

**Addendum to
Core Strategy Background Paper No. 7**

Strategic Development Sites

January 2011

Introduction

- A1 Following consideration of the response to consultation on the Draft Core Strategy the Council confirmed the allocation of Strategic Development Sites at Olympia Park (Sites D and G), and Cross Hills Lane (Site A).
- A2 This was however subject to the satisfactory resolution of outstanding highways and flood risk issues, and ensuring that schemes were viable and deliverable.
- A3 Further consultation with landowners and technical bodies has therefore been undertaken in order to resolve these issues.

Highways

- A4 Previous traffic modelling Option studies¹ commissioned by North Yorkshire County Council indicates that the combined traffic impact of developing Olympia Park and Cross Hills Lane would increase town centre congestion. In particular the Gowthorpe/Scott Road and the Selby Swingbridge signalled junctions would be operating over capacity, and would require mitigation.
- A5 North Yorkshire County Council have subsequently announced proposals to upgrade the Gowthorpe/Scott Road junction, and have agreed in principle to an improvement scheme² for the Selby Swingbridge junction put forward by consultants acting on behalf of the landowners.
- A6 This scheme, which impacts marginally on the design of the Swingbridge flood defences, is also acceptable to the Environment Agency.

Flood Risk

- A7 Following publication of the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (February 2010), the Environment Agency released an update to the flood map for Selby. This reveals that Selby and surrounding land, is now affected by a higher probability of flooding, although the presence of modern flood defences reduces the risk of flooding to a low residual risk, for example resulting from failure of the defences rather than overtopping. Strategic Development Site Options are now affected by a higher probability of flooding (Sites A, B, E and F), or remain at the same level of risk as previously (Sites C and D).
- A8 As a number of changes had also been made to the District housing requirement and the planned spatial distribution of development (after consultation on the Draft Core Strategy), the Council undertook a review of the PPS25 Sequential Test.³

¹ Phase 1 and Phase 2 Options Testing undertaken by Jacobs Consultancy

² Swingbridge Junction Study (July 2010) undertaken by Aecom Transportation

³ Published as an addendum to the PPS 25 Sequential Test

- A9 This concluded that the preferred strategy of concentrating growth in Selby remains appropriate, and that sufficient capacity is available to accommodate the revised Selby housing requirement on a combination of medium and high flood risk sites, including strategic development sites.
- A10 It was further concluded that Sites A and D remain the most sustainable residential options.
- A11 In view of the fact that a much larger area of land at Cross Hills Lane is now within Flood Zone 3 (high flood risk) it was considered necessary to review the Level 2 SFRA for this site.
- A12 The Level 2 Review ⁴, identifies two potential sources of flooding, associated with a potential breach in the Selby flood defences and secondary flooding attributable to 'backing up' of Selby Dam, caused for example through a pump failure.
- A13 While the flood levels and extents are greater than the previous flood map, the Environment Agency acknowledge that the hydraulic modelling used to identify areas benefitting from flood defences in Selby (and theoretically those at greatest risk) is of less value for the purpose of the Level 2 Review and that the Cross Hills Lane site is more at risk of flooding from Selby Dam.
- A14 The review concludes that while the risk of flooding is insufficient to preclude development, the developable area of the site will be reduced because of the increased area of 'functional floodplain'. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment is also required in order to quantify the level of risk in more detail, including delineation of the floodplain, and to inform the layout of development.

Viability and Deliverability

- A15 Subsequent to publication of the draft Core Strategy proposals, the Council has been working with the Homes and Communities Agency, ATLAS (the Advisory Team for Large Applications) and landowners to help refine the Councils requirements for the development of the strategic site allocations. This includes identifying and rectifying gaps in the evidence, understanding remediation and infrastructure required in liaison with providers, and establishing the scale of developer contributions required.

Olympia Park

- A16 Following an 'optioneering' exercise the development team acting on behalf of the landowners have produced a revised master plan and Delivery Framework Document ⁵. This is accompanied by a high level economic viability assessment, identifying development and construction costs (including abnormal costs), remediation costs and

⁴ Published as an addendum to the February 2010 Level2 SFRA

⁵ BOCM Pauls, Potter Group and Selby Farms Updated Masterplan and Delivery Framework Document, November 2010 - published as a separate piece of evidence

anticipated up lift in land values for different land use types and phases of development.

A17 On the advice of the District Valuer who has scrutinised the assessment on behalf of the Council, the scheme is considered to be physically and commercially viable, and will create a positive land value with a surplus available for funding infrastructure and other requirements.

A18 Other outcomes of the ongoing discussions are as follows

- The landowners have entered into a 'co-operation agreement' to ensure the joint promotion of the site, continuing co-operation between themselves and with the public sector, agreement on future access arrangements and delivery of the scheme through joint planning applications.
- There are no insurmountable physical, environmental, land ownership, land use or investment constraints.
- The scheme can deliver mixed housing and employment development in the short to medium term with phase one housing commencing in 2011/2012.
- The masterplan will be reviewed in consultation with the local community and other stakeholders prior to granting of any planning consents
- Future planning applications will be progressed through a development team approach/planning performance agreement with the Council

Cross Hills Lane

A19 In order to help shape the development concept a 'visioning' exercise with key stakeholders and principle landowners, facilitated by ATLAS, was held in July 2010. This helped identify constraints and opportunities, and was used to produce a draft vision accompanied by a series of development objectives and an illustrative master plan.

A20 Unfortunately while there is a general willingness on the part of landowners to co-operate with the Council in bringing the site forward, there is at the present point in time no formal landowner agreement to share risks and costs. Neither has an expression of interest been secured from a developer/housebuilder to become involved in the scheme.

A21 It is also evident that further technical and development work is required in order to

- Fully understand the flood risk affecting the site as identified in the addendum to the Level2 SFRA, which will require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment in order to establish the precise developable area (and reduced yield) and site boundaries.
- Demonstrate that the highway works required including a new

access road and road bridge are achievable without affecting flood storage capacity

- Demonstrate that the scheme would be financially viable particularly having regard to the potential highway and flood mitigation costs

Conclusion

- A21 Following investigation of additional evidence, including a viability assessment and framework delivery document, the Olympia Park scheme has been judged to be physically and commercially viable and has been carried forward into the Submission draft Core Strategy.
- A22 The Cross Hills Lane site has been withdrawn from the Core Strategy because it has not been progressed to the stage where it is possible to demonstrate its viability and deliverability. This does not mean that the site is no longer considered appropriate for development. It will be reconsidered as part of the Site Allocations DPD process providing additional time in which to address the technical, viability and deliverability issues highlighted above.