

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Schedule of Supplementary Information**

**25<sup>th</sup> November 2020**

**Members are advised of the enclosed information that was either  
received or requested after the production of the planning applications report**

**Bolton  
Council**

**06232/19**

|      |  |
|------|--|
| Ward | Location   |
| HOBL | HORWICH LOCO INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, CHORLEY NEW ROAD,<br>HORWICH BL6 5UE |

Suggested conditions

Officers are now recommending that condition 3 (surface water drainage) is removed as this is already conditioned within the outline approval (conditions 34-36) and make condition 14 (Traffic Regulation Orders) an informative of the decision notice rather than a condition, as this is not a requirement under Planning legislation (it is instead covered by the Road Traffic Regulations Act and therefore separate from the planning consent).

Viability/S106 contributions

Further to the publication of the officer's report, the Council's independent viability consultant has stated that, despite their initial comments to officers, there may be potential to achieve "some" affordable units within the development if the submitted cost assumptions were further re-appraised.

Officers however consider the following should be noted:

- There is currently a large gap between the expected developer's profit and the agreed Acceptable Return (25% of GDV, as agreed within the S106 Agreement for Rivington Chase) within the appraisal that has been submitted to the Council. The assumed costs would have to change substantially for the expected profit to exceed the Acceptable Return.
- It has always been the assumption that the Rivington Chase development would not be able to deliver many affordable units given the required contributions to off-site highways works and the other on and off-site contributions that are not subject to additional viability appraisals (see para. 103 of the officer's report), and also as the former Loco Works is a difficult site to develop owing to past (contaminated) uses. It must be noted that affordable housing (along with secondary education and public transport) are specifically subject to a viability assessment.
- The developer/applicant will already be contributing some £2.26m towards Section 106 contributions (combined sum for the requirements within para. 103 of the officer's report).
- Requiring the applicant to re-run their viability appraisal would be time consuming and at an additional cost to them, which would further delay the delivery of the dwellings on the site.
- And importantly, the Section 106 Agreement for Rivington Chase already requires the developer to submit a further viability appraisal (a reassessment) prior to 90% occupation of the development, mainly given the unknown costs for remediating the site prior to the commencement of development. This would enable the Council to clawback any surplus made above the agreed Acceptable Return (potentially towards off-site affordable units) at that time.

Officers therefore do not consider that the viability appraisal should be re-run at this current stage/prior to approval of reserved matters.

Typo

Para. 3 – the application reference no. should read 06233/19 not 06323/19.