net gain was 92% and the low carbon design had meant a significant reduction in carbon emissions.
- 10) There had been 2 years of engagement with officers, residents and interested stakeholders before the application was submitted.
- 11) Looking at the issue raised by the Petitioners of harm to the setting; the applicants had used an urban design approach to relate the buildings together and had looked at the symmetry of the existing layout and breaking buildings into smaller blocks, use of materials which reflects the existing roof pitches and use of gable ends.
- 12) Looking at the issue of separation distances (overlooking distances) usually these are between 18-20m and were usually back to back and

not front to front. The application proposes separation distances of at least 26.9m. The neighbouring development, Darwin Green had separation distances ranging from 8.6m to 18.8m.

- 13) Proposed to reduce the building height next to the NIAB building.
- 14) The relationship between the aparthotel and NIAB had been carefully considered.
- 15) The applicants did not believe the proposed development would cause any harm to the existing setting.
- 16) The microbrewery was seen as a community facility and would be managed as part of the whole development. No concerns had been raised by the Environmental Health Officer. Noise and opening hours would be managed through the application process.
- 17) The proposals sought to build the social and economical history of NIAB into the development. Areas for gardening would build on the agricultural history of the site.
- 18) The Conservation Officer provided a positive response to the proposed development.
- 19) There was a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the site. Six trees were proposed to be removed, five of these were due to the development and one was due to the condition of the tree. Forty-two new pleached lime trees were proposed to be planted, as well as 113 new trees.
- 20) Had been encouraged to use Howes Place for pedestrian and cycle access to and from the site to improve the permeability of the site. Most of the vehicle access points were from Lawrence Weaver Road.
- 21) The first 70m of Howes Place would have a vehicle access point for the aparthotel. It was proposed that this would be used for a refuse collection once a week and for two laundry collections per week. A turning head was proposed here which had been requested by the Refuse Department. They had agreed with the Transport Officer that the use of Howes Place would be monitored as the whole site was owned by the Applicant.
- 22) High quality amenity space would be provided. The development would provide 130% of the open space standards (taking into account semi-private courtyards), if the communal areas were excluded then the development would provide 87% of the open space standards. Generous open space provision was being proposed.

- 23) Noted a comment about the under provision of private rent dwellings. The applicant did not accept this and felt they met with national advice, the new local plan did not provide much policy context for build to rent. The adopted Housing Strategy mirrored national advice that 20% of the units should be designated as affordable and should be offered at a maximum market discount of 80%.
- 24) The application was in accordance with car parking standards (expressed in Cambridge as maximum standards). A wide range of sustainable transport measures were due to be adopted. Travel plan would be secured through the s106 agreement.

Case by Petitioners

- 1) Were not against development per se but wanted to minimise any harm which would be caused by the proposed development.
- 2) Concerns were detailed on the planning file and in the attached document to the agenda. They had also been raised in pre-application discussions with the developer.
- 3) The proposed area for development was less than 2 times the size of Howes Place but the proposal was for 25 times more dwellings on the site compared to the number of dwellings at Howes Place.
- 4) The context of Howes Place was that it was a notable development of its time and contained two storey residential properties running the length of Howes Place (Nos 1 to 15) which were identified as local heritage assets and are designated as Buildings of Local Interest within Appendix G of the Local Plan due to:
 - a. The architectural interest of the buildings;
 - b. The grouping and street scene value of the buildings set within the formal landscaping of Howes Place; and
 - c. The importance of NIAB and the residential properties in Howes Place in the social and economic history of Cambridge.
- 5) Howes Place was exemplar of place making and was unique in Cambridge. The proposed massing (scale and height of the development) amounted to gross over development of the site and would harm the amenity of existing and neighbouring properties and future residents of the proposed development. The setting of the Local Heritage Asset was further harmed but the microbrewery and bar alongside an existing residential area. On every boundary of the site the proposed

- building heights were 1-2 storeys higher than the existing residential properties.
- 6) The development would be overbearing and would cause harm to the amenity of residents.
 - 7) Residents of Plymouth Close and Falmouth Close were advised when they bought their properties that the former NIAB site would be open parkland.
 - 8) The proposed development would cause harm to the setting and landscape of the local heritage asset.
 - 9) Believed the development proposed to fell 10 pleached lime trees and not 6 as the applicant's representative had referred to create new access points from and to Howes Place.
 - 10) It was proposed to demolish 14 and 15 Howes Place, but these properties mirrored 3 and 4 Howes Place. The archaeological report describes 14 and 15 Howes Place as a pair of unremarkable mid-war houses but fails to recognise the significance in the context and setting of the heritage asset.
 - 11) Proposed access points to and from Howes Place created a short cut (primary desire line), which would divert pedestrians, cyclists and e-scooters away from existing fit for purpose dedicated footpaths and cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver Road to Howes Place which was a narrow, unadopted, unlit private road with direct uncontrolled access on to Huntingdon Road.
 - 12) The proposed development introduces a commercial service yard with access from and to Howes Place, requiring HGV turning manoeuvres to be undertaken on Howes Place. This would create conflict between pedestrians and cyclists from over 500 dwellings large commercial vehicles to serve the aparthotel and microbrewery and bar, non-residential traffic linked to drop-offs to and pick-ups from the aparthotel, microbrewery, bar and internet shopping deliveries to the build to rent properties.
 - 13) The proposed development failed to provide the required amount of fully accessible and immediately convenient amenity space, which would prejudice the health and well being of future residents. The amenity space included the area surrounding the former NIAB headquarters and the internal courtyard of the aparthotel.

- 14) The Transport Statement sought to demonstrate that sufficient parking would be provided within the proposed development, the reduction of the proposed parking spaces for the build to rent units from 144 to 110 was overly optimistic and relied on a behavioural shift towards use of a car club scheme. The provision of 28 spaces for the aparthotel underestimated the parking spaces which would be needed. There was no assessment relating to the number of parking spaces required for the proposed 45 staff members for the aparthotel. The Local Plan stated that there should be 1 space per 2 staff members.
- 15) Considered the proposed development failed to provide sufficient parking and therefore residents of, and visitors to the proposed development would seek alternative parking provision beyond the proposed development site for example within Darwin Green or on Howes Place.
- 16) There would be inadequate provision of affordable private rented dwellings. The caselaw Council officers had relied on did not address the circumstances of the application. The caselaw did not justify a reduction in the provision of affordable private rent dwellings from 20% to 12.7%.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 1) Key Dates relating to the application include:
 - The pre-application was first submitted to the Council in 2019. Two Quality Panels have considered the application and the applicants have also attended various forums including: Access Forum, North-East Forum, JDCC presentation and various technical officer workshops in relation to the proposals.
- 2) The key constraints on the site include:
 - The site lies wholly within the Cambridge City boundary.
 - The site is on the Council's Brownfield land register.
 - The NIAB Headquarters building and houses along Howes Place are identified in the City Local Plan as 'Buildings of Local Interest' (BLI).
 - There is a group tree preservation order (TPO) on the site.
 - Part of the site (rear undeveloped part) sits within the Darwin Green Area of Major Change allocation (policy 20).
 - The existing buildings on the site were granted prior-approval consent in 2020 to be converted from offices to residential units. 68 are currently being built within the 1920s building to the front of Huntingdon Road. The

- prior approval for the remaining 102 units will fall away if this application get permission.
- 3) The application was validated on 2nd August 2021 and the neighbour consultation and local press advertisement expired on the 9th September 2021. The site notice expired on the 20th September 2021.
 - 4) Third Party comments included:
 - 42 letters of objection - (directly adjacent to the development site)
 - Howes Place
 - Falmouth Avenue
 - Lawrence Weaver Road
 - 2 letters of support.
 - 5) Consultation Responses:
 - There were a number of holding objections which had been raised by the following consultees. None of the objections appear to be major in-principal issues and officers feel they can be addressed by a series of amendments. These amendments might also help address some of the concerns that have been submitted by third parties partially around:
 - the impact to the non-designated heritage assets
 - impact on existing residential amenity
 - highway safety
 - 6) There has been ongoing dialog with the agent/applicant to shape the amendment package and officers would continue these discussions after the Development Control Forum (DCF) taking on board comments raised during the DCF.
 - 7) Awaiting a response from 3C Shared Waste and still need to agree details on Open Space provision and S106 contributions.
 - 8) Application initially due to be determined on the 1 November 2021, however an extension of time has been agreed with the agent until 31 January 2022 to address the outstanding concerns through the submission of an amendment package. The application will be subsequently determined by the Joint Development Control Committee in subsequent months.

Case by Ward Councillors

Councillor S.Baigent:

- 1) Howes Place is a local heritage asset and comprised a row of Edwardian houses set back in a picturesque lime tree setting which stood alone as a particular example of architectural genius and historical interest. Nature compliments the architecture and use of space.
- 2) Each house in Howes place is beautifully crafted and together form the community and guardians of the historical treasure

- 3) Supported the concerns raised by residents.
- 4) Objected to the scale and massing of the proposed development and especially in terms of building heights. This would affect the original architectural design of Howes Place.
- 5) The proposed microbrewery, facing residential housing would offend the tranquillity which frames the community space.
- 6) Asked for consideration to be given to the impact on Darwin Green, Falmouth Road and Plymouth Road of the development proposals.

Written Statement from Councillor Payne read out by the Committee Manager:
Expressed concerns relating to this development are as follows:

- 1) From all boundaries of the site, the proposed buildings are at least one, and in general, two storeys higher than the adjoining existing properties. This will significantly overshadow Howes Place. I am particularly concerned to see the ApartHotel standing at 16 metres, making it one of the taller buildings on the site. For a commercial venture, this seems to me to be unnecessary. While I am in favour of providing new housing, building to one or two storeys higher than neighbouring properties is over-development, which will be to the detriment of the neighbouring residents, and indeed the new residents of the proposed development.
- 2) The plans propose felling at least 10 pleached limes, all of which are currently under a Tree Protection Order. The trees are integral to the unique streetscape of Howes Place, and the committee will be aware of the great environmental benefit of rows of trees: we should always be seeking to add more trees, not remove them. I am concerned that permitting the felling of these trees would set the precedent for future development, that a Tree Protection Order can be overturned.
- 3) Access to the proposed development from Howes Place is an issue the petitioners will discuss, but I am particularly concerned to see a proposed service access route to the ApartHotel from Howes Place. The entrance to Howes Place is very narrow, and cannot accommodate additional large vehicles, risking dangerous conflict with other road users. Bin lorries already need to reverse along Howes Place, so adding further large vehicles to this is a recipe for disaster which could be easily avoided by moving this service access to Lawrence Weaver Road.
- 4) The use of e-scooters as a form of transport is increasing, so I would like to see some consideration given to the movement of this form of transport. Given the speed at which these vehicles can travel, I would like to see safeguards to ensure they have no access to or from Howes Place, for the reasons given above.
- 5) Lawrence Weaver Road is not yet adopted by the County Council, but given the increase in traffic which will occur once the former NIAB site is

developed, I hope the committee and the developers will encourage the County Council to adopt the road as quickly as possible so traffic on here can be properly directed and the road be properly maintained. This should include adding double yellow lines along the cycle lanes on Lawrence Weaver road so cyclists from the proposed development are not discouraged from using these cycle lanes, as they are currently used for parking cars in.

- 6) Publicly available green space is at a premium in Cambridge, so I would like to see the green space in the ApartHotel being made available to all residents, otherwise there is potentially a large area of green space only open to be used by a small number of people, and not benefitting the wider area.
- 7) The assessment of parking needs for staff at the ApartHotel sets a requirement of 4 parking spaces for up to 45 members of staff. While of course I hope all members of staff will be able to travel to work by public transport or active travel, at present this seems unrealistic. This assessment also fails to comply with Appendix L of the Local Plan, which sets the requirement at 1 space for every 2 members of staff. A lack of parking will lead to overflow parking on the surrounding streets such as Howes Place, Whitehouse Lane and Lawrence Weaver Road. In order to prevent this problem, I would recommend that this requirement is re-evaluated to be more realistic.

Councillor S.Smith:

- 1) Noted the proposed development had been prepared without a parameter plan. Noted that the Darwin Green development had prepared a parameter plan so queried why this proposed development had not prepared one.
- 2) Felt insufficient weight and due regard had been given to Howes Place as a local heritage asset. The current planning process would allow a place like Howes Place to be created.
- 3) Howes Place was an exemplar example of place making and should be enhanced and protected.
- 4) The lack of a parameter plan has led to an overwhelming massing of development in both scale and height and as a result of this key concerns arise.
- 5) Access was a key concern. Understood that connectivity was a good planning principle and policy however consideration needed to be given as to the harm as well as the benefits of the application and how this would be applied. A balanced application of the policy was needed.
- 6) It was clear the development would create a desire line through Howes Place and this was undesirable both because of the inappropriate use of

Howes Place and the appropriate use of Lawrence Weaver Road which had purpose built infrastructure.

- 7) The amenity space proposed was inadequate and inappropriate.
- 8) Expressed concerns regarding the use of Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) as part of a usable recreation amenity space.
- 9) A parameter plan was required and would result in the reduction in scale and massing of the height of the development.
- 10) Access points to the development needed to be addressed. There should be no access points from Howes Place.
- 11) Current planning tools could not create a place like Howes Place, but they can protect and enhance Howes Place.

Members' Questions and Comments:

The Principal Planner and Assistant Director Delivery answered as follows in response to Members' questions:

1) The current holding objections to the application included:

- a. Heritage Officer - They were generally comfortable with the siting and location of the aparthotel but had concerns regarding the proposed height of the building and this encroaching above the existing NIAB headquarter building. Applicant had shown a willingness to reduce the height of the aparthotel. A lack of information about the finish of the NIAB building, hoped further information would be provided.
- b. Urban Design and Landscape - Had also expressed concerns about view points from the build to rent units from Plymouth Close and Beagle Way, had tried to break up roof lines so that the development looked less bulky. There were concerns about the entrance point from Lawrence Weaver Road, in the plans submitted it looked like a hard landscaped entrance, and they wanted to add a bit more surveillance to the area so had looked at moving the building around and adding some soft landscaping.
- c. Highways – Had expressed concerns about the in and out access points on Lawrence Weaver Road and the impact on highway safety and cyclist safety and wanted one of the access points removed. The applicant had agreed to this and was looking at re-designing the access so that it was improved for cyclists.
- d. Disability and Access Officer – The way the bathrooms had been designed needed to be looked at. The agent was going to be asked to make amendments.

- e. More information needed to be submitted regarding accident data, trip generation and mitigation measures in the transport assessment.
 - f. Drainage Officer – The preferred solution was for water to flow into the surface water drainage on Lawrence Weaver Road. Hoped that the drain on Lawrence Weaver Road would be adopted. A back up plan was required in case the drain was not adopted.
 - g. S106 contributions needed to be agreed and what open space was included in calculations and what wasn't.
 - h. A public art strategy was required.
- 2) The height of the aparthotel shown by the applicant's representative during their presentation showed the proposed reduction (1m) in building heights.
 - 3) The application had been seen by the Quality Panel a couple of times so they were aware of the current layout proposed. Would ensure that members were able to see comments made by the Quality Panel before the application came to committee.
 - 4) Officers would take advice on the proposed reduction of the affordable housing.
 - 5) Noted the reference to Darwin Green's parameter plan and would work with the applicant regarding this request although felt the Design and Access Statement dealt with some of the issues which would be contained in a parameter plan.
 - 6) The aparthotel fell within the sui generis use class so there was no requirement to provide open space so there were different considerations compared to a residential use but open space would be provided as part of the development.
 - 7) Noted discussions about SUDS and the suitability of using this space as part of open space for play areas. A trim trail was proposed on the site and it was proposed to keep this away from the water SUDS features. The introduction of water to the open spaces was considered an important feature
 - 8) The main vehicular access to the site would be from Lawrence Weaver Road and parking would be contained in the basement, there would be a few disabled parking spaces at ground level but no general parking provision. The Howes Place access would only service the aparthotel. Highways expected the rest of the access points onto Howes Place to be

pedestrian and cycling access points. No objections on highways safety grounds had been raised so far.

- 9) It was felt that 14 and 15 Howes Place made less of a contribution to the wider group of buildings and the opening up of the rear part of the headquarters would make a positive benefit to the buildings of local interest as a group. It was a balanced judgement,
- 10) The proposed development would be covered by the North West and West Community Forum.
- 11) The site fell within the City Council administrative boundary but also within the sites allocated for determination by the Joint Development Control Committee.
- 12) The mixed use of the site included the aparthotel and the build to rent properties but also within those buildings there would be facilities on the ground floor which could be used by the community including a gym, swimming pool, brewery, cafe and co-working space.

The Applicant's Representative answered as follows in response to Members' questions:

- 1) The difference between residential private properties in the private rented sector could include individual landlords or landlords with small portfolios. Their properties could be dotted around the city or there could be small numbers together. This development was different in that the overall development was designed around the rental offer, it included a high level of shared amenities for those residents. The buy to rent facility would be managed 24/7 and there would be concierge staff on site who could deal with all issues at all times. The build to rent model relied on having high occupancy levels and few 'voids' and to achieve this the applicant would need to ensure that the site was well maintained and managed.
- 2) Noted the comments made by members regarding the provision of affordable housing. The applicant had taken QC's advice and was confident they would comply with housing policies, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Housing Strategy.
- 3) The applicants were able to reduce the level of affordable housing provided in the application as they were able to claim credit on the units which had been granted consent under the prior notification procedure. These units would not be brought forward if the aparthotel development was brought forward.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- 1) Felt this was an exciting development for the area.
- 2) Believed the development would meet known needs for a high-quality rented housing scheme and would offer security of tenure for those who were unable to buy on the open market or for those who chose not to do so.
- 3) The proposal included 291 buy to rent units and an aparthotel with 202 rooms.
- 4) The applicant had been through a lengthy consultation process before the submission of the application.
- 5) The application had been considered by the Quality Panel twice and had been well received by the Panel and changes to the application had been informed by comments made by the Quality Panel.
- 6) It was an exemplar scheme in terms of sustainability.
- 7) It was a policy compliant scheme.
- 8) Felt that the proposal was respectful to Darwin Green and Howes Place and how the proposed scheme would sit next to those neighbouring properties.
- 9) The vehicle access into / from Howes Place was only for servicing the aparthotel and for nothing else. It was only expected to have 3 movements a week.
- 10) Noted that 6 pleached lime trees would be lost however 42 new trees would be planted.
- 11) Some limited design changes would be coming and had been discussed with officers.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- 1) There was no clear justification for the harm which would be caused by the development to both the local heritage asset and amenity of existing residents in neighbouring properties and future residents of the proposed development which would be outweighed by a public benefit.
- 2) The proposal failed to satisfy:
 - a. NPPF paragraph 130 – that the development would function well and add to the overall quality of the area;
 - b. policy 55 in terms of responding to context;
 - c. policy 57 in providing a positive impact on the setting (height, scale, form).
 - d. Policy 61 in terms of conservation and enhancement of a Cambridge historic environment.

- 3) Felt that members should undertake a site visit.
- 4) Proposed the following changes:
 - a. That access points on to Howes Place should be removed and all access points should be on to Lawrence Weaver Road.
 - b. Wanted the unique place of Howes Place to be respected.
 - c. Wanted the parameter rules from the Darwin Green development to be applied to this development which would result in significant reduction in massing (scale and height) to protect the amenity of existing residents in neighbouring properties and future residents of the proposed development and contribute fully to the protection and enhancement of Howes Place. The significant reduction in massing would resolve the issues with under provision of amenity space and parking spaces.
- 5) There should be a minimum of 20% affordable private rented housing provided.

Final Comments of the Chair

25) The Chair observed the following:

- Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties, published on the council's website and appended to the Planning Officers report.
- The case officer should contact the applicants/agent after the meeting to discuss whether a meeting would be helpful to discuss the issues raised at the Forum and to discuss any changes that may be necessary to the application. The applicant will be encouraged to keep in direct contact with the petitioners and to seek their views on any amendment/s.
- The case officer will inform the petitioners' representatives of any amendments to the application. Normally, no further Development Control Forum will be held if the planning application is amended.
- The petitioners' representatives will be informed of the date of the meeting at which the application is to be considered by the committee and will be sent copies of the committee report. The petitioners and applicants will be asked to send any further comments they may have on the report to the planning case officer as soon as possible, so that they can be circulated in good time to members of the committee.

The meeting ended at 3.00 pm

CHAIR