

## PLANNING & LICENSING COMMITTEE

1<sup>st</sup> August 2017

### ADDENDUM REPORT

Report no.	Item no.	Application no.	Applicant	Parish
151/2017	2	2017/0444/FUL	Abbey Developments	Cottesmore

#### Letter/Further information from applicant

A letter has been received from the agent and copied to members making comments on the content of the main report.

#### Further Consultation Response

##### Housing Strategy Officer

In response to the letter from Paul Jolley Associates dated 19 July 2017, the following comments are made:

The developer hasn't confirmed the affordability level the registered provider would be able to offer. The words 'Affordability Criteria' are capitalised as if they are a defined term, but it's not clear what cost level they are offering or how deliverable they would be in practice. The minimum levels in NPPF are based on a moderate discount on open market housing which would not be sufficient to meet the relevant need here- e.g. in the context of SP9. The affordable values would need to be similar to those on an identical semi-detached house and a Registered Provider could be under pressure from the Homes and Communities Agency and lenders to maximise income from the property.

#### Revised Reasons for Refusal

The Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan has several policies relating to housing and affordable housing provision. There are other policies in addition to H8 that are relevant. The following are updated reasons for refusal:

1. The land is located outside the Planned Limit to Development for Cottesmore and in an area of open countryside. In dismissing a recent appeal, the Inspector found that the sites were in an unsustainable location remote from shops and services in the village. There has been no material change in circumstances since that appeal decision so the proposed development is contrary to the advice in Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS4 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011), Policies SP6 and SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014) and Policies COT H1, COT H2, COT H6 and COT H8 of the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan (2016).
2. The scheme fails to provide for the requisite amount of affordable housing units so is contrary to Policy CS11 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011), Policy SP9 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014), Policy COT H3 of the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and the advice in the Planning Obligations SPD (2016).