

# Site Selection Methodology

## Introduction

The Site Selection Methodology (SSM) is intended to objectively screen and then assess sites taking into account a wide range of factors to guide choices over site allocations in the Local Plan Sites Document and Helmsley Plan. The approach adopted is set out in detail below. The content and staging of the SSM was consulted on in both 2009 and 2010 and this document builds on that approach.

Proposers of sites are now required to produce a greater amount of detail and this process cannot be a surprise. Indeed it is essential to positively engage the development industry for them to have confidence in the process, and ultimately for the right development to take place in the right places. All the Stages of the SSM involve the gathering of further information to enable assessment to take place. This SSM effectively 'signposts' developers to the likely site specific requirements needed to progress their site. However this is not only to be done by developers – it also involves information gathering by statutory and non-statutory bodies who provide some of this information, including this Council and North Yorkshire County Council. It is essential therefore that this process begins now, so that proposers of the site are aware of the likely information requirements from them.

The SSM is split into 3 stages:

- **Stage 1** - is an initial sift of sites which do not fit with the approach of the Local Plan Strategy or have significant constraints which effectively prevent the site coming forward for development. This is similar to the approach taken into the consultation but also now includes impact on nature conversation sites and heritage assets as suggested by consultation (see consultation section below)
- **Stage 2** – is made up of three assessment levels to allow comparisons between the various factors and to take into account the weighting of those factors. These are:
  - *Assessment 1* - considers key strategic considerations – accessibility, highways and flood risk - that should be given due weight through this methodology and which were supported at consultation as having more significant weight.
  - *Assessment 2* - considers groups of detailed thematic considerations which influence and inform relative merits of each site.
  - *Assessment 3* - considers the deliverability of the site in terms of physical, commercial, legal and other factors. It also assesses the likely contributions that can be secured from the development of the site to necessary infrastructure to deliver the objectives of the plan. This will be an ongoing discussion and negotiation with the development industry.

- **Stage 3** – represents the outcome of Stages 1 and 2 to enable Officers to make informed choices based on the results of the detailed assessment undertaken.

### **Stage 1**

The SSM applies the approach of the Local Plan Strategy. For housing this means assessing sites only at the towns – Malton and Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley and the key service villages – Amotherby/Swinton, Ampleforth, Beadlam/Nawton, Hovingham, Rillington, Sheriff Hutton, Sherburn, Slingsby, Staxton/Willerby, and Thornton le Dale. For employment this involves assessing sites only at the towns, as allocations are not proposed to be made in the villages. For retail this involves the consideration of new non-food retail sites – where put forward - in Malton as the Principal Town Centre and then Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley as Local Town Centres. For food retailing this involves appropriate sites only in Malton. Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve significant harm to heritage assets will not be considered further

### **Stage 2**

Undertaking the assessment at three different assessment levels enables the weighting of key factors to be taken into account, particularly in Assessments 1 and 2. It also allows for effective comparison of the relative merits and demerits of sites being considered with a range of other factors. However Assessment 3 is concerned with the commercial deliverability of a site which remains a critical factor in an uncertain economic environment.

### **Stage 3**

Stage 3 represents the outcome of the detailed assessments undertaken in Stage 2 and following the site 'sift' in Stage 1. This will enable conclusions to be drawn about the overall performance of sites and ultimately their potential suitability for allocation. The presentation of this information will be set out in tables at a settlement level to allow comparison between the sites put forward for consideration. The tables will allow visual comparison of the outcomes to the SSM questions for each site.

## **Considerations**

### **Previous consultation**

As part of the Summer 2009 and 2010 Core Strategy consultations specific questions were asked on site selection. A two stage process of site selection was proposed in both consultations. Stage 1 is a 'sieve' of all those sites which do not meet the settlement hierarchy and strategy set

out in the Core Strategy. Stage 1 seeks to 'discount' sites (or part thereof) which fall into Flood Zone 3b, which is classed as 'functional floodplain and is at the most risk of flooding. Stage 2 then set out a number of factors, grouped by theme which the sites would be assessed again, such as accessibility, highways, previously developed land and flood risk. Questions were asked whether respondents agreed with the Council's approach to the Stage 1 'Sieve', whether they agreed with the factors set out, whether there were additional factors we should consider and finally whether there should be any 'weighting' to reflect the differing importance of the factors.

The following key points were made in response to those consultations:

- Substantial agreement for the Stage 1 'sieve' of sites and broad support for the factors set in Stage 2. Some concern that Malton and Norton we're being treated differently in the 2009 consultation as all sites - not just those adjacent to the development limits - would be considered. Also confusion over the phrasing of sites that partially lay in Flood Zone 3b.
- Concern that consultation on this subject was too specific for the Core Strategy.
- Concern that no detail is given on how the consideration of sites in Stage 2 would be undertaken – for example a scoring approach or matrix.
- Suggestion that weighting needs to be taken into account in Stage 2 as some factors are more important than others, and decisions need to be made on a transparent basis. In particular transport and accessibility issues were considered more important as was developing 'brownfield' sites first and avoiding unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside. Another respondent also thought that community impact, impact of population increase and historic and cultural factors should be considered to carry more weight in Stage 2.
- Suggestion, particularly from proposers of development sites, that the deliverability and developability of the site should be recognised.
- Suggestion that sites which affect Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) should be included in Stage 1.
- Suggestion that both cultural and heritage assets as well as a full list of environmental designations should be listed in Stage 2.
- Concern that no detail around how the approach to flood risk in Stage 2 would be tackled in terms of the sequential test as set out in Planning Policy Statement 25: Flood Risk

These responses have informed the development of the SSM. The broad support for the 'sieve' of sites and the factors set out in Stage 1 of the have been taken forward as well as recognising that site which affect national or international nature conservation sites, or heritage assets, should also be discounted. Stage 2 has been split into different assessment levels to enable weighting of the various factors to be taken into

account. The key factors identified in Assessment 1 of Stage 2 are those which respondents thought most important. Cultural and heritage assets, as well as relevant environmental designations have been included in Assessment 2 of Stage 2. Assessment 2 also sets out the Council assessment of the flood risk of sites in line with PPS25, and in the context of the SSM will guide the application of the sequential and exception test where necessary. The Council do not believe a 'scoring' system' or 'matrix' is appropriate for the Ryedale SSM. Therefore an alternative approach has been proposed which attempts the balance of categorizing sites but to do so in a way which allows comparison of the various elements to enable an informed choice to be made. Therefore a rating system similar to that used in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy, with positive and negative outcomes, has been suggested for each stage. Officers believe that approach, together with the introduction of additional stages into the process introducing a form of weighting the importance of certain factors, is a reasonable and fair approach

### **The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The SSM is an objective assessment of sites and the NPPF does not have a significant effect on this per se. However, a key element of the new NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Give that this SSM is considered against the sustainability and plan objectives of the Ryedale Plan, this principle of achieving sustainable development is embedded in the SSM. The elements reflected in the SSM are based on the core principles of the English planning system, which the NPPF also generally reflects. Also, the Local Plan Strategy has been found sound, and is considered to reflect the policies and principles set out in the NPPF, which was finalised before the Local Plan Strategy was submitted for Examination.

### **What uses included?**

The SSM applies the approach of the Local Plan Strategy for the key land uses which are housing, employment and retail. Mixed-use sites are also included where they involve elements of the key land uses.

Uses to be considered through SSM:

- Housing (including use classes C2 and C3)
- Employment (including use classes B1, B2 and B8)
- Retail (including use classes A1, A2 and A3)
- Mixed Use sites (which include elements of the above)

Uses not considered individually through the SSM unless part of mixed use proposal set out above:

- Leisure or tourism
- Open space
- Transport
- Community uses

### **Fit with Sustainability Appraisal Objectives**

To ensure that the assessment of sites through the SSM considers sustainability principles and plan objectives, the SSM has been developed against both Ryedale District Council's (RDC) and North York Moors National Park (NYMNP) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and plan objectives to ensure that a broad range of factors considered which meet the objectives of the LDF. The SA Scoping Report (October 2009) to the Core Strategy made clear that the draft Core Strategy objectives (which evolved into the Local Plan Strategy Objectives) would also be applied to the Local Plan Sites DPD and Helmsley Plan DPD, with the consideration of some site-specific/place specific sustainability appraisal objectives.

For reference Table 1 below sets out the Local Plan Strategy Objectives for Ryedale:

Table 1: Ryedale Draft Core Strategy Objectives

<b>Objectives</b>
<b>1. Plan for growth in Ryedale which is compatible with the principles of sustainable development which address local sustainability issues and which specifically helps to support a more balanced population structure in the longer term.</b>
<b>2 Enhance the role of the Market Towns as accessible, attractive and vibrant service centres, offering a range of homes, jobs, shops, entertainment, leisure and recreational facilities within a high quality public realm. Emphasise the role and regeneration of Malton and Norton as the District's Principal Town.</b>
<b>3 Focus development at those settlements where it will enhance accessibility to local services, shops and jobs and which provide sustainable access to major service centres outside of the District by promoting the use of public transport, walking and cycling, while reducing the need to travel by private car.</b>
<b>4 Protect and, where appropriate, enhance the distinctive character of the District's settlements, landscapes and biodiversity, safeguarding those elements of the historic and natural environment that are recognised as being of local, national or international importance.</b>
<b>5 Deliver new development alongside the provision of the necessary community, transport and utilities infrastructure and initiatives. Make best use of existing infrastructure and make best use of development to secure investment in improved and new infrastructure. Maximise opportunities to secure Green Infrastructure links between the towns, villages and the open countryside.</b>
<b>6 Support the delivery of new homes and to substantially increase the delivery of affordable housing; encouraging an appropriate mix and type of housing that will meet local housing needs and requirements of all in the community, including those of Ryedale's elderly population.</b>
<b>7 Protect and enhance the provision of community facilities, recognising the particular importance they play in supporting the District's rural and village communities.</b>
<b>8 Support new and existing businesses with the provision of a range of employment sites and premises, including higher quality purpose built sites, principally at the Market Towns.</b>
<b>9 Diversify the District's economy and enhance skills by building links with the York economy and science and knowledge sectors: supporting Ryedale's precision/advanced engineering cluster and using the District's strong rural identity and its historic, cultural and landscape assets as economic drivers.</b>
<b>10 Support the land-based economy through sustainable land management; promoting sustainable rural enterprises and activity that helps to retain traditional land uses such as food production and horse racing, which help to retain land management and traditional building techniques and skills; supporting and facilitating the provision of local weekday and farmer's markets and</b>

the retention of a livestock market in the District.

**11 Improve the quality of the environment and environmental systems and require that new development has as low an impact on the environment as possible.**

**12 Respond to climate change by reducing green house gas emissions and helping Ryedale to adapt to the impacts of climate change through flood risk minimisation and enhancing Green Infrastructure opportunities.**

Table 2 indicates which SA objectives relate to which plan objectives and which SSM questions are appropriate in these areas. The basis for these questions is from the areas highlighted in both the 2009 and 2010 Core Strategy consultations relating to Site Selection. As set out above, these consultations highlighted the main factors that the SSM would be concerned with. Through the preparation of the SSM against these objectives, additional questions have been added to ensure coverage in all areas.

Table 2: Comparison of SA Objectives and Local Plan Strategy Objectives in formulating SSM questions

<b>SA Objective which relate to this area</b>	<b>Local Plan Strategy Objectives which relate to this area</b>	<b>Factors to Assess Sites</b>
<b>SOCIAL</b>		
<i>A1 To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure and recreation services that are required.</i>	<b>1,2,3,4,5,7</b>	<p><b>How accessible is the site to areas of employment, town/ village centres and other community facilities?</b></p> <p><b>How accessible is the site to bus routes, trains and public rights of way, reducing the need to travel by car?</b></p> <p><b>What is the relationship of the site to existing development limits (in the case of housing and/or employment proposals) or commercial limits (proposals which include retail elements)?</b></p> <p><b>Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?</b></p>
<i>A2 To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing</i>	<b>1,6</b>	<p><b>Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the SHMA, ELR, RRCS and Malton Town Centre Strategy?</b></p> <p><b>What level and type of affordable housing is provided on site?</b></p>

<i>needs.</i>		<b>What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?</b>
<i>A3 To improve overall levels of health and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas.</i>	<b>1,2,3,5,6,7</b>	<b>Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle, rather than travel by car?</b>
<i>A4 To maintain and promote the distinctiveness of identifiable communities</i>	<b>1,4,7</b>	<b>Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting? Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?</b>
<i>A5 To reduce crime and the fear of crime.</i>	<b>None directly</b>	<b>Can the site potentially incorporate the principles of Secure By Design? Is the site compatible with neighbouring uses, discouraging anti-social behaviour?</b>
<i>A6 To develop a more balanced population</i>	<b>1,2,6,8,9</b>	<b>Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/ or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?</b>

<b>SA Objective which relate to this area</b>	<b>Local Plan Strategy Objectives which relate to this area</b>	<b>Factors to Assess Sites</b>
<b>ECONOMIC</b>		
<i>B1 To maintain and enhance employment opportunities.</i>	<b>8,9,10</b>	<b>How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?</b>
<i>B2 To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres.</i>	<b>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9</b>	<b>Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?</b>
<i>B3 To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors.</i>	<b>5,7,8,9,10</b>	<b>Does the proposal involve the creation of additional jobs in Ryedale? Will the development provide appropriate levels of developer contributions? Can the development meet the requirements of the CIL Charging Schedule</b>

<i>B4 To diversify the local economy</i>	<b>8,9,10</b>	<b>Will the mix of employment uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the Ryedale economy as set out in the ELR? (including building links to the York economy)</b>
--	---------------	---

<b>SA Objective which relate to this area</b>	<b>Core Strategy Objectives which relate to this area</b>	<b>Factors to Assess Sites</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>		
<i>C1 To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity.</i>	<b>4,11,12</b>	<p><b>Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity, (including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation - SINCs, Local Nature Reserves - LNRs, or geological value (including Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites - RIGS) or affect UK or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan - BAP - protected species?</b></p> <p><b>Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?</b></p> <p><b>Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure?</b></p>
<i>C2 To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity.</i>	<b>4,11,</b>	<p><b>What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments and Special Qualities study (including views and open spaces)?</b></p> <p><b>Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features or providing adequate landscape mitigation measures?</b></p> <p><b>What impact would the site have on the Howardian Hills AONB?</b></p> <p><b>What impact would the site have on the York greenbelt?</b></p>
<i>C3 Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to travel.</i>	<b>1,2,3,5</b>	<p><b>Has Traffic Modelling or a Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?</b></p> <p><b>What is the impact of the development on the highway network? Is mitigation required as part of the development?</b></p> <p><b>Would the site help to promote forms of travel other than the private car? Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses these options?</b></p> <p><b>Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?</b></p> <p><b>Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way?</b></p>
<i>C4 To ensure future</i>	<b>11,12</b>	<b>How does the site perform against the flooding sequential test as set out in</b>

<p><i>development is resilient to climate change such as development is not vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere</i></p>		<p><b>PPS25 in terms of:</b>  <b>What Flood Zone (and sub-section of flood zone in the case of Malton and Norton) does the site fall within?</b>  <b>What level of vulnerability is the site based on its proposed use?</b></p> <p><b>How does the site perform against other flood risk factors in terms of:</b>  <b>If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (Malton/ Norton/ Old Malton only), what level of hazard would exist?</b>  <b>Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?</b>  <b>Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?</b>  <b>Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?</b></p> <p><b>Have Sustainable Drainage Systems been proposed, particularly in the towns?</b>  <b>What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?</b>  <b>Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?</b></p>
<p><i>C5 To preserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment.</i></p>	<p><b>1,4,</b></p>	<p><b>Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting? Designated heritage assets include Scheduled Monuments, Listed buildings, Registered Park and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Where an affect is identified, the onus is on the promoter to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance.</b>  <b>Will the affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration? (includes buildings, monuments, site, place, area or landscape)</b></p>
<p><i>C6 To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases</i></p>	<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>Is the site capable of utilising on-site renewable energy or other low carbon energy sources?</b>  <b>Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards?</b></p>
<p><i>C7 To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy sources within Ryedale</i></p>	<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?</b>  <b>Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?</b></p>

<i>C8 To make the most efficient use of land</i>	<b>1,2,3,11</b>	<p><b>Is the site/ or any part of the site considered previously developed land ('brown field')?</b></p> <p><b>Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?</b></p>
<i>C9 To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality</i>	<b>3,4,10,11</b>	<p><b>Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?</b></p> <p><b>Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality? Has an air quality management assessment been carried out to assess the impact?</b></p> <p><b>Is the development in an area where smell, noise, light or dust is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?</b></p> <p><b>Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight, over bearing effects.</b></p> <p><b>Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?</b></p> <p><b>Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?</b></p> <p><b>Major hazard sites and pipelines (HSE)</b></p>
<i>C10 Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals</i>	<b>3,4,11,12</b>	<p><b>What agricultural land classification is the site? Would the development of this site involve the loss the best and most versatile agricultural land?</b></p> <p><b>Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?</b></p>
<i>C11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally as possible</i>	<b>1,11</b>	<p><b>Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?</b></p> <p><b>Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?</b></p>

## The Helmsley Plan

Given that the Council is preparing a Plan to cover the town of Helmsley, jointly with the National Park (in which the National Park will lead), it is important that due consideration is given to the alignment between the Ryedale Plan and National Park Core Strategy Objectives. To this end the National Park's Core Strategy and SA Objectives have been compared in the first instance to assess any additional factors which should be taken into account. Table 3 below compares the Ryedale SA/Plan objectives and the National Park SA/Plan objectives. It demonstrates all NYMNPA SA and CS Objectives are broadly covered by Ryedale SA and Local Plan Strategy Objectives. There are a small number of areas where Ryedale have objectives which do not relate to any NYMNPA Objectives. However the basis of the SSM is formed from the Ryedale objectives, so these are already taken into account. Overall, there is considered by both the National Park and District Council that there is a close fit between the RDC and NYMNPA objectives. On this basis, no additional questions are therefore required to consider sites at Helmsley, and *inter alia* that in applying the SSM will not compromise the Objectives of the North York Moors National Park Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal.

Table 3: Comparison of Ryedale and National Park Objectives

Ryedale SA Objective	Local Plan Strategy Objectives	NYMNPA SA Objective	NYMNPA Core Strategy Objective
<b>SOCIAL</b>			
<i>A1 To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure and recreation services that are required.</i>	<b>1,2,3,4,5,7</b>	<i>11 Protect and enhance access to key community facilities and services, leisure and recreation opportunities and access to the countryside, by means which minimise environmental impacts on the Park and its communities.</i>	<b>13 Facilitate access to services and facilities. 11 Support the provision and retention of key community facilities and services throughout the area.</b>
<i>A2 To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing needs.</i>	<b>1,6</b>	<i>12 Ensure that local needs are met locally wherever possible.</i>	<b>10 Ensure that a range of new housing is provided including housing to meet local needs affordable housing that will remain affordable and available to local people in perpetuity.</b>
<i>A3 To improve overall levels of health and reduce the</i>	<b>1,2,3,5,6,7</b>	<i>10 Protect and enhance human health</i>	-

<i>disparities between different groups and different areas.</i>			
<i>A4 To maintain and promote the distinctiveness of identifiable communities</i>	<b>1,4,7</b>	<i>1 Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character.</i>	<b>11 Support the provision and retention of key community facilities and services throughout the area.</b>
<i>A5 To reduce crime and the fear of crime.</i>	-	-	-
<i>A6 To develop a more balanced population</i>	<b>1,2,6,8,9</b>	-	<b>9 Maintain and foster vibrant local communities where young people have an opportunity to live and work and consolidate the role of settlements.</b>

<b>Ryedale SA Objective</b>	<b>Ryedale Core Strategy Objectives</b>	<b>NYMNPA SA Objective</b>	<b>NYMNPA Core Strategy Objective</b>
<b>ECONOMIC</b>			
<i>B1 To maintain and enhance employment opportunities.</i>	<b>8,9,10</b>	<i>13 Enable quality employment opportunities available to all that create a vibrant local economy.</i>	<b>8 Strengthen and diversify the local economy by supporting a range of opportunities for employment and training particularly in sustainable locations.</b>
<i>B2 To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres.</i>	<b>1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9</b>	<i>14 Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities</i>	<b>9 Maintain and foster vibrant local communities where young people have an opportunity to live and work and consolidate the role of settlements.</b> <b>11 Support the provision and retention of key community facilities and services throughout the area.</b>

<i>B3 To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors.</i>	<b>5,7,8,9,10</b>	<i>15 Develop a tourism product that provides sustainable benefits to the local community and its economy.</i>	<b>7 Support the tourism and recreation industry by ensuring that development contributes to the local economy by supporting a range of opportunities for enjoying the Park's special qualities.</b>
<i>B4 To diversify the local economy</i>	<b>8,9,10</b>	<i>16 Manage natural resources in a way which sustains their environmental qualities as well as their productive (or economic) potential</i>	<b>8 Strengthen and diversify the local economy by supporting a range of opportunities for employment and training particularly in sustainable locations.</b>

<b>Ryedale SA Objective</b>	<b>Ryedale Core Strategy Objectives</b>	<b>NYMNPA SA Objective</b>	<b>NYMNPA Core Strategy Objective</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>			
<i>C1 To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity.</i>	<b>4,11,12</b>	<i>5 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species. Maintain, and enhance where appropriate, conditions for biodiversity and avoid irreversible losses</i>	<b>1 Conserve and enhance the natural environment and the biological and geological diversity of the Park.</b>
<i>C2 To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity.</i>	<b>4,11</b>	<i>1 Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character. (Repeats A4)</i>	<b>4 Secure high quality new development that takes into account of and enhances the unique landscape character, settlement pattern and building characteristics of the 9 landscape character areas in the Park</b>
<i>C3 Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to</i>	<b>1,2,3,5</b>	-	<b>Reduce the need to travel and facilitate alternative, more sustainable modes of travel to</b>

<i>travel.</i>			<b>the private car and minimise the environmental impact of transport.</b>
<i>C4 To ensure future development is resilient to climate change such as development is not vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere</i>	<b>11,12</b>	<i>3 Reduce the causes and manage the effects of climate change 4 Reduce the risk of flooding, ensuring development and land use changes are not vulnerable to flooding, or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere in a catchment / coastal zone.</i>	<b>2 Reduce the causes and assist in adaptation to the effects of climate change on people, wildlife and places.</b>
<i>C5 To preserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment.</i>	<b>1,4</b>	<i>7 Preserve and enhance the archaeological and historic environment</i>	<b>5 Preserve and enhance historic assets</b>
<i>C6 To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases</i>	<b>12</b>	<i>8 Promote concepts of design that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use</i>	<b>6 Promote sustainable design and efficient energy use in new buildings</b>
<i>C7 To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy sources within Ryedale</i>	<b>12</b>	<i>6 Encourage consumers to meet their needs with less energy input and through the use of renewable energy technologies</i>	-
<i>C8 To make the most efficient use of land</i>	<b>1,2,3,11</b>	-	-
<i>C9 To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality</i>	<b>3,4,10,11</b>	<i>2 Minimise pollution releases to levels that do not damage natural systems, human health and quality of life.</i>	-
<i>C10 Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals</i>	<b>3,4,11,12</b>	<i>8 Promote concepts of design that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use (Repeats C6)</i>	<b>3 Promote prudent and sustainable use of natural resources.</b>

C11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally as possible	1,11	9 Encourage waste reduction, reuse, recovery and recycling	
--	------	--	--

## Proposed Approach

The 2009 and 2010 consultation, together with the assessments in Tables 2 and 3, have led to the proposed three stage approach set out below and the particular questions which ensure that development contributes to the objectives of the Ryedale Plan and also contributes to achieving sustainable development.

### Stage 1 - Sift

This is the only stage where sites are ruled out of consideration when the considerations are applied. The latter two stages are concerned with comparison of the relative merits of sites remaining after this first stage 'sieve' has been undertaken. In particular this stage applies the approach of the settlement hierarchy in the Local Plan Strategy in guiding allocations through the Local Plan Sites and Helmsley Plan DPDs. It also dismisses sites which are affected by constraints of such significance which effectively preclude them coming forward for development. These constraints are the national and international level nature conservation sites, or historic assets, and Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain). The threshold for sites being capable of allocation is 0.3ha and above for the Market Towns and 0.15ha for the Service Villages. Below this level sites will not be taken further.

**Sites 0.3 ha and above (Market Towns) or 0.15ha and above (Service Villages)**



**Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy Summary and Settlement Hierarchy (SP1) for sites at the relevant settlements (including Stamford Bridge sites) and National Park Core Strategy (for Helmsley)**



**Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further**



**Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development**



**Remaining sites progress to Stage 2**

## Stage 2 – Site Assessments

This stage is made up of three assessment levels. Assessment 1 considers the key factors which allow comparisons between the various factors and to take into account the weighting of those factors. Assessment 1 considers key strategic considerations (those supported at consultation) – accessibility, highways and flood risk - that should be given due weight through this methodology as having more significant weight.

Assessment 2 considers groups of detailed social, environmental and economic thematic considerations which influence and inform the relative merits of each site.

Assessment 3 considers the deliverability of the site in terms of physical, commercial, legal and other factors. It also assesses the likely contributions that can be secured from the development of the site to necessary infrastructure to deliver the objectives of the plan. This will be an ongoing discussion and negotiation with the development industry.

### Assessment 1- Key Site Considerations

Sites from Stage 1 will be assessed on a settlement basis in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy and Policy SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy. There are a number of constraints which are critical to the ability or appropriateness of a site coming forward. After an analysis of all the various elements set out in Table 2 above, the following elements are considered to have that weight or importance:

- **Accessibility** – Using local standards and those developed for the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy
- **Flood Risk** – Assessing the main flooding factors including Flood Zone and Vulnerability of Use
- **Highway assessment** – Applying initial highway advice from the Highway Authority

These factors have are given additional weight in the decision making process as they are fundamental principles about the acceptability of a site, before more detailed factors can be assessed in Stage 2. Results from Assessment 1 in Stage 2 will be analysed in detail and then compared to the results from Assessments 2 and 3 to arrive at a balanced view of the suitability of the site. Results will be presented in a clear visual way to enable comparisons between the relative merits of each site.

#### Why choose these factors?

Accessibility plays a critical role in assessing the relationship of the site to the settlement, key facilities, services and employment areas. Indeed this was a factor in the selection of the settlement hierarchy in the Local Plan Strategy, though directing development so that it can meet the needs of a wider range of Ryedale's population, and help to create a more balanced population. It is important to distinguish between the

relative accessibility of sites within a settlement as these can vary widely. The importance of considering and mitigating flood risk is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the planning practice guidance. It is an issue that is close to the hearts of many communities in Ryedale who have experienced flooding events. Planning authorities must apply the sequential test (and where necessary the exception test) to the choice of sites for potential allocation. This essentially means avoiding vulnerable development in areas at most risk of flooding and focusing development to the lower risk areas where possible. There are now significant amounts of data to inform this decision and the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides detailed information particularly in Malton and Norton. The key flood risk factors that are considered in this stage relate to the level of flood risk as indicated by the former PPS25 flood zone classification (which has been retained) and the vulnerability of the use. For Malton, Norton and Old Malton this also includes the hazard rating of the site in relation to the Rapid Inundation Zones (RIZ). Further flood risk factors such as potential groundwater flooding, surface water flooding and sewer flooding are considered in Assessment 2 of Stage 2.

Clearly a balance has to be struck between competing factors in selecting sites and this is reflected in the numerous factors being considered in this methodology. However flood risk is of such significance, that it is essential that it is considered in Assessment 1 of Stage 2. Being able to achieve a satisfactory highway access and egress from a site to the local network is also a critical factor in whether a site can be developed for the use envisaged. Not being able to provide means of access and egress would indicate that a site would be unlikely to come forward.

## 1 Accessibility

**Q1A** *How accessible is the site to key services and facilities? (Sites involving housing and employment development)*

*Housing*

**Towns**

Service/ facility	Walking Time from site to service/ facility			
	Up to 5 minutes	Up to 10 minutes	Up to 15 minutes	Over 20 minutes
<b>Public Transport</b>				
Bus Stop	++	+	-	--
Railway Station (Malton and Norton only)	++	+	-	--
<b>Shopping</b>				
Nearest commercial limit	++	+	-	--
<b>Employment</b>				
Nearest employment area	++	+	-	--
<b>Education</b>				

Nearest primary school	++	+	-	--
Nearest secondary school	++	+	-	--
<b>Facilities</b>				
Nearest doctor's surgery	++	+	-	--
Hospital (Malton and Norton only)	++	+	-	--
Nearest development limit	++	+	-	--

### Villages

Service/ facility	Walking Time from site to service/ facility			
	Up to 5 minutes	Up to 10 minutes	Up to 15 minutes	Over 20 minutes
<b>Public Transport</b>				
Bus Stop	++	+	-	--
<b>Shopping</b>				
Local Shop	++	+	-	--
<b>Education</b>				
Nearest primary school	++	+	-	--
Nearest development limit	++	+	-	--

### Employment

Location	Walking Time from site to specified location			
	Up to 5 minutes	Up to 10 minutes	Up to 15 minutes	Over 20 minutes
Nearest bus stop	++	+	-	--
Train station (Malton and Norton only)	++	+	-	--
Nearest commercial limit	++	+	-	--
Nearest development limit	++	+	-	--

Retail

**Q1B** How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential test?

Town Centre	Edge of Centre	Out of Centre	Out of Town
++	+	-	--

Overall accessibility rating

Site has excellent accessibility	Site has good accessibility	Site has variable accessibility	Site has poor accessibility
++	+	-	--

**2** Flood Risk

**Q2A** What Flood Zone does the site fall within? (NB Flood 3b already excluded from Stage 1)?

Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3a
++	+	-

**Q2B** What vulnerability class does the site fall within?

Flood Zone	Less vulnerable	More vulnerable	Highly vulnerable
Flood Zone 2	++	+	-
Flood Zone 3	+	-	--

**Q2C** Malton and Norton only: Which sub-category of Flood Zone 3a does the site fall within?

Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50	Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100	Flood Zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50< 1:100
--	+	-

NB: Uses considered through the Local Plan Sites DPD and Helmsley Plan DPD are principally housing, employment and retail which fall under these classes. Where mixed use sites are proposed which include the development of essential infrastructure or involve water compatible uses, the flood risk will be individually assessed.

**Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?**

A flood risk assessment (FRA) is critical for the Council and the Environment Agency to assess the flood risk associated with the development. Where a FRA has not been undertaken, assessment of many of the flood risk factors will not be possible, and this may prejudice the ability of the site to be considered through the SSM.

Yes	No
-----	----

**Q2E Malton, Norton and Old Malton only: If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?**

RIZ zones are defined in the SFRA Update 2010.

Low – ‘Caution’	Moderate – ‘Danger for some people’	Significant – ‘Danger for most people’	Extreme – ‘Danger for all people’
+	-	--	--

**A Overall flood risk assessment**

Site has low overall flood risk	Site faces some flood risk issues which can be mitigated	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated	Site faces significant flood risk issues, and may be inappropriate for development
++	+	-	--

**3 Highway Assessment**

Highway assessment is an initial assessment by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) as the highway authority and gives an early indication of the suitability of a site in general highway terms. It looks at issues such as access/egress to/from a highway and potential impact on the highway. The NYCC assessment will also highlight what further highway work will be required, depending on the scale and nature of the site. This is dealt further in Assessment 2 (other transport factors) and Assessment 3 (developer contributions towards highway improvements).

**Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highway Authorities (NYCC) and Highways Agency (HA) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?**

Site has no highway issues identified	Site has some highway issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise
++	+	-	--

**Outcome of Assessment 1**

The results of Assessment 1, given that we consider them to be key factors, will be reported in order at a settlement level by use with sites being shown both separately and together. This will give an indication of how sites compare against each other, and can be compared with the results of Assessments 2 and 3.

## Assessment 2 – Other Considerations

Everything else not considered in Assessment 1. In assessing the coverage of SSM questions against SA/ plan objectives above, numerous overlaps occur and the subject of the questions changes rapidly. Whilst the use of the SA and plan objectives is essential for ensuring coverage for SSM questions and generating additional questions where necessary, its structure can be repetitive and confusing. For ease of assessment and to follow a logical structure, questions assessed through Assessment 2 have been ordered into thematic blocks.

### Biodiversity and Geo-diversity

**Q4** *Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity, (including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation - SINCs, Local Nature Reserves - LNRs, or geological value (including Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites - RIGS) or affect UK or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan - BAP - protected species?*

Enhancement of feature/ species possible – mitigation not required	Neutral impact - no effect or effect can be fully mitigated	Adverse impact but mitigation possible	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation
++	+	-	--

**Q5** *Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/ corridors?*

Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors.	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors.	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these.	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these.
++	+	-	--

**Q6** *Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?*

<b>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required</b>	<b>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated</b>	<b>Adverse impact but mitigation possible</b>	<b>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation</b>
++	+	-	--

**B** **Overall Rating for ‘Biodiversity and Geo-diversity’**

<b>Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required</b>	<b>Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated</b>	<b>Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements but effects are capable of some mitigation</b>	<b>Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated</b>
++	+	-	--

**Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting**

**Q7** *What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area, and Special Qualities study (including views and open spaces)?*

<b>Site has very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character.</b>	<b>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character.</b>	<b>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved</b>	<b>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/ no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved</b>
++	+	-	--

**Q8** *What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of North York Moors National Park and/or Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)?*

Site has very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character.	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character.	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/ no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved
++	+	-	--

**Q9** *(Sites within the York Greenbelt only) What impact would the site have on the defined York greenbelt?*

Positive impact – mitigation not required	Neutral impact – no or limited mitigation required.	Negative impact with potential for harm but mitigation possible	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation
++	+	-	--

**Q10** *Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?*

Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features.	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/ proposed
++	+	-	--

**Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?**

Principally the settlements where coalescence needs to be carefully considered is at Malton and Old Malton, Pickering and Middleton Kirkbymoorside and Keldholme, Amotherby and Swinton, Staxton and Willerby.

Development within the built form of the settlement	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible
++	+	-	--

**C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'**

Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement.	Negative impact - the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible	Significant impact - the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible
++	+	-	--

## Culture and Heritage

### **Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?**

Designated heritage assets include Scheduled Monuments, Listed buildings, Registered Park and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Where an affect is identified, the onus is on the promoter to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance.

Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible
++	+	-	--

### **Q13 Will the affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?** (includes buildings, monuments, site, place, area or landscape)

Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible
++	+	-	--

**D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'**

<b>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset</b>	<b>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset</b>	<b>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible</b>	<b>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible</b>
++	+	-	--

**Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy**

**Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?**

1. USE LESS ENERGY

Through design and construction; and a lower energy demand

2. USE ENERGY EFFICIENTLY

Encourage occupants to reduce their energy use; increased energy efficiency

3. USE RENEWABLE AND/OR LOW CARBON SOURCES

For heat and power; either on site or through a network

<b>Site capable and developer willing</b>	<b>Site capable but developer unwilling</b>	<b>Site not capable</b>
++	-	--

**Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?**

Where it is not appropriate to provide on-site renewable energy generation, it may be appropriate for a development to link in to an existing or proposed off site renewable energy scheme. Currently there are very few off site schemes in existence or being proposed.

<b>Site capable of linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward</b>
++

**Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?**

Given the rural nature of Ryedale, currently not many opportunities exist for linking into existing heat or energy sources. Most opportunities are likely to exist in the towns close to industry.

**Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward**

**++**

**E Overall rating for ‘Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy’**

**Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing**

**++**

**Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling**

**-**

**Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology**

**--**

**Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction**

**Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?**

Building standards relating to sustainable building are set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes for housing and BREEAM standards in the case of non-residential development. These standards are being progressively tightened through Building Regulations over the coming years to achieve zero carbon development. The Local Plan Strategy expects all new build residential schemes (and major non-residential development) to demonstrate that it meets the highest sustainable Building Standard that is feasible and viable on the site.

**Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit**

**++**

**Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit**

**-**

**Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level**

**--**

**Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?**

Increasingly waste is being minimised in the construction of buildings such as on-site recycling of rubble. It is important that carbon reduction is achieved in the construction of the development, and not just over its building lifetime.

<b>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into the both the construction and operation of the development</b>	<b>Proposals have investigated waste reduction , however only limited measures are achievable</b>	<b>No proposals suggested for waste reduction</b>
++	-	--

**Q19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
+	--

**F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'**

<b>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing</b>	<b>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling</b>	<b>Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development</b>
++	-	--

**Efficient Use of Land**

**Q20 Is the site/ or any part of the site considered previously developed land ('brownfield')?**

<b>Site is over 50% to 100% 'brownfield'</b>	<b>Site is up to 50% 'brownfield'</b>
++	+

**Q21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?**

<b>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context</b>	<b>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context</b>	<b>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development</b>	<b>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development</b>
++	+	-	--

**Q22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?**

The Plan is supportive of the principle of remediating land, and the ratings reflect that where land is contaminated there will be an expectation that remediation measures are applied, the council is aware that sites can be capable of remediation (and indeed this would be the preferred outcome) but it must be satisfied that such remediation is both feasible and viable, and this is an inherent part of site deliverability. Requests will be made to site submitters to provide such information.

Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward
++	+	-	--

**G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'**

Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required.	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible.
++	+	-	--

**Natural Resources**

**Q23 Would the development of this site involve the loss the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a)?**

No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost
++	-	--

**Q24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?**

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) is the responsible planning Authority for mineral extraction. The saved policies in the Mineral Local Plan identifies Preferred Areas and Areas of Search to prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources. Mineral consultation zones are also in place which relate to old and new mineral sites. In some cases pre-extraction of mineral deposits is possible so that the site may be suitable for development. However the value of the mineral deposits involved and the possible sterilisation that may occur needs to be taken into account.

Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone
++	-	--

**Q25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?**

There are a number of Groundwater Source Protection Zones (GSPZ) across Ryedale which ensure that the public water drinking supply is protected. GSPZs protect essential elements of the water supply including aquifers, groundwater flows, wells, boreholes and springs. GSPZs are split into three main zones:

- Zone 1 (inner protection zone)
- Zone 2 (outer protection zone)
- Zone 3 (total catchment)

Zone 1 represents the most sensitive Zone to development. The Council will liaise with Yorkshire Water and the Environment Agency in assessing sites against this factor.

Development would not affect the public water supply	Development could potentially affect public water supply but mitigation possible	Development could potentially affect public water supply but no investigation undertaken	Development would lead to serious risk of contamination of public water supply and mitigation not possible.
++	-	--	--

**Q26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?**

An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been designated in Malton due to the exceedence of NO<sub>2</sub> particulate levels. Other areas in the Market towns also experience poor air quality. The Council's Environmental Health Officers monitor particulate levels across Ryedale, where necessary. Where there may be a potential adverse impact, proposers of the site should carry out an air quality assessment to analyse the nature and level of the impact.

Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality	Site falls outside an area of poor air quality. Development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality	Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality	Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/ no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality
++	+	-	--

**Q27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?**

Where there are reasons for suspecting instability, appropriate investigation and geo-technical appraisal should be undertaken by the site proposer.

Land has no instability concerns	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate.
++	+	-	--

**Q28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?**

Ryedale has a number of major pipelines and a single major hazard site. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) have produced guidance on how development near these sites should be dealt with. Three zones have been established around these installations:

- Inner Zone
- Middle Zone
- Outer Zone

The HSE then split development into four sensitivity levels (1-4) depending on the type of development proposed. The HSE standing advice can be then applied to state either “Do Not Advise Against Development” and “Advise Against Development”

HSE Standing Advise states “Do not advise against development”	HSE Standing Advise states “advise against development”
++	--

**H Overall Rating for ‘Natural Resources’**

Site would not adversely affect any natural resources	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible
++	+	-	--

**Amenity**

**Q29 Is the development in an area where small, noise, light or dust is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate smell, noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?**

The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site	The development is may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible.	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance.
+	-	--

**Q30** *Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users?* These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight, over bearing effects.

<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site</p>	<p>The development is may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible.</p>	<p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance.</p>
+	-	--

**I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'**

<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site</p>	<p>The development is may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible.</p>	<p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance.</p>
+	-	--

## Flood risk

The Council has produced a Planning Policy Statement 25: Flood Risk compliant Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update 2010 (SFRA). The information from this assessment, together with data from the Environment Agency, forms the basis of the assessment and the need for further information.

### ***Q31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?***

Known incidents of groundwater flooding are shown in the SFRA update.

No

Yes – further investigation required

### ***Q32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?***

Indications of potential surface water flooding are shown on the Environment Agency's surface water flood map, though this is currently indicative. In addition known incidents of surface water flooding are shown in the SFRA update. There are two sets of surface water maps available: Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding and Flood Map for Surface Water (1 in 30 and 1 in 200 year) as well as Critical Drainage Areas identified in the North East Yorkshire SFRA

No

Yes – further investigation required

### ***Q33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?***

Known incidents of groundwater flooding are shown in the SFRA update.

No

Yes – further investigation required

**Q34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?**

The SFRA considers that SUDs should be incorporated into all development where this is practically possible. This is especially the case for Ryedale's towns.

Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS
++	+	-	--

**Q35 What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?**

In addition to SUDs, there are a number of other examples of measure which help to build in resilience to the effects of Climate Change. Measures\* could include: Development zoning; land raising; raised floor levels; flood resistant construction methods; flood defences; flood warning; and avoiding increased downstream flood risk.

Multiple additional measures*proposed which build in resilience to climate change	Single additional measure* proposed to build in resilience to climate change	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change
++	+	-	--

\* which depend on the nature of the site, and the nature of the measure(s) proposed

**J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk\*'**

No flood risk associated with the site	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible
++	+	-	--

\*in so far as current data allows.

## People

**Q36** *Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?*

Some existing uses are strongly valued by communities. Where development leads to the loss of an existing facility, this needs to be carefully considered, particularly if any alternatives are proposed.

Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/ use and no justification or alternative provided
++	+	--

**Q37** *Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured by Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?*

Secured by Design (SBD) is a police initiative to encourage the building industry to adopt crime prevention measures in the design of developments to assist in reducing the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime, creating a safer and more secure environment. A key principle of SBD is the concept of 'natural surveillance' where developments (particularly involving housing) are designed so that routes and public areas are designed to be overlooked and self policing, reducing or preventing crime and anti-social behaviour. Each police authority has an SBD Officer, and North Yorkshire Police will be involved in ensuring SBD principles are integrated into any site proposals.

Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police	No – SBD principles not taken into account
+	-

**Q38** *Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle, rather than travel by car?*

Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport promotes the concept of 'modal shift' which principally means reducing the reliance on the motorcar by promoting other forms of travel particularly walking and cycling for shorter journeys. The layout of a scheme can encourage walking and cycling through the provision of new footpaths and cycleways which connect directly into existing routes, or create new routes.

<b>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development, encouraging walking and cycling</b>	<b>Some cycleways and/ or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling</b>	<b>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of the development</b>
++	+	--

**Q39** For sites over 1 ha or involving over 80 houses (whichever comes first): *Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?*

<b>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out</b>	<b>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift</b>	<b>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken</b>
++	+	--

**Q40** *Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/ or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?*

It is important that new development encourages mixed communities in Ryedale. To ensure that this is the case new development should contribute to attracting a balanced working and/or living community, by appealing to a wide range of different sectors of society, in particular young adults, families and the elderly.

<b>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/ or working community</b>	<b>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced living and/ or working community</b>	<b>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/ or working community</b>
++	+	--

**K Overall Rating for 'People'**

<b>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities</b>	<b>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities</b>	<b>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities</b>	<b>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities</b>
++	+	-	--

**Meeting needs**

**Q41** *Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?*

These studies are part of the Evidence Base for the LDF. This evidence indicates what the needs are for different forms of development and this is reflected in the objectives of the Ryedale Plan. New development is expected to contribute to meeting the specific needs of Ryedale as set out in these studies.

Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met
++	+	-	--

**Q42** *(Sites involving an element of housing only) What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?*

The provision of affordable housing is a key aim of the Council. The SHMA identifies what the need is for affordable housing across the different wards in Ryedale in terms of size and tenure. New housing is expected to contribute to meeting these identified needs

Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA	The development makes no provision for affordable housing
++	+	-	--

**Q43** *(Sites involving an element of housing only) What provision has been made for Ryedale’s elderly population?*

Census data and the SHMA identifies that Ryedale has an increasingly ageing population. There is a specific need to address the requirements of a growing elderly population through all forms of development but in particular housing.

<b>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population.</b>	<b>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population.</b>	<b>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population</b>	<b>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population</b>
++	+	-	--

**L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'**

<b>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development</b>	<b>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development</b>	<b>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development</b>	<b>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met</b>
++	+	-	--

**Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure**

**Q44 (Malton and Norton only) Has Traffic Modelling or a Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment (STA)?**

A SATURN traffic model for Malton, Norton and Old Malton was developed by Jacobs on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council and RDC some years ago. Work on the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) updated this model to assess potential development sites at a strategic level to 2026.

To progress work on the Local Plan Sites DPD, this SSM expects that proposers of sites in Malton, Norton and Old Malton will undertake detailed highway modelling of their site. To enable a consistent approach to this modelling and to ensure it is cost effective, proposers can model their site using the Malton and Norton SATURN model. This is currently administered by Jacobs on behalf of NYCC. However due to the blanket requirement to model sites in Malton and Norton, the Council proposes to undertake detailed highway modelling of the sites in Malton, Norton and Old Malton, building on the work undertaken in the Malton/Norton Strategic Transport Assessment. It is likely that the Council will ask for a small pro-rata contribution from developers towards this work. Please note that the Highways Agency is responsible for the management of the A64 trunk road, and as a result will undertake separate modelling of potential sites which impact on this route, but also will have an input in the assessment of the sites in the Malton/Norton area. It is important to note that this modelling work will not negate the need for detailed transport assessments to accompany site-specific planning permissions, as and when they are made, and this is set out in SP20 of the Local Plan Strategy. The Highways Agency will feed in information from their Network Analysis Tool where appropriate.

Yes (Go to Q46)

No – traffic modelling required

**Q45** Everywhere else on sites greater than 1ha: *Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken?*

Yes

No – transport assessment required

**Q46** *Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?*

Once traffic modelling and/or a transport assessment has been undertaken, it is necessary to know the traffic impact of the proposal and what mitigation may be necessary to accommodate the development. The Highways Agency will feed in information from their Network Analysis Tool where appropriate. It is important to note that the work in this area will be undertaken to demonstrate suitability of site for the purposes of allocation. Given that sites may ultimately come forward in the later plan period, further updated information may be required at the submission of a planning application, to take into account any changes in local conditions.

No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation
++	+	-	--

**Q47** *Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?*

All forms of development require adequate parking and servicing to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the site. The Council will liaise with North Yorkshire County Council as the local highway authority to assess the adequacy of the proposals.

Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing.	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/ not practically possible to overcome
++	-	--

**Q48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PRoW)?**

In this context, PRoWs help to connect and integrate new development to the settlement, reducing dependency on car travel and promoting exercise. To be effectively used, PRoWs need to be attractive to users, and careful integration with any site proposal is essential where it is possible to connect to an existing PRoW.

Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development	Proposal will not affect a PROW	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW
++	+	--

**Q49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?**

Public realm defines and enhances the spaces, we live, work and play in. They are an important element in contributing to the environmental quality of our surroundings. This can range from village green space in rural areas to soft and hard measures in the Ryedale towns complementing and enhancing the existing built environment.

Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development	Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development	Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it
++	+	--

**Q50 What is the impact on capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with the development?**

The technical evidence base and infrastructure work prepared for the Core Strategy has identified the strategic impacts on existing infrastructure, based on the quantum of development proposed in the various settlements. However in assessing site specific allocations, the detailed impacts can be further investigated and will influence the particular choice of sites. The Core Strategy identifies the infrastructure necessary to support the levels of development proposed, and Assessment 3 considers further the collection of Developer Contributions towards providing the necessary infrastructure to satisfactorily accommodate development. These processes need to be considered together and will involve detailed discussion with the development industry.

Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation.	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation
++	+	-	--

**Q51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?**

If a site falls within 400m of a Waste Water Treatment Works it is advisable to consult with Yorkshire Water.

Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works	Within 400m of the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water no objection	Within 400m of the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken	Within 400m of the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken. Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object
++	+	-	--

**Q52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?**

Sometime the redevelopment of sites directly impacts a community facility (including sport recreation/ education/ social care/ community venues) or indirectly when the site is in close proximity to the facility. These community facilities are often valued services and the impact on their operation from new development needs to be taken into account.

<b>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities.</b>	<b>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities.</b>	<b>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated.</b>	<b>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated.</b>
++	+	-	--

**M Overall Rating for ‘Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure’**

<b>Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated</b>	<b>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated</b>	<b>Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation.</b>	<b>Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation</b>
++	+	-	--

## Strong Economy

**Q53** (Proposals involving town centre uses only) **Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?**

<b>Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment</b>	<b>Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities</b>	<b>Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline</b>
++	+	--

**Q54** (Proposals including employment uses only) **Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the Ryedale economy as set out in the ELR?**

The Council's Employment Land Review (2006) and Employment Land Review Update (2010) set out the current economic profile of Ryedale. Whilst there are notable exceptions (such as bioscience and advanced engineering), the Ryedale economy relies on traditional sectors which are predicted to decline over the long term such as agriculture and food manufacturing. The ELR studies support the diversification of the economy into a range of areas and see a key opportunity of linking in with the buoyant York economy including initiatives such as 'Science City York' to build in stability and resilience to market changes. However the role of traditional industries in the Ryedale economy should not be underestimated and new proposals in traditional sectors will make an important contribution to the local economy.

<b>Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR</b>	<b>Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale</b>
++	+

**Q55** (Proposals including employment or retail uses only) **Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?**

Providing new employment opportunities as part of a stable and diverse economy is a key aim of the Council. New employment and retail opportunities potentially involved the creation of a number of new jobs available locally. However some proposals may involve the loss of existing employment generating operations and it is important to examine the net gain or loss in jobs involved in the proposed development.

<b>Up to 250 net jobs created</b>	<b>Up to 50 net jobs created</b>	<b>Up to 50 net jobs lost</b>	<b>Up to 250 net jobs lost</b>
++	+	-	--

**N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'**

Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy
++	+	-	--

**Assessment 3 - Deliverability/ Developability**

**Q56** *How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?*

*Housing*

Category 1 (Deliverable)	Category 2 (Developable)	Category 3 (Not Currently Developable)
++	+	-

*Employment*

Category I	Category II	Category III
++	+	-

*Retail*

Proposals involving retail uses will be assessed against the advice set out in the various Ryedale Retail Capacity studies. This advice tends to be largely qualitative and therefore a categorised assessment is not possible beyond the tests set out in Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.

**Q57 Are there other any legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?**

There may be other physical or legal issues which affect the ability of the site to be brought forward. These may include ‘ransom strips’ or other factors particularly related to the site. Through the site selection process, additional factors may be identified (either by the proposer of the site or by third parties) which will be reflected here.

No constraints identified	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain
++	+	-

**Developer contributions**

**Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?**

The Local Plan Strategy Policy SP22 sets out the range of on and off-site developer contributions which developments are expected to contribute towards. The mechanism for on-site contributions will be via s106 legal agreements. They would include affordable housing and site specific contributions which are necessary as a result of the scheme and which are essential to allow the granting of planning permission. The application of the CIL charging schedule will cover off-site contributions. The Council, and where relevant in conjunction with the National Park, will be developing both a Developer Contributions SPD and CIL charging schedule alongside the preparation of the Local Plan Sites and Helmsley Plan documents, including undertaking a viability assessment of the charging schedule. Policy SP22 sets out a list of areas where contributions may be required (or will be required as part of CIL). This will be an ongoing process as part of the preparation of both the Sites and Helmsley DPDs, including consultation and discussions with the development industry and landowners. However developers will need to confirm the level of contributions able to be achieved through development of the site proposed.

Normal range of contributions can be achieved	Some contributions can be achieved	Limited contributions can be achieved	No contributions can be achieved
++	+	-	--

**Q59 (Housing development only) Can the development support the requirements of the CIL Charging Schedule?**

The Council is progressing a CIL charging schedule which will be a flat rate applied to new developments. It is a non-negotiable contribution, and as such its impact needs to be factored into development viability.

Yes	No
++	--

**O Overall Deliverability/ Developability Rating**

Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions	Some has some constraints and/or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions
++	+	-

**Stage 3 – Conclusions**

This stage is the consideration of the outcome of the assessments undertaken in Stage 2. This will enable conclusions to be drawn about the overall performance of sites and ultimately their potential suitability for allocation. The presentation of this information will be set out in tables at a settlement level to allow comparison between the sites put forward for consideration. The tables will allow visual comparison of the outcomes to the SSM questions for each site.

The purpose of distinguishing between the three assessment levels is to recognise their importance and in particular the weight that can be attached to these. Detailed analysis will be undertaken for Assessments 1 and 3 in particular as these involve both the key constraints that were supported at consultation and in demonstrating that the site is developable and deliverable. Then comparisons will be made with Assessment 2 to gain an overall picture of the performance of sites, particularly where sites emerge equally through Assessments 1 and 3.

The combination of these assessments will enable Officers to form a 'preferred' list of sites in readiness for consultation on potential allocations in the Local Plan Sites and Helmsley Plan DPDs. However it is important to repeat that this SSM does not give the answer in itself, it allows for the objective assessment of sites and ultimately for the Council to make an informed choice based on the Objectives of the Plan. Also it is an iterative process and will involve an ongoing discussion with the proposers of the sites in providing the necessary information to make that judgement.