MINUTES OF TORQUAY NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
Steering Group

Wednesday 17th Sept 2025, 6.30pm

At Torbay Communities Office & Zoom

Officers of the Steering Group: Present Rodney Horder (Chair), Nigel Goodman (Treasurer)
Steering Group Members: Cllr Nicole Amil, Julie Brandon, Cllr Darren Cowell Margaret Forbes-Hamilton, Alan Griffey, Roger Carter, Carolyn Drew, Chris Smith, Rose Millard
Other: Sally Allen-Gerard, David Hinchcliffe, Cllr George Darling, John Arcus – Torbay Communities, Steven Chown- Torbay Communities

Item	
1.	**Minute taker:** John Arcus
2.	**Apologies:** Mike Cowdery (Vice Chair), Beth Huntley, June Pierce,
3.	**Civic Society –** Sally Allen-Gerard attending as Civic Society representative to understand group operations
4.	**Minutes of meeting 15th July 2025** Approved
5.	**Matters arising from July meeting:** • AGM 24 September – covered later in meeting • Holding over david Edmondson & Adam Billings to later meeting with more Agenda space.
6.	**Forum Membership:** • **Membership eligibility clarified** as anyone living or working in Torquay can join the forum. • **Steering group** aims to ensure geographical representation across all community partnerships, balanced multiple political parties, and civic organisations. We now have Watcombe, Hele, Barton and the Willows areas covered. Formal appointment process to be completed at AGM. • **RH & Tracey** to review for potential gaps. • **George Darling** offered regular substitution role for absent Liberal Democrat representation.
7.	**Bank accounts/balances** Balance £3,043.26

DRAFT

8.	**Torquay Neighbourhood Forum AGM –**
	• **AGM scheduled for 24th November at Unleashed Theatre** with comprehensive programme designed to engage community members
	  ○ **18:30 start time** with refreshments (teas and coffees) provided to encourage attendance
	  ○ **David Carter delivering 15-minute presentation** on various regeneration bands and ongoing development projects
	  ○ **Paul providing theatre briefing** to familiarise attendees with Unleashed Theatre venue and activities
	  ○ **12-month review and forward planning session** to demonstrate forum achievements and set future direction
	  ○ **Formal steering group appointment** requiring active representatives from diverse organisational spectrum
	  ○ **Publicity strategy focused** on presenting AGM as opportunity to hear about plans rather than formal administrative meeting

9.	**Section 106/CIL**
	• CIL Applications – process, criteria update. (**Steven Chown – more details in Appendix**)
	  • **Expert consultation** undertaken to enhance CIL application procedures and documentation
	  ○ **Steven Chown** identified as CIL specialist who conducted comprehensive process review with Chair. Meeting held to examine overall CIL process and identify specific improvement opportunities
	  ○ **Steven** subsequently developed enhanced guidance materials and assessment frameworks
	  • **Documentation improvements** created to standardise and enhance CIL application processes
	  ○ New assessment forms developed similar to existing policy checklists for planning applications
	  ○ Enhanced screening forms created as project request documentation to replace original screening processes
	  ○ Application form notes prepared to support improved guidance implementation
	  • Documents were reviewed and some changes made. **Steven will finalise, and send to RH to confirm agreement of Steering Group**
	
	Funding Policy Development for Private Rental Premises
	• **Core policy concern addressed** regarding funding organisations operating in privately rented premises
	  ○ St. Mary Church not-for-profit application previously raised concerns about supporting private landlords
	  ○ Recognition that public funding could inadvertently benefit private property owners through premises improvements
	  ○ Need to establish clear, consistent criteria to avoid discriminatory decision-making
	  ○ Acknowledgement that valuable community services operate across various property types
	  • **Lease security framework proposed** as primary assessment criterion for funding decisions
	  ○ Need for standardised questioning process to assess lease terms and security of tenure
	  ○ One-year leases suggested as insufficient security for funding investment
	  ○ Five-year leases identified as potentially acceptable timeframe for funding consideration
	  ○ Month-to-month tenancies flagged as highest risk category requiring careful evaluation

DRAFT

Organisational Equity and Consistency Standards

- Fair treatment principle established for all not-for-profit organisations regardless of premises type
    - Recognition that not all organisations have access to council-owned properties
    - Importance of supporting community work occurring in privately rented spaces
    - Need to avoid creating unfair advantage for organisations with council premises access
    - Emphasis on evaluating applications based on community benefit rather than property ownership status
- Previous case clarifications provided to establish precedent framework
    - CIC organisations confirmed as eligible despite initial qualification concerns

New proposals

- **Windmill Centre:** Unanimous approval granted for community partnership application with strong endorsement from all Steering Group members
    - Application distributed promptly upon receipt, allowing adequate review time for all participants

    Lease Arrangement Clarification

    - Windmill Centre operational structure confirmed as council-owned property with charity management.
        - Local authority retains ownership of site whilst Windmill charity assumes operational responsibility
        - Full repairing lease arrangement places all fabric maintenance and operational costs on charity
        - Council absolved of repair liabilities under current lease structure, confirmed through previous enquiries
        - Historical skylight installation by council represented goodwill gesture but created subsequent operational complications
    - Lease security concerns raised regarding long-term investment viability and renewal certainty.
        - Risk assessment highlighted potential loss of improvements if lease not renewed after expiry
        - Committee acknowledged need for lease duration confirmation before major funding commitments
        - Community centre designation emphasised as core purpose since original council construction
        - Historical transition path documented: council estate → Sanctuary → Torbay CDT council assets
        - Council unlikely to reclaim property given community centre function and lack of alternative use requirements

    Action items

    Unassigned

        - Verify definitive lease arrangement details with council
    - Confirm lease duration and renewal terms for Windmill Centre

DRAFT

- **Glen Sannox:** project £23,880 (£28,000 vat included – CIL panel to confirm VAT status - A**pproved**

Infrastructure Safety & Project Justification

- **Site requires immediate safety intervention** due to deteriorating conditions posing significant public risk
  - Current hazards include falling rocks, missing safety fences, dangerous drops, and impassable track sections
  - Multiple council warning notices posted at site entrances indicate official recognition of safety concerns
  - Site's designation as SSSI, conservation area, and historic location creates legal obligations for proper maintenance
  - **Gary Pilbeam identified as sole qualified contractor** with specific expertise in coastal path infrastructure and challenging terrain conditions
- **£28,000 represents minimum viable safety standard** according to expert assessment, with potential for £150,000+ comprehensive development
  - Two main accessible paths designed to replace current hazardous routes whilst allowing natural vegetation overgrowth in appropriate areas
  - Water diversion systems included to prevent erosion and maintain long-term path stability
  - Infrastructure designed specifically to meet **SWISCO maintenance capabilities** ensuring sustainable ongoing care
  - Important that Council/SWISCo commit to ongoing routine maintenance. Council initially resisted responsibility until public footpath signage and four Torbay Council site markers established clear municipal ownership
  - Maintenance agreement structured specifically

Financial Partnerships & Sustainability Framework

- **Cary Arms £5,000 contribution secured with critical August deadline**.
  - Cary Arms historically invested thousands in site maintenance
  - Contribution represents significant local business investment in community infrastructure beyond immediate commercial benefit
  - Partnership model demonstrates successful private-public collaboration for heritage site preservation
  - Long-term vision positions site as community asset with potential for volunteer group involvement in specialized area maintenance while council maintains core path infrastructure

Action items

Unassigned

- Confirm VAT arrangements and final project cost through SWISCO contractor process
- Complete infrastructure works by next August to secure Cary Arms £5,000 contribution
- CD/DH to proceed with National Lottery heritage funding application following infrastructure approval

DRAFT

	• DH to develop detailed historic trail plans and content following infrastructure completion

10.	**Development Plans**
	• **Local Plan Working Party**
	  ○ No further updates since last SG Meeting
	  ○ DC to try to get Meeting Minutes for NF information.
	  ○ Looking into reducing delivery target for Torbay to 500 homes per year.
	  ○ Cabinet to review housing site proposals 18-25 November.
	  ○ Regulation 18 Consultation due to run from November through January.
	• **Neighbourhood Plan Update**
	  ○ Housing sites to be identified from Local Plan Regulation 18 proposals.
	  ○ RH & NG to review Policies for final update at that time, then circulate to SG for final review and agreement
	  ○ Neighbourhood Plan to proceed without waiting for Local Plan in order to bring Policies into force as soon as possible.

11.	**Planning concerns**
	• **Conservation Area Appraisals**
	  ○ **24 conservation areas** across Torbay requiring professional assessment with current capacity of **3 per year** creating **8-year completion timeline**
	  ○ **Torquay Harbour Area 1** demonstrates gold standard approach with complete photographic documentation of listed buildings, architectural features, and historical research incorporating **1820s-1830s imagery**
	  ○ **Technology advancement** since previous appraisals enables more comprehensive documentation and research capabilities than previous assessments
	  ○ **Amateur limitations acknowledged** - forum members lack specialist knowledge of historic buildings, architectural significance assessment, and professional recording equipment required for thorough documentation
	  ○ **Environmental information gathering** identified as critical component requiring professional expertise and comprehensive site surveys
	  ○ **Boundary optimisation opportunity** presents potential for streamlined conservation management
	  ○ **Coterminous boundaries** between multiple conservation areas create administrative complexity requiring clarification and potential consolidation
	  ○ **Action items**

DRAFT

	Unassigned
	• Feedback specific conservation area concerns from Neighbourhood Forum to Rob Palmer for prioritisation in the 8-year review programme
	• Consider updating conservation area appraisals independently to move process forward (00:00)
	
	• **Planning/Enforcement Concerns (Overview & Scrutiny)**
	  ○ **Enforcement inconsistency identified** as priority issue requiring systematic approach and coordination
	  ○ Multiple outstanding cases including Singleton Gardens, Merida, Dawn and Belgrave Road with no visible progress or communication from enforcement team
	  ○ **RH to collate information and send to David Edmondson for next SG Meeting**

12.	**Planning Committee**
	• **Meeting 15 September** – very long meeting 17:30 to 20:45
	  ○ Union Square approved, with 53 Conditions, including agreement on finishing materials (as requested by NF)
	  • **Guy Henderson's** presence noted with positive interaction regarding previous "Stalinist" feedback that led to development modifications (https://www.devonlive.com/news/devon-news/massive-torquay-revamp-passed-despite-10502615?utm_source=mynewsassistant.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=embedded_search_item_desktop)
	  • **Financial viability concerns raised** based on comparable market failures in current market conditions
	  ○ **British Land case study**: Arab investors' **£130 million Slough purchase** sold for **£30 million** after one year
	  ○ **Note for Town Deal Board Meeting** – confirm Financial viability of the projects.
	  • **Compulsory Purchase Process & Business Support**
	  • **Business relocation assistance concerns** identified through stakeholder feedback. Affected business reported **council limiting support** to council-owned properties with "extortionate rent"
	  • **Legal clarification provided**: tenants entitled to **full disturbance compensation** regardless of property ownership status
	  • **Council duty confirmed** to conduct comprehensive market search for alternative premises
	• **Planning Committee Process Efficiency**
	  ○ Current officer presentations described as overly detailed regurgitation of written materials causing member disengagement
	  ○ Streamlined format recommended: brief visual presentation followed by issues summary with recommendation and rationale.
	  ○ Cllr Martin Brook (Chair) prefers current format as it highlights the Case Officer's work.

13.	**Planning Applications**

DRAFT

	Review of new Applications • RM to review proposals for Barton and advise if Response needed. **Current specific Application** • **Merida P2025/0444** o RH to draft response based on Gary King's Objection. SG to agree 19 September to meet deadline. • **5G Mast, Perinville Road P/2025/0565** o RH to draft response highlighting ecology and potential for sink holes • **Old Town Hall P/2024/0889 & 0890** – no update • **10 homes, Edginswell P/2025/0152** – no update • **Corbyn Head Hotel P/2024/0264** o JP following up on privacy. o RH to draft NF response to Licensing as bar opening times conflict with Planning Conditions. o midnight-to-midnight full licence directly contradicting existing planning conditions 19 and 22. • **Palace Hotel P/2024/0336** – Bridges, Corrective Action o Fragrance are insisting allowed by GPDR. o Wellswood CP following up • **Maycliffe Hotel** o JB to clarify with Planning if switching to HMO. o Exterior aircon units installed on building facade in conservation area without planning permission o White PVC cladding being installed around edges and window eaves, completely inappropriate for conservation area character • **Sladnor Park P/2025/0353** – possible Planning Committee 10 November • **Land at Garth Road DE/2025/0112 (Happaway Road)** o Agreed that development not appropriate owing to use as green space (not Designated) o Antisocial Behaviour issues o RH to draft NF Response
14.	**Torquay Plan for Neighbourhoods** **Community Partnership Funding Programme Structure** **51 applications** submitted for significant community funding with compressed timeline creating process challenges • Community engagement research identified **three clear priority areas**: crime prevention/disorder, town centre regeneration, and neighbourhood regeneration • **Skills and employment programmes** recommended as fourth priority to support other regeneration goals

DRAFT

- **27th October** next board meeting date with November submission deadline creating **extremely tight turnaround**
- Board composition includes voluntary organisations, youth representatives, and faith community members providing diverse perspectives
- Transparency measures include public domain publication of all application summaries for community review

• **Process transparency concerns** about board members potentially voting on their own funding applications
- Multiple board members have submitted applications creating potential conflict of interest situations
- **Rose's organisation** and community partnership both declared applicants requiring careful handling
- Forum role defined as providing independent assessment against community plan aspirations to guide board decisions

• **Fundamental criticism of funding approach** lacking strategic infrastructure planning and long-term vision
- **£500,000 play park funding** example of piecemeal approach missing comprehensive planning opportunities
- **Upton Park success model** highlighted demonstrating value of master planning approach with blueprint development
- Historical progression: initial master plan → MFH successful first phase funding → Town Deal **£200,000** allocation for blueprint delivery
- Current programme missing opportunity for revenue funding to develop mini master plans for other open spaces

• **Board meeting dynamics** showing encouraging grassroots resistance to inadequate proposals
- Voluntary organisations, youth, and faith representatives voicing strong concerns about project focus and deprivation emphasis
- Public attendees (**Julie** and meeting participant) observing board members courageously challenging proposal quality
- Clear message emerging that current applications don't adequately address deprivation or children's provision needs
- Democratic process working with community representatives holding decision-makers accountable

Application Assessment and Co-production Process
- RM was asked to develop an Excel workbook list of proposals if possible for review.
- Forum members will independently assess which proposals align with established community plan aspirations
- RM receiving collective guidance on which applications deserve advocacy support during board discussions
- Recognition that public summaries provide limited detail compared to full applications requiring careful interpretation
- Opportunity identification for **co-production between overlapping applications** to create stronger joint proposals

• **Gap analysis and proposal development support** helping applicants strengthen submissions to meet community priorities
- Board committed to identifying gaps between submitted applications and community engagement priorities
- **Skills and employment elements** being encouraged as additions to existing proposals addressing crime, disorder, and regeneration
- Workshop programme designed to help applicants flesh out proposals and address identified gaps
- **Ongoing application acceptance** beyond initial 51 submissions allowing late entries if proper community consultation conducted
- Emphasis on reaching most deprived communities requiring additional outreach effort and genuine consultation processes

Action items

DRAFT

	RM • Send list of 51 funding applications to forum members for review • Distribute Eventbrite workshop information to community contacts • Create Excel spreadsheet for collaborative application assessment **Forum Members** • Review funding applications and provide opinions on which match community plan aspirations • Forward Eventbrite workshop information to their community partnership contacts
15.	**Torquay Town Vision/Town Deal** • **Financial viability of Projects** o Need to raise concerns about Union Square and former Debenhams • **Pavilion** o Agreed to accept opportunity for site visit o TC to arrange • **Strategic Planning & Town Development** o One remaining town deal meeting scheduled providing opportunity for financial sustainability review o Market evidence integration needed to inform realistic development expectations and risk assessment o Residual valuation requirement emphasised to ensure project deliverability and avoid derelict site outcomes
16.	**Shopfront Design Guide –** • Ross Wise has sent out for formal consultation • As this is a Wellswood CP/NF initiative, SG members are encouraged to respond with support.
17.	**Torbay Council** • **Governance and Performance Monitoring Issues** • Enforcement KPI reporting gaps identified in scrutiny board documentation review. o GD tasked with locating missing Key Performance Indicators that should be standard meeting contributions o Regular reporting commitment appears to have lapsed without clear explanation o Performance monitoring framework requires restoration for effective oversight • **Planning department performance concerns escalating** with deep red RAG ratings across multiple functional areas o Application processing delays continuing despite departmental reformation efforts o Economic factors contributing to reduced application income and staffing challenges o Some improvements acknowledged but critical areas remain significantly underperforming o Ongoing scrutiny commitment to maintain oversight during transformation period

DRAFT

	○
20.	**Any other business** • **None**
	Next meetings: 14 October, 04 November, 09 December (no clashes with Council Meeting Calendar

The meeting closed at 8.40pm.

DRAFT

APPENDIX

Discussion on Steven Chown's CIL guidelines presentation.

CIL Guidance Development and Streamlining

- **Comprehensive guidance document created** to streamline Community Infrastructure Levy application process across Torbay's neighbourhood planning areas
  - **Steven** developed unified approach combining information from multiple council and forum websites into single resource
  - Document designed to demystify CIL process for community organisations, explaining funding sources, eligibility criteria, and assessment procedures in straightforward language
  - Guidance specifically addresses **four neighbourhood plan areas** though administrative processes vary between locations
  - Primary objective to reduce confusion and provide clear pathway for community groups seeking infrastructure funding
- **Role transition and expertise transfer** from previous community funding advisor **Robin Causley** to current position
  - Focus extends beyond funding advice to **"bid readiness" preparation** including governance structure development and policy implementation
  - Significant emphasis on connecting new organisations with existing networks and partnerships to prevent duplication of services
  - Community-centred approach leveraging Torbay Communities' extensive local connections for strategic guidance

Eligibility Criteria and Application Framework

- **Expanded eligible applicant categories** now include **Community Interest Companies (CICs)** alongside traditional community groups, registered charities, and social enterprises
  - **Wider community benefit principle** underpins all application assessments, ensuring projects serve broader public rather than restricted membership
  - Social enterprises and CICs must demonstrate genuine community benefit despite profit-generating nature
  - **Community partnerships consultation requirement** mandated before formal application submission
- **Three-tier funding approach** covering diverse infrastructure needs with clear parameters
  - **New physical community infrastructure provision** for entirely new facilities and structures
  - **Improvements and replacements of existing structures** for enhancement and modernisation projects
  - **Maintenance of existing physical infrastructure** for specific repair and refurbishment needs, explicitly excluding ongoing operational costs
  - **£25,000 typical maximum grant** with flexibility for exceptional circumstances providing scope for larger strategic projects
- **Timeline requirements streamlined** to ensure project viability and timely delivery
  - Projects must **start within 12 months of approval** rather than complete within timeframe, providing more realistic implementation window
  - Application form timing requirements made consistent with guidance documentation to eliminate confusion

Assessment and Evaluation Process

DRAFT

- **Two-stage application process maintained** with enhanced screening and evaluation procedures
    - **Initial screening form redesigned** from basic "back of envelope" format to comprehensive preliminary assessment tool
    - **Full application form requires minimal changes** due to existing detailed structure and comprehensive information capture
    - Clear decision points established between screening and full application stages
- **New weighted scoring system introduced** providing structured evaluation framework for consistent decision-making
    - **0-5 point scale implemented** with detailed criteria for need assessment, cost effectiveness, and community benefit evaluation
    - **Minimum score of 8 required** for project approval, ensuring only strong applications receive funding
    - **Flexibility built into system** allowing for application improvement suggestions and resubmission opportunities rather than outright rejection
    - Assessment covers alignment with neighbourhood plan objectives, evidence of community consultation, and realistic project costing

Neighbourhood Plan Administrative Clarifications

- **Three currently adopted neighbourhood plans** requiring correction in guidance documentation: **Torquay, Churston Galmpton and Broadsands**
    - **Brixham Peninsula neighbourhood plan** still in development phase, not yet adopted through full consultation process
    - **Brixham Town Council administers** CIL applications independently, requiring separate process documentation
    - **Paignton and Galmpton Broadsands plans** referenced in original guidance but need status clarification
- **Website consistency issues** identified requiring coordination with planning department
    - **Torbay Council website references** need updating to reflect accurate neighbourhood plan naming conventions
    - **Multiple information sources** currently create confusion, necessitating unified approach across all platforms

Funding Limitations and Ongoing Maintenance

- **Clear boundaries established** around ongoing maintenance cost coverage to prevent future misunderstandings
    - **One-time funding approach** for infrastructure improvements with explicit exclusion of operational and routine maintenance expenses
    - **Previous application complications** cited where funding recipients expected continued maintenance support beyond initial grant period
    - **Responsibility clarification** that ongoing maintenance remains with property owners or relevant authorities such as Torbay Council for public spaces
- **Flexible criteria application** for match funding and procurement requirements
    - **Match funding not mandatory** but considered favourably in assessment process, providing advantage without creating barrier for community groups
    - **Three quotes requirement waived** for small-scale projects, reducing administrative burden while maintaining value for money principles
    - **Cost effectiveness assessment** includes realistic project costing and clear expense explanation requirements

CIL Panel Process Optimisation

- **Current system inefficiencies identified** with panel members asking irrelevant questions and **Adam Billings** getting delayed by quote requirements
    - Panel standing up projects independently but facing unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles

DRAFT

    - Some questions described as "right off the wall" and not relevant to applications
    - Quote requirement delays specifically impacting project approval timelines
    - **SWISCO exemption established** - no longer requiring three quotes for wholly council-owned company projects
    - SWISCO provision now formally documented in guidance for consistent application
- **Planning department role clarification** to eliminate duplicated assessments and streamline approval workflow
    - Panel responsibility limited to project benefits assessment and neighbourhood plan alignment
    - Planning department handles all technical approvals including building control and planning permissions
    - Reduces forensic interrogation burden on panel members while maintaining oversight quality
    - Creates clear separation between community benefit evaluation and technical compliance checking

Application Form Restructure and Screening Process

- **New project request screening form implemented** to filter applications before full assessment begins
    - Replaces previous screening form with more focused eligibility requirements
    - **150-word limit** for project summary descriptions to avoid excessive detail at initial stage
    - Saves time for both applicants and panel by identifying unsuitable projects early
    - Includes community partnership consultation confirmation as mandatory requirement
- **Organisation verification requirements enhanced** with multiple validation mechanisms
    - **Charity registration numbers** requested for easy verification through Charity Commission database
    - **Companies House numbers** for Community Interest Companies to enable status confirmation
    - Website details required for independent organisation verification
    - **£5,000 income threshold** noted for mandatory charity registration requirements
    - Accommodation for smaller organisations under threshold that cannot register as charities
- **Form standardisation improvements** with consistent word limits and checkbox implementations
    - **Word count limits** applied across all sections to prevent excessive submissions
    - **2-3 hundred word maximum** recommended for benefit and need explanations
    - Checkbox additions for easier form completion and data processing
    - Infrastructure project categorisation with yes/no options for clearer classification

Funding Security and Banking Arrangements

- **Alternative funding mechanisms** established for organisations without traditional bank accounts
    - **Community Partnership** designated as primary fund holder option for unincorporated groups
    - **Torbay Communities** available as secondary fund holder where Community Partnership insufficient
    - Direct council-to-SWISCO payments confirmed for council-owned company projects
    - Recognition that not all small charities and community groups maintain dedicated bank accounts

DRAFT

- **Organisation legitimacy requirements** balanced with accessibility for genuine community groups
    - Security level expectations appropriate for neighbourhood CIL fund scope
    - Host organisation provisions similar to existing community fund models
    - **Games group puzzle purchase** cited as successful example of creative funding solutions
    - Flexibility maintained for well-structured community partnerships versus semi-defunct organisations

Document Finalisation and Approval Process

- **Weekend deadline established** for final panel member input on revised documentation
    - **Steven** responsible for incorporating all feedback and ensuring internal consistency
    - Final circulation planned after Steven's edits for ultimate panel approval
    - All documents to cross-reference consistently for seamless application experience
    - Process refinements aimed at reducing future panel questions and improving applicant success rates

Action items

Steven

- Update guidance document to reflect only three adopted neighbourhood plans, clarifying Brixham Peninsula plan status
- Revise wording on ongoing maintenance costs to explicitly state 'how ongoing maintenance costs will be covered in the future' rather than current ambiguous phrasing
- Email revised guidance documents back to forum members for final review and reformatting
- Contact planning department to update Torbay Council website references to ensure consistency with neighbourhood plan naming
- Edit and tidy up assessment forms with track changes corrections
- Make documents internally consistent across all sections
- Implement word count limits on application form questions
- Add charity registration number fields to screening form
- Include SWISCO provision in relevant form sections
- Send revised documents back for final review

Unassigned

- Obtain current balance information for neighbourhood CIL funding pot

All Panel Members

- Provide final comments on revised forms by weekend deadline
- Complete final approval after Steven's edits are circulated

DRAFT