## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE 16 October 2024

**ADDITIONAL PAGES** (Published 11.10.2024)

# AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS: Page I - 3		
Agenda No:	Ref No:	Content:
8	23/01513/FUL	Officer Update:
	(Land North Of Oddington Road Stow-on-the- Wold)	Subsequent to the publication of the Officer committee report, the applicant has requested a further change to the proposed housing mix. The proposed mix results from a need to ensure that the scheme can secure adequate funding and be viable. The applicant has advised the following:
		'For clarity this would mean all 24 rented units would be social rent, no affordable rent and then 13 shared ownership. This social rent tenure would also apply to the conversion of shared ownership if they failed to sell.'
		The proposed housing mix would therefore consist initially of 24 units for social rent and 13 units for shared ownership. The shared ownership units would be marketed for purchase by persons with a local connection for a 3 month period. If the shared ownership units fail to sell they will revert to social rented units.
		The revised proposal will provide additional units for social rent, which was identified as a particular need in the Stow-on-the-Wold and the Swells Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) March 2022. It will also meet the Council's objective of securing housing that is genuinely affordable. In addition, shared ownership units will remain available for purchase for an initial period, thereby meeting a local need for such accommodation. The 3 month time period is considered reasonable as it is consistent with the marketing period recommended by central Government in connection with First Homes, which is another form of affordable housing.
		The Council's Strategic Housing Manager is supportive of the proposed changes.

### Stow-on-the-Wold Town Council:

'Council considers that a 3-month period to seek sales is too short. Council does not support any option that could lead to the dwellings being ultimately lost as affordable units.'

#### **Other Representations:**

### 2 objections received:

1. 'I am only objecting to the application outside my area, as it raises a matter of general principle.

Clearly the proposed change of units 8 - 10 from shared ownership to social rent is to be welcomed. This is 3 more social rent properties, than Committee previously accepted, and is in line with the Councils objectives, which supports social rent, given its true affordability.

The other proposed change relating to the shared ownership is however not appropriate for what is supposed to be an exception site. The appropriate way to proceed would be for the other shared ownership units to remain as shared ownership, as then the purchased element v the rented element would be more likely to be at a level that makes the properties more affordable.

If the developer finds it impossible to sell the shared ownership properties over a reasonable period (I would suggest 6 months from completion), then it would be up to applicant to apply for a modification to the Section 106 Agreement. It would be up to the Council, as to whether or not Agree to a Deed of Variation.

It is not appropriate to build into the original Section 106 Agreement, a clause that would potentially undermine the objective of the development complying fully with the rationale of the exception Policy, and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance.

The flexibility requested on the remaining shared ownership should be resisted.'

2. 'I acknowledge that removal of the rent to buy, is a positive change, following my previous objection.

Cont/....

I would not object to the flexibility on the Shared Ownership Units, if the period for exclusive attempts to find Shared Ownership, is extended to 6 months from completion, of the relevant units.

Alternatively, the 3 months flexibility is only given to up to half of the Shared Ownership properties, to the nearest full unit. That would be an alternative potential compromise.'