

## Gedney, Oliver

---

**From:** Polly Harris-Gorf  
**Sent:** 21 July 2020 12:18  
**To:** Gedney, Oliver  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application H04-0508-19

6SUP (Response to Cllr Walsh)

Yours sincerely

Polly Harris Gorf | Principal Planning Officer | South Holland District Council  
Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, PE11 2XE  
DDI: 01775 764504

[www.sholland.gov.uk](http://www.sholland.gov.uk)

Please note that any informal officer opinion expressed by this email is without prejudice and is not binding on the Council during the consideration of any formal application.



---

**From:** Gedney, Oliver <Oliver.Gedney@sholland.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 July 2020 11:42  
**To:** Polly Harris-Gorf <pharris-gorf@sholland.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** \_planningadvice <planningadvice@sholland.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application H04-0508-19

Hi Polly

Could you please confirm the title and code as this looks like an email from Ashwood Homes?

Many thanks  
Oliver

---

**From:** Polly Harris-Gorf <[pharris-gorf@sholland.gov.uk](mailto:pharris-gorf@sholland.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 21 July 2020 11:01  
**To:** \_planningadvice <[planningadvice@sholland.gov.uk](mailto:planningadvice@sholland.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application H04-0508-19  
**Importance:** High

6SUP (Response to Cllr Walsh)

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 20 July 2020 15:03  
**To:** Polly Harris-Gorf  
**Cc**  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application H04-0508-19  
**Importance:** High

**This message originated from outside your organization**

---

Good Afternoon Polly,

I have several thoughts on this one.

Firstly, the viability has been agreed with your independent expert. Albeit as you are aware we did not agree with some of his land valuation or some of his costs etc but came to agreement in order to be able to progress this site.

Secondly, I am not aware to date that other developers in South Holland in this situation have had to go down this route and have therefore had uncertainty as to the final outcome on the development.

Thirdly, we did not achieve the revenues expected that were used in the viability on first development on Town Dam Lane but were still expected to deliver the affordable housing as the agreement.

Fourthly, it is not reasonable to go down a route where only if sales prices improve or costs fall that Section 106 contributions are revised upward. We already know that or costs will be higher due to the items that the valuer would not accept (£1,108,848). We are currently still experiencing supply shortages that COVID 19 has created, which is resulting in higher pricing due to the shortage in supply and increased demand from the large companies returning to site.

We are all also uncertain about sale revenues going forward due to the media taking about high levels of redundancy and recession and the fallout from Brexit should a suitable withdraw and trading agreement not be agreed.

So if this sort of way was to be considered falls in sales prices and increased costs to those within the viability should also be taken into account and the Section 106 Contributions should also be adjusted downward if sales prices fall or costs increase.

This approach would also mean until the site was completed we would not know what the overall contribution should be, so would this result in just a final payment at the end of the site?

This would involve both ourselves and South Holland District Council in a lot of additional administration costs in providing additional information during this four and a half year project so these costs would need to be taken into account.

Finally, We have a contract to purchase the whole site outright for the 136 units so looking at a phased solution would also not be an option and we do not believe that this site would be large enough to look at a phasing. Some of the infrastructure such as Services, Foul Pump Station and Storm Attenuation and outfall position location and payments also means that a phased approach will not work. The finance needs to be agreed on the whole development and not part to enable the site purchase to go ahead.

In Summary, we are looking to start works on this development as soon as possible.

We do not accept your members suggestion of having a one way variable S106 Contribution or that developers should further look to reduce our profits as we are the ones taking the risk.

Also our funding to undertake these projects has profit levels that we need to achieve set by the lender not ourselves for finance to be provided.

With regards the suggestion that sites where viability is challenged if the challenge is found to be genuine and upheld by independent valuation it should get to a point where these sites are refused poses a whole new question as to the delivery of your Local Plan going forward. Are developers going to invest and risk substantial amounts of money to get to the point where we are today to then get a refusal?

We understood that following you independent experts viability and Chairman's Panel that the scheme was going to a full committee to decided how the £268,000 (£50,000 in the figure of £318,000 is the cost to lay out the public open space on the development and provide a LAP within it) that your expert has agreed the scheme will provide is spent?

Kind Regards



1 Goodison Road, Lincs Gateway Business Park, Spalding, PE12 6FY