

NOT FOR PUBLICATION by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

### **EXEMPT APPENDIX TO MINUTE 92 OF THE MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 24 APRIL 2018**

It was noted that, under the second bullet point, which related to the economic and community investment objective detailed in paragraph 2.1 of the officer's report the sum of £100,000 investment was over the 4 years of the agreement, i.e., £25,000 per annum, rather than £100,000 per annum, as indicated in the report.

The Portfolio Holder for Community reflected on what Sanctuary had delivered for this Council and how this had exceeded expectations. This involved around £100,000 investment over four years in community projects, which had allowed 18 projects to be supported during this financial year. This included the set up and launch of the Rochford Dementia Alliance to help elderly and vulnerable residents; the roll out of the get healthy and falls prevention workshops to Sanctuary Housing residents via RRAVS; the partnership with Essex Youth Council to assist Essex Youth outreach projects to young people within the town of Rochford. The housing adaptation spend to date exceeded the £114,500 agreed investment per annum, with £177,555 spent in 2016/17 and a forecast spend of £143,351 for 2017/18. Sanctuary, in this area, had again invested beyond what had been asked of them by this Council. Finally, he emphasised that 15 units in Frances Cottee Lodge let on licences had supported the Council in its target to reduce its bed and breakfast costs while also facilitating the move of local homeless families back into the District.

The Leader of the Green and Rochford District Residents Group drew attention to the fact that 129 of the 375 new dwellings, referred to in paragraph 3.3 of the officer's report, were for open market sale, i.e., 35%. This figure had not been highlighted in the initial briefing to Members two years ago. He observed that, of the remaining 246 new properties, 151 would have been provided by planning development policy without this agreement. He, therefore, claimed that the added value to social housing of this agreement was a total of 99 properties, 25 social rent and 74 shared ownership properties, which may or may not go to Rochford District residents. Another Member commented that, shortly after the initial briefing to Members in June 2016, it had emerged that the 363 new properties were not all to be social housing properties, although Members were not told this during the briefing. He also emphasised that 14 of the 151 properties that would have been provided by planning development policy were being built on land ceded to Sanctuary by this Council during the housing stock transfer; it had taken a considerable amount of time for the land to be used by Sanctuary to build new properties. He commented that he did not consider that the deed had given the Council the benefits that had been promised. Another Member added that it appeared as though Sanctuary could comply with the terms of the agreement by starting to build new properties, without needing to complete them.

Responding to a Member question as to whether the Council would be entering into a new deed of variation and, if so, whether this would be restricted to Sanctuary or would include other social housing providers, officers confirmed that there were currently no proposals for any further deeds of variation. It was noted that CHP had won the contract for the provision of affordable housing units on the Hall Road site. If other registered housing providers were to want to open discussions with the Council in respect of providing affordable housing the Council would be open to such approaches.

In response to a question raised by a Member as to how this message could be disseminated to other social housing providers, the Leader of the Council stated that details within the exempt report had been included in the original briefing to Members and that it had been Sanctuary that had initially approached the Council. He emphasised that it was for any social housing providers to come to the Council with any proposals; the Council would welcome any such approaches. He reiterated that Sanctuary had delivered what it had said it would deliver, although in some cases not necessarily within original time frames, and in some cases had delivered beyond what was originally agreed.

One Member, however, stated his belief that the original briefing to Members had not included details of the tenure mix outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the officer report.

In conclusion, officers emphasised that the Assistant Director, Community & Housing Services and the Housing Team were in close contact with the housing associations that operate within the District. Issues relating to their development proposals and arrangements for allocating residents on the housing register were all part of the team's ongoing dialogue with registered providers of social housing.