

ADVANCE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st March 2016

Agenda item 5

Application ref. 15/001085/OUT

Hamptons Metal Merchants and Land Adjoining Keele Road, Newcastle

Since the preparation of the agenda report the interim conclusions of the **District Valuer (DV)** has been received.

A further **objection** has been received making the following comments:

- If the Council's consultant's modelling is correct, and there is no reason to doubt that it is, then the majority of the houses proposed will at least be very unpleasant to live in and make the houses untenable for quite significant lengths of time, depending on wind direction and atmospheric pressure.
- No mention seems to be being made of the probability of landfill gas migration at this site. The minimum clearance between the landfill and any further development should be at least the same as for the Persimmon development or a minimum distance of at least 250m if no study was undertaken when that development was permitted.

Your Officer's comments

The conclusion of the DV's appraisal is that the scheme is "marginally unviable".

On this basis and so as to inform the next stage and the Planning Authority's consideration of the matter, your Officer has asked him to undertake certain further sensitivity testing work as follows :-

In Scenario One work out, on the basis of nil (ZERO) education contributions, the number of affordable housing units that will be able to be provided before the scheme becomes unviable. If the full affordable housing provision can be made and there is some available "surplus" for the education contribution in this scenario the DV has been asked to advise what it (the education contribution) would be.

In Scenario Two work out, on the basis of no (ZERO) affordable units, the amount of education contributions that would be achievable. If the full education contribution can be provided and there is some available "surplus" in this scenario the DV has been asked to calculate what he consider that surplus would represent (in terms of on-site affordable housing provision).

In Scenario Three, assuming in proportional value terms that education and affordable housing take equal reductions (i.e. the total value of each element is reduced by equal percentage amounts), the DV has been asked to work out what number of affordable units and what value of education contributions can be viably achieved by the current scheme.

As further information is awaited from the DV it has not been possible to consider the different scenarios and make a recommendation as to what contributions should be secured through a S106 obligation. It is expected, however, that the DV will provide a response before Committee and as such it is anticipated that a recommendation will be made at the meeting.

As indicated in the report policies of the development plan are not considered to be up-to-date as the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (plus an additional buffer of 20%) as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. In such circumstances, as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. If the

DV's appraisal is sound, indications are that it may be possible to secure some affordable housing within the scheme (and indeed potentially not far off the full 25% required by policy). The benefits of the provision of additional and, again provided the DVs appraisal is sound, deliverable housing land must be accorded appropriate weight, together with the associated benefits to the local economy and the relocation of the existing scrap yard within the site to a more appropriate and efficient site. However taking all of these points into account the adverse impact arising from granting planning permission (i.e. the odours arising from the adjoining landfill site having an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of this development) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh such benefits. Such a development would not be sustainable.

The RECOMMENDATION remains, at this time, as set out in the main agenda