NOT FOR PUBLICATION by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

EXEMPT APPENDIX TO MINUTE 75 OF THE MEETING OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE HELD ON 10 APRIL 2018

In response to questions, the following was noted:

- Sanctuary Housing Association (SHA) was not in breach of the development obligations detailed in the Deed of Variation, as listed in paragraph 4.2 of the report.
- SHA had been unable to meet the 'start on site' date of 31 March 2018 for four of the proposed development schemes due to delays in the planning process.
- The Bullward Hall application was rescheduled due to planning dependencies and would be considered by the Development Committee on 19 April 2018; Members would be advised whether an extension to the original date of determination of 16 January had been granted. SHA had shown commitment to the development by its financial investment in demolition/clearance works on the site.
- The Development Committee had granted outline planning permission for the Barrow Hall Road site on 14 December 2017 and reserve matters now applied.
- The officers at the meeting had no detailed planning information. Information on why dates had slipped, extensions to the time limit on development sites and who had requested them, would be put to the Assistant Director, Planning Services.
- Reference to the financial penalty that could be imposed on SHA under the terms of the agreement had been included in the report as this aspect had been discussed previously by the Committee. The penalty clause applied only to the obligation that SHA starts on site and not later aspects of the process. SHA continued to be committed to delivering homes in the District in the spirit of the agreement.
- In legal terms, SHA had used reasonable endeavours to obtain planning permission, in accordance with the requirement of the Deed of Variation.
- In respect of both the Timber Grove and London Road developments, SHA is neither the owner nor the developer. However, it had committed a team to work with the developers and with the Council to try to obtain planning permission for these sites.

• The tenure types of the properties provided by SHA were driven by the Council's housing need; SHA liaised with the Council's Housing team in this respect.

Members commented that it would have been useful to have had a planning officer at the meeting to provide detailed responses to the issues raised. The Committee would be provided with the information requested relating to planning matters.