

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

TUESDAY 27 SEPTEMBER 10.00am

The questions in italics are some (but not the only) specific matters which arise from the evidence and will assist in focusing the discussion.

MATTER 4. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SITE

4.1 Is the selection of the Olympia Park strategic development site sound and founded on a credible and robust evidence base? How has the judgement which balances flood risk against sustainability/ countryside/ settlement form matters been reached?

4.2 Is the Olympia Park strategic development site consistent with national policy in PPS25 and have the Environment Agency's concerns been overcome?

- *How is the residual risk of flooding as a result of the site benefiting from defences treated in the application of the PPS25 sequential/exception tests*
- *Has it been suitably demonstrated that the scheme would not increase flood risk on site and elsewhere*

4.3 Is the Olympia Park strategic development site consistent with national policy in PPS4, particularly with regard to proposed B1 office development?

- *The sequential approach appears not to consider edge-of-centre sites or sites within the urban area – do any such sites exist for the proposed office development*

4.4 Is there a robust and credible evidence base to demonstrate that the proposal can be delivered over the plan period? What stage has been reached with matters such as landowner/developer agreements, the availability of funding for new infrastructure, the phased release of land, the masterplanning process?

- *Is the "co-operation agreement" between landowners sufficiently robust to ensure delivery of the scheme – how detailed and binding is it, does it provide mechanisms for dispute resolution, etc*
- *What is the risk that The Potter Group could delay or frustrate the scheme if their interests are not satisfied*
- *Is there evidence that the scheme is likely to prove attractive/viable to developers*

4.5 Is it clear which key items of infrastructure are essential for delivery of housing and employment land at Olympia Park and when and how they will be provided? What stage has been reached in discussions with the key infrastructure operators/providers?

Selby District Core Strategy Examination

- *Have any of the statutory authorities (highways, water etc) raised significant concerns which could threaten or delay implementation*
- *Are discussions with Network Rail sufficiently advanced to give certainty that the railway bridge can be provided within the timescale required*

4.6 Has the economic viability of the proposal been robustly demonstrated? Are the assumptions that have been made about the key variables (including land values, infrastructure and abnormal costs, profit margins, income) realistic?

- *Have the major abnormal costs associated with the remediation of contamination, poor ground conditions, flood alleviation measures and the railway bridge been independently tested and verified*
- *Have the assumptions about costs fully taken into account the sustainable development, renewable energy and building design policies of the CS*
- *Are the assumptions about values and costs based on current market conditions, and if so are they a realistic basis for assessment over a 12 year build period*
- *The viability appraisal is based on a residualised land price rather than a market value for land – has an appraisal been carried out on the latter basis*
- *The District Valuer suggests that the scheme could support £30-35m in S106 infrastructure payments – if the Council seeks such provision, does the scheme remain viable from the developer's standpoint. To what extent would such a sum meet the Council's normal infrastructure requirements*
- *The viability appraisal assumes that development within the three zones would occur simultaneously, whereas the phasing in policy CP2A(ii) requires employment land to be released before residential – does this undermine the appraisal*
- *Why has a Regional Growth Fund bid been made if the scheme is believed to be viable (notwithstanding it is acknowledged to be a fallback)*

4.7 Are the implementation programmes and monitoring mechanisms for a phased delivery reasonable and realistic? Does reference to the "release" of employment land in policy CP2A (ii) give sufficient clarity about what is required?

- *Does "release" mean that fully serviced employment sites/plots (with access and utilities in place) will be available, or that unserviced land will be released onto the market - is the policy sufficiently specific*

4.8 Are all the specific requirements of policy CP2A realistic and achievable?

- *How did the increase in dwellings from 800 to 1,000 arise and is it certain that this number can be achieved on the available land*
- *Is it realistic to expect completion of 1,000 dwellings by 2026*
- *Can noise from existing industrial/distribution operations and the railway be absorbed without significant adverse effects on the residential component of the scheme. Is a buffer necessary and does the policy require amendment*
- *Should The Potter Site be included within the Strategic Development Site*
- *Have the interests of existing residents been adequately addressed*

4.9 What are the implications of any significant delays in delivery of Olympia Park? Does the Core Strategy provide a robust strategy with appropriate contingencies that can adjust to such delays?