

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545	
Stage 1 - Sift					Consent granted	Consent granted		
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha --	(++)1.28ha	(++)1ha	(++)4.35ha	(++)2.44ha consent granted	(++)0.27ha consent granted	(++)0.75ha	
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++) consent granted	(++) consent granted	(++)	
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.	Will Not cause harm ++ Will cause harm --	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	(++) Consent granted	(++) Consent granted	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	
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.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++) consent granted	(++) consent granted	(++)	
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(-)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	Consent granted	Consent granted	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	Consent granted	Consent granted	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
Highly vulnerable -							
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	(--) SFRA. FRCA will be required site >1ha	(--) SFRA. FRA will be required site >1ha	(--) SFRA. FRA will be required site >1ha	Consent granted	Consent granted	(--) SFRA.
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	Consent granted	Consent granted	(++)
	Site faces significant 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 --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (Where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(-) County Highways advised: Minor works may be required to extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site (off Main street). A transport assessment and travel plan may be required, depending on number of units. Visibility onto Main Street would need to be assessed and accommodated, trees may need to be removed.	(-) County Highways advised: The only possible access would need to be achieved through site 288.	(--) County Highways have advised: Access can achieve appropriate width, but it is opposite the junction to David Wilson Homes site- junction spacing requirements cannot be met.	(++) County Highways advised: site of David Wilson Homes scheme. The highways implications of the development have been considered, conditioned as part of the approval.	Consent granted	(-) County Highways advised: Acceptable on East Lane, works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Unlikely to need a Transport Assessment or a Travel Plan. May require additional facilities.
	Site has some highways 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 --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A Pair of Curlews showed suggestive breeding in the fields west of this site.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A pair of grey partridges were identified in the fields adjacent.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A single territory or Song Thrush was identified in the south west corner. Two territories identified of Tree Sparrow.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.	(+)The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q5. Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>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 –</p> <p>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 --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning opportunities for linking into Green Infrastructure. However, there is no reason to suggest that such linkages cannot be achieved. The site has a PRoW running proximal to the site. The site also has established boundary treatments.	No information has been submitted concerning opportunities for linking into Green Infrastructure. However, there is no reason to suggest that such linkages cannot be achieved. The site does not have a PRoW running proximal to the site, but there is on site 224 , the adjacent site to the west, across the road. The site also has established boundary treatments. To the south is an established area of community green space.	No information has been submitted concerning opportunities for linking into Green Infrastructure. However, there is no reason to suggest that such linkages cannot be achieved. The site does have two PRoWs running around the edge of the site, and their retention will be particularly important. The site also has established boundary treatments. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has noted the presence of mature trees and hedgerows, and is supportive of their retention.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	The site is an established farm complex. Limited green infrastructure opportunities exist on the site at present. No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that green infrastructure/corridors cannot be created. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer considers that a copse of trees could be used for providing wider landscape screening, compatible with the established woodland in the area. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p>	(+) No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to assume that there would be an adverse impact. here will be an expectation that hedgerows and trees will be retained, unless there are special circumstances which necessitate their removal. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to assume that there would be an adverse impact. here will be an expectation that hedgerows and trees will be retained, unless there are special circumstances which necessitate their removal. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.	(+) No details have been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has assessed the site and considers that to protect these assets the following will be important: Retain boundary hedges and trees in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Preferably retain central hedgerow and trees incorporating it into open space allocation. Tree planting for the development should include a small number of native forest type trees within at least 5% of plots native to the locality. Ensure a high standard of landscaping throughout the development. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+) No such tree assets have been identified on the site. Some from of screening through the development of a copse may reinforce the landscape character here. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe. The Council Tree and Landscape Officer has advised that: Layout may consider conversion of existing buildings and full enclosure of northern boundary with additional properties along northern boundary inwardly facing (south). Alternatively, if conversion is not practical consider screening of the development from the north by the planting of small copses of trees close to the northern boundary in keeping with local landscape character.

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -						
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						
C 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)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(--). The part of Ampleforth outside the National Park is within the Howardian Hills AONB. The landscape character is 'Southern Moors Fringe'. As such the site is on elevated land, which is sloping. The site is prominent within the village. It is considered that the site is by virtue of its topography and situation would harm the character of the settlement, were it to be developed. There is limited, linear development. The village is set down along the ridge, and the site sweeps round. The site has been subject to appeal, which was dismissed.	(+) The landscape character is 'Southern Moors Fringe' which is broadly sloping, open, and on the southern-facing valley slope. This site is further down-slope and reflects the topographical variations that exist to the south of Ampleforth. The site is against a suburban edge, is well screened by existing vegetation. It is on the lower levels of the village, the topography is flatter at this part of the settlement. Planning consent has been granted for the land to the immediate north of this site, and it is being developed out. Development of this site in conjunction with the new development would not cumulatively harm the character of the settlement, the site would integrate with the new development, and assist in the formation of a back lane type of development, which is already a feature of Ampleforth.	(-) The landscape character is 'Southern Moors Fringe' which is broadly sloping, open, and on the southern-facing valley slope. This site is further down-slope and reflects the topographical variations that exist to the south of Ampleforth. This is a substantial site, which consists of two fields which display different capabilities of accommodating development. The eastern part of which is surrounded by estate-type development on three sides, including the school and which has the access, this part may be more comfortably assimilated into the existing settlement, and the land is less open and flatter. Tree planting could assist in assimilation. The more western field is much more open, and it is considered that this area of land would be harder to assimilate into the village, and longer distance views would be more prevalent from this part of the site. The site also has a undulating quality, reflecting the small-scale topographical variation in this area.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-) The land here is in the 'Southern Moors Fringe' and is sloping, open, and on the southern-facing valley slope. This is a pre-existing redundant farm complex, which is used for cider making and storage, and which is part of the Ampleforth College complex. It is situated amongst residential development, associated with the college. It is considered within the landscape development of this site would not have an undue impact. The Tree and Landscape Officer has recommended the use of trees to form a copse of trees which is compatible for the established woodland.
	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 --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or Howardian Hills AONB?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(--) This site is adjacent to the National Park, and within the Howardian Hills AONB. As such, it is a site of particular landscape sensitivity. The elevation of the site, coupled with the sloping topography mean the site is particularly prominent within Ampleforth village, and would impact on the setting of a number of listed properties and the Conservation Area. The current development extent means that this parcel of land is the end of the village on the southern side of the road. Were development to be undertaken, it would be going against the development grain of the village, and by virtue of the topography it is not considered that the development would be capable of mitigation. Given its adverse impact on the form and character of Ampleforth, development of this site would adversely affect the immediate landscape setting of the National Park and the AONB, and has the potential to adversely affect the wider setting by virtue of its topography.	(+) The site is within the AONB, but it set adjacent to relatively modern development. The key aspects are the flatter land at this point, and it is well treed, so the wider impact on the AONB is considered to be not significant, and any impacts would be mitigatable through landscaping. The development of this site would be achievable without harming the setting of the National Park due to the favourable topography, and relationship to the modern southern limb of Ampleforth.	(-) The site is within the AONB and in its entirety has the potential to adversely affect the landscape context of the settlement, within the AONB and the National Park. The larger, western parcel of land is much more open in character, with gently rolling topography, and this could be viewable from the edge of the National Park. However, a more contained site (eastwards) would be more integrated with the existing built area of the settlement, and the topography is flattened. Landscaping has been identified as being an appropriate mitigation.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-) Although the site is not adjacent to the national park boundary, it is proximal. It is not considered that in principle that re-development of this site would adversely affect the character of the National Park- though the scale, design and landscaping of development would need consideration, to avoid harming wider views. The site is within the AONB, and although not part of Ampleforth village, given its development history, and surrounding with residential development it is not considered in principle that re-development of this site would adversely affect the character of the AONB- though the scale and design of development would need consideration, to avoid harming wider views.
	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 --						
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 ++	(--) The elevation, topography (sloping) orientation to Ampleforth village would result in a visually intrusive scheme for which landscaping would not provide an appropriate level of mitigation.	(+) topography and vegetation cover would assist in the assimilation of this site into the landscape.	(-) The larger, western part of the site has open, undulating qualities which make this area more restrictive in its ability to accommodate development. The eastern component has a topography which is much flatter. It is considered this area will be more accommodating.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-) The topography is open and sloping, but the presence of existing development will minimise the impact of development of the site, or appropriate landscaping could be applied.
	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 -						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+ Ampleforth is not a village currently vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement, but the Ampleforth College is proximal, and there has been development which has extended over time towards the village. This site is on the western extent, and as such would not affect this situation.	(+ Ampleforth is not a village currently vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement, but the Ampleforth College is proximal, and there has been development which has extended over time towards the village. This site is on the eastern extent, but lower down the valley side, away from the college site, and as such would not affect this situation.	(+ Ampleforth is not a village currently vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement, but the Ampleforth College is proximal, and there has been development which has extended over time towards the village. This site is on the western extent, and as such would not affect this situation.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-) It would not directly contribute to the coalescing of settlements, but it is an outlier of the college complex, which is physically proximal to the edge of the Village. It is currently developed, so there an opportunity through landscaping to improve the visual appearance.
	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 ++	(--)	(+)	(-)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-)
	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 --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	<p>(--) The site is adjacent (and part within) the Ampleforth Conservation Area on Knoll Hill. It is considered that development of site would adversely affect the setting and context of this part of the Ampleforth Conservation Area, the existing form and pattern of development has remained within the natural ridge on the southern side of the road. The open area affords important open view from within and outside Conservation Area. Indeed it has been identified as being important within the Ampleforth Conservation Area Appraisal. As such the development of this site would neither protect nor enhance the Conservation Area of Ampleforth. The site is also within the buffer zone of a collection of Listed Buildings, and part of the site is adjacent to the Grade II Listed Fern Villa, as such development would compromise the setting of the Listed Building which current has open, sweeping views of Knoll Hill. Historic England have identified the sensitive nature of this area. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.</p>	<p>(+) The site is contiguous the newer part of Ampleforth, and it is physically and visually distanced from the Ampleforth Conservation Area. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs. Therefore, development would not adversely affect the setting of Ampleforth's heritage assets.</p>	<p>(-) The site abuts to the north the Ampleforth Conservation Area, in particular a area of enclosed fields which surround the church. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies these fields as being important to provide a distinction between old and new Ampleforth, and wider settlement character. The development of the larger, western part of the site would have a greater impact on the character of the Conservation Area, as it would compromise the open views afforded to this area and the western part of Ampleforth's Conservation Area. The fields outside the Conservation Area boundary to the south west are described as providing an important green buffer zone and separate the older part of the village from the more modern development. The site is proximal to the Listed Church, and it is considered that the site as a whole has the potential to adversely affect the setting by reducing the green wedge between old and new Ampleforth. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs. The eastern part of the site would be much less intrusive, and physically related to the existing modern development. Development of this part of the site would preserve those special features of the Ampleforth's Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site</p>	<p>Planning consent has been approved for this site</p>	<p>(+) There are no heritage assets proximal to this development. The site is surrounded by semi-detached properties. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.</p>

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--) It is considered that development of this site would be harmful to the wider character of Ampleforth. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Potential for prehistoric remains in this wider area. Advise geophysics and trial trenching.	(+) it is considered that the nature and scale of this would not harm the wider character and appearance of Ampleforth. There would be no adverse cumulative impact in conjunction with the in-development site to the north. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Potential for prehistoric remains in this wider area. Advise geophysics and trial trenching.	(-) Considering the scale of the site, and its location within the settlement it is considered that it could adversely affect the wider character of Ampleforth, were the full site to be extended, as a smaller site, contained to the east, would not harm the wider character of Ampleforth. Potential for prehistoric remains in this wider area. Advise geophysics and trial trenching.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Potential for prehistoric remains in this wider area. Advise geophysics and trial trenching.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+) The site is previously developed, and so its re-development would not adversely harm the character, providing design and landscaping considerations are met, it is not considered that it would substantially adversely affect the character of the village of Ampleforth, and its relationship to the Ampleforth Abbey complex.
	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'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+)
	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 --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	There are no such schemes in this area.	There are no such schemes in this area.	There are no such schemes in this area.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	There are no such schemes in this area.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time. The planning consent.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information available at this stage	No information available at this stage	No information available at this stage	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information available at this stage
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	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?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + +	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	No --						
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage	No information submitted at this stage	No information submitted at this stage	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information submitted at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	(+) 1.28ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.	(+) 1ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.	(+) 4.35ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++) 0.75ha of land which has been developed - although includes agricultural buildings, which in planning terms are not considered to be previously developed land.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 27 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 21 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 91 dwellings.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 15 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +						
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -						
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	Land is not contaminated.	Land is not contaminated.	Land is not contaminated.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	Land is not contaminated. Surrounding houses are on Private Water Supply
	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 ++	(+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+) (+) (+)
	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							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 1.28ha of grades 3 and 4. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile land. The topography is not conducive for arable (site grazed) and is less than 5ha.	(-)1ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile land.	(-) 4.35ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile land. The land is grazed.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++) 0.75ha of grade 3 (Farm complex- developed)
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost –						
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --						
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(++) (++) (++)	(++) (++) (++)	(++) (++) (++)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++) (++) (++)
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?						
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --						
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(++) (++) (++)	(++) (++) (++)	(++) (++) (++)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site.	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++) (++) (++)
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +						
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -						
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.
	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 --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(++)
	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							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate 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 +	(+) given the nature of the type of development, it is unlikely to cause advise impact on amenity through light or dust, although noise would be a consideration on the amenity of existing residents, but this would be considered on a site specific basis.	(+) given the nature of the type of development, it is unlikely to cause advise impact on amenity through light or dust, although noise would be a consideration on the amenity of existing residents, but this would be considered on a site specific basis.	(+) given the nature of the type of development, it is unlikely to cause advise impact on amenity through light or dust, although noise would be a consideration on the amenity of existing residents, but this would be considered on a site specific basis.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+) It is unlikely to cause harm, the complex of buildings has been a farm and brewery. Therefore this would be an improvement for the amenity of neighbouring residents were this to change.
	The development 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 --						
Q. 30 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 overbearing effects.	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 unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.	(+) The development is unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.	(+) The development is unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+) The development is unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.
	The development 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 --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	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 +	(+)	(+)	(+)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+)
	The development 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 this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this this site	(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++) The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site. FRA required.	(++) The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site. FRA required.	(++) No, but vulnerable to surface water flooding. Not a Critical Drainage Area. The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site. FRA required.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this this site	(++)The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this this site	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	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 --	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. The Environment Agency has recommended that SDSs are utilised on this site. They also require no increase in surface water run off rates. FRA required.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
Q. 35 What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?	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 --	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
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 --	(+)	(+)	(+)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	(+)

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
People							
Q. 36 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?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character of the settlement. However, this field, which is sporadically grazed space does contribute to the character of the settlement in a wider community sense.	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character of the settlement.	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character of the settlement. However, this field, which is grazed space does contribute to the character of the settlement in a wider community sense.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	The development would lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character of the settlement. The farmstead, although not a publicly accessible facility, contributes to the rural character of this area.
	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 --						
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. The Highways Authority have said that routes for pedestrians and cyclists, to have most convenient desire lines to nearest service centre/village (Ampleforth)	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +						
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	Not required
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +						
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --						
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(-)	(+)	(+)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +						
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -						
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Meeting needs							
Q.41 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?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>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 –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 27 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 21 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 91 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 15 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3. Limited on-site affordable housing provision.
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	(-)	(-)	(-)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(-)
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	No Transport Assessment has been submitted at this stage.	No Transport Assessment has been submitted at this stage.	No Transport Assessment has been submitted at this stage.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Not required	Not required

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++				Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	
	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 --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++				Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	
	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 --						
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+) No details have been submitted. There are PROWs in proximity which run in close proximity to the site.	(+) No details have been submitted. There are PROWs in proximity, but they are not physically proximal to the site.	(--) This site is transversed by two public rights of way, one which runs to extreme west of the site, and the second which runs past the school, and across the site to the newer estate development in the south west of the village. No details have been submitted as to how such PROWs would be incorporated into any development.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +						
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --						
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	(++) site has no impact on the public realm.	(++) site has no impact on the public realm.	(++) site has no impact on the public realm.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(++) site has no impact on the public realm.
	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 --						

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545	
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development. Main water and sewer pipelines clip the site.				Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	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 --							
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.	(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.	(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.	
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --							

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545
Q. 52 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?	<p>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 ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(+) Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.	(+) Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.	(+) Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+) Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	<p>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 can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	(+)	(+)	(-)	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+)
Strong Economy							
Q53. (Town Centre uses only) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	<p>Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++</p> <p>Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +</p> <p>Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --</p>	NA	NA	NA	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	NA
Q.54 (Employment uses only) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	<p>Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++</p> <p>Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +</p>	NA	NA	NA	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	NA
Q.55 (Employment or retail uses only) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional	<p>Up to 250 net jobs created ++</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs created +</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs lost -</p> <p>Up to 250 net jobs lost --</p>	NA	NA	NA	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	NA

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		111	160	224	288	544	545	
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	NA	NA	NA	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	NA	
	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 --							
Stage 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)++	Employment: Category I ++	(++) Category 1 site in 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site in 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site in 2009 SHLAA	(++) Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site. Category 1 Site in SHLAA	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -						
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Planning consent has been approved for the majority of this site	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	Subject to archaeological investigation	
	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?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Unknown	(+) Continue to consider remainder of site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	(+) Continue to consider remainder of site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	
	Some contributions can be achieved +							
	Limited contributions can be achieved -							
	No contributions can be achieved --							
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	
	No --							
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	No response received	(+)	No response received	(+)	Planning consent has been approved for this site.	(+)	
	Site 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 --							

Assessment		547	616	632	
Stage 1 - Sift					
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)0.4ha	(++)0.45ha	(++)4.66ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --				
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --				
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.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to North York Moors SPA	
	Will cause harm --				
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.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --				
Stage 2 - Site Assessment					
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(-)	(+)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		547	616	632	
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+) (+)	(+) (+)	(++) (++)	
	Site has good accessibility +				
	Site has variable accessibility –				
	Site has poor accessibility --				
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	
	Flood Zone 2 +				
	Flood zone 3a –				
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	
	Flood Zone 2				Flood Zone 3a
	Less vulnerable ++				Less vulnerable+
	More vulnerable +				More vulnerable -
	Highly vulnerable -				Highly vulnerable --
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	(--) SFRA.	(--) SFRA.	(--)/SFRA. FRA will be required site >1ha	
	No --				
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	(++) (++)	
	Site faces significant 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 --				
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (Where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(-) County Highways advised: Acceptable on East Lane, works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Unlikely to need a Transport Assessment or a Travel Plan. May require additional facilities.	(-) County Highways advised: Concerns regarding visibility, further assessment work would need to be determined a suitable access location to address these concerns.	(-) County Highways advised: Access acceptable, location to be determined by Transport Assessment. A Travel Plan will also be required. May require additional facilities/services may be required, as informed by the above assessments. Officers concerned about the state of the road which leads to the site. It is pot holed and narrow with high hedges and inability to raised to an adoptable standard.	
	Site has some highways 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 --				
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity					
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.	(+)The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A Pair of Curlews showed suggestive breeding in the fields west of this site.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A Yellowhammer territory was found on the eastern edge.	
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +				
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –				
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --				

Assessment		547	616	632
Q5. Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>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 –</p> <p>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 --</p>	<p>The site is part of a much larger, open field which is cropped. No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that green infrastructure/corridors cannot be created. There is an established hedgerow running north-south through the western portion of the site. The retention of this would be desirable. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted concerning opportunities for linking into Green Infrastructure. However, there is no reason to suggest that such linkages cannot be achieved. The site has a PRow running proximal to the site. The site also has established boundary treatments. There are 4 trees, which could be affected by a development scheme on the site. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.</p>	<p>The site is within the buffer zone of a green infrastructure corridor. The site is a large grazed field, between Ampleforth village and development belonging to the Ampleforth College. No details have been submitted as to the capability or nature of green infrastructure that could be incorporated into the development, but there is no reason to suggest that green infrastructure could not be retained/incorporated. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.</p>
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p>	<p>(+) No details have been submitted as to the impact on the established hedgerow. There is no reason to suggest that this cannot be retained. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: Layout should aim to retain existing hedges along the east and west boundaries and enclose the southern boundary with a strong native hedge. The northern boundaries of properties should also be formed by native hedges. Generally the properties to the east and west are well treed therefore adequate space should be allowed for new native tree planting within the development.</p>	<p>The site also has established boundary treatments. There are 4 trees, which could be affected by a development scheme on the site. No details have been submitted as to the impact on the established hedgerows or trees. There is no reason to suggest that this cannot be retained. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.</p>	<p>No details submitted. There will be an expectation that hedgerows and trees will be retained, unless there are special circumstances which necessitate their removal. This is a landscape priority in the Howardian Hills Management Plan for the Southern Moors Fringe.</p>

Assessment		547	616	632
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +			
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -			
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --			
C 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)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(-) The land here is in the 'Southern Moors Fringe' and is sloping, open, and on the southern-facing valley slope. This site is a parcel of land which is between existing residential development, but forms part of a larger, cropped field. The development adjacent is in the form of a linear strip of residential properties, which serves the Abbey complex, and is not part of the village of Ampleforth. It is open and on sloping land, so development of this site, would be visually prominent, and may increase the visual presence of this collection of dwellings within the wider valley landscape, but the site is relatively small, and the contribution is likely to be not significant, subject to the appropriate using of boundary treatment.	(-) The land here is in the 'Southern Moors Fringe' and is sloping, open, and on the southern-facing valley slope. This is a visually prominent elevated site, which is adjacent to the Ampleforth Conservation Area. There is development to the north of the site, on the opposite side of the road, but the site would also be viewable in the wider landscape, by virtue of the site extending up and over the hill.	(-) this site represents a large, sweeping open field, which provides a physical break between Ampleforth village and the Ampleforth Abbey school complex. When viewed from the other side of the Valley (Gilling) this is a very prominent field, and it provides a clear, distinct, break between the village and the abbey complex.
	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 --			

Assessment		547	616	632
<p>What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or Howardian Hills AONB?</p>	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p>	<p>(-) Although the site is not adjacent to the national park boundary, the site is proximal. As a currently open field, it helps to break up the linear form of development which has occurred along the road. however, with appropriate boundary treatment is considered that in wider views the development would not adversely affect the character of the National Park. The site is within the AONB, and is not part of Ampleforth village, but part of the outlying complex of the College, with residential development to the west and east. It is considered in landscape terms the development has the potential to reduce the physical/visual boundary between the village and college, and this would be detrimental to the objectives of the AONB Management Plan. However, through the scale and design of development, in conjunction with appropriate landscaping that the longer-distance impact on views and context of the settlement would not be affected.</p>	<p>(-) The site is adjacent to the boundary with the North York Moors National Park, and within the Howardian Hills AONB. The development on this elevated, prominent and therefore sensitive field which is currently open, with sporadic trees. As field which contributes to the setting of Ampleforth and provides a physical 'end' to development along this road, it is considered that the site's development would harm the visual character and appearance of this area, its relationship with Ampleforth, and its Conservation Area. It is considered that development in this site would adversely affect the setting of the National Park, and the Howardian Hills AONB.</p>	<p>(-) The site is proximal to the national park boundary, and is within the Howardian Hills AONB. The development of this site would coalesce Ampleforth village with the Ampleforth school complex. It is currently an open field which is visually prominent, and viewable from the other side of the valley. It is considered that given its inherent landscape sensitivity, and the coalescence, with loss of identity, the development of this site would have an adverse impact on the, identity and setting of both Ampleforth and the Abbey School complex, and this would be detrimental to the setting of the National Park, and detrimental to the character of the AONB.</p>
	<p>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 +</p>			
	<p>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 -</p>			
	<p>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 --</p>			
<p>Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?</p>	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p>	<p>(-) The topography is open and sloping, this site is currently open and undeveloped. It is bounded by development on either side, and so development will be visually distinct and enhance the perception/view of this linear strip of residential development.</p>	<p>(-) Because of the topography, and the elevation of the site, it is considered that the existing landscape features make this site very prominent, and no means of mitigating any landscape impacts.</p>	<p>(-) because of the open, sweeping topography on the hillside, it is considered that the existing landscape features render the site incapable of being developed without harm to the character of Ampleforth</p>
	<p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p>			
	<p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible -</p>			
	<p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed -</p>			

Assessment		547	616	632
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	<p>Development within the built form of the settlement ++</p> <p>Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +</p> <p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –</p> <p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --</p>	(-) It would not directly contribute to the coalescing of settlements, but it is an outlier of the college complex, which is physically proximal to the edge of the Village, currently it is an open field, and its development would further reinforce the visual physical association between the village and the college.	(+) Ampleforth is not a village currently vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement, but the Ampleforth College is proximal, and there has been development which has extended over time towards the village. This site is on the western extent, and as such would not affect this situation.	(--) The site would lead to the coalescence of the village of Ampleforth with the Ampleforth Abbey/School complex, which would be undesirable because it would be diluting the distinctive character of these two separate built environments which although they have links, were not intended to be physically linked, the Local Plan Strategy is clear about the need to respect the individual character of settlements.
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	<p>Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +</p> <p>Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –</p> <p>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 --</p>	(-)	(--)	(--)

Assessment		547	616	632
Culture and Heritage				
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	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 --			
	(+)	(-)	(-)	
	(+)	(-)	(-)	
	(+)	(-)	(-)	
	(+)	(-)	(-)	

Assessment		547	616	632
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) The site is currently an open field, breaking up a strip of residential development. Development of the site would increase the visual impact of this collection of dwellings, and increase perception of coalescence with Ampleforth and the Ampleforth Abbey complex. As a result it is considered that it could affect the wider character of the village and its relationship with the Abbey/School complex. The wider land on which this site is situated is defined as being part of a Strip Field System. A relic agricultural system, which is becoming increasingly rare nationally. Although the site would not remove any existing boundary hedges, it would truncate a field.	(--)-The site would harm the important views in and out of the settlement. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Potential for prehistoric remains; due to scale of site would suggest a condition for mitigation recording as opposed to pre-determination evaluation.	(--) Development of this field would fully erode the long-standing separation between Ampleforth Village and the College. It is considered that development of this site would not be in keeping with the evolutionary form of Ampleforth. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: The site contains a mound presumed to be of antiquity - probably a 'tumulus' or round barrow Bronze Age burial mound. Advise geophysics and trial trenching.
	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'	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 --			
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy				
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.	No information has been submitted regarding compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, but there is no reason to suggest that compliance is not achievable.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -			
	Site not capable --			
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	There are no such schemes in this area.	There are no such schemes in this area.	There are no such schemes in this area.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.	It is not possible to do this in Ampleforth. At the present time.

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		547	616	632
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information available at this stage	No information available at this stage	No information available at this stage
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	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?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -			
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + +	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	No --			
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage	No information submitted at this stage	No information submitted at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -			
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --			
Efficient Use of Land				
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	(+) 0.4ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.	(+) 0.45ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.	(+) 4.66ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites capable of meeting housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +			
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 8 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 9 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 97 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +			
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -			
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --			

Assessment		547	616	632
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	Land is not contaminated. Surrounding houses are on Private Water Supply.	Land is not contaminated.	Land is not contaminated.
	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				
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-)0.40ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile land. It is cropped land.	(++) 0.45ha of grade 4.	(--) 4.6ha Grade 2. This site is close to the 5ha threshold.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -			
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --			
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?			
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --			
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +			
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -			
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --			

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		547	616	632
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.
	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 --			
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice 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				
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate 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 +	(+) given the nature and scale of the site submitted, it is unlikely that there would harm to residential amenity from these nuisances.	(+) given the nature of the type of development, it is unlikely to cause advise impact on amenity through light or dust, although noise would be a consideration on the amenity of existing residents, but this would be considered on a site specific basis.	(+) given the nature of the type of development, it is unlikely to cause advise impact on amenity through light or dust, although noise would be a consideration on the amenity of existing residents, but this would be considered on a site specific basis. As submitted, this is a substantial site and the implications for traffic noise and residential amenity would require particular consideration.
	The development 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 --			
Q. 30 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 overbearing effects.	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 unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.	(+) The development is unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.	(+) The development is unlikely to cause such nuisances, although it will be a site -specific consideration to ensure that the amenity of existing neighbouring properties, and those of the new properties, is not compromised to an unacceptable level.
	The development 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 --			

Assessment		547	616	632
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	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 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 this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --			
Flood Risk				
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --			
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++	(++) The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site.	(++) The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site.	(++) Yes to surface water flooding, but not considered to be a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency have advised that there must be no increase in surface water run off from the site. FRA required.
	Yes further investigation required --			
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --			
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	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 --			
Q. 35 What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information is provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	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 --			
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 --			

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		547	616	632
People				
Q. 36 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?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character of the settlement. However, this site is part of a field which is cropped, and the space does contribute to the character of this outlier collection of dwellings and farm, which are associated with the college.	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing 'use' which contributes to the social character of the settlement. However, this field, which is grazed does significantly contribute to the character of the settlement, and therefore its development would be a loss in a wider community sense.	The development would not lead to the loss of an existing 'use' per se which contributes to the social character of the settlement. However, this field, which is grazed does significantly contribute to the character of the settlement, by providing separation between Ampleforth village and the college. Therefore its development would be a loss in a wider community sense.
	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 --			
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. How this is undertaken would be considered on a site-specific basis taking into account the context of the area.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -			
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +			
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --			
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	Not required	Not required	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +			
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --			
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	No information provided but there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +			
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -			
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +			
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -			
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --			

Ampleforth - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		547	616	632
Meeting needs				
Q.41 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?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
	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 --			
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 8 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3. No on-site affordable housing provision.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 9 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3. No on-site affordable housing provision.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. At a theoretical yield of 97 units, on-site affordable housing would be required as per policy SP3.
	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 --			
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +			
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –			
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --			
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	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 are or how any needs will be met by the development –			
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --			
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure				
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++	Not required	Not required	No Transport Assessment has been submitted at this stage.
	No- transport assessment required --			

Assessment		547	616	632
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation –</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>			
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>			
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	<p>(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted.</p>	<p>(+) The site is proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted to demonstrate any provision to improve PROW access.</p>	<p>(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW.</p>
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	<p>(++) site has no impact on the public realm.</p>	<p>(++) site has no impact on the public realm.</p>	<p>(++) site has no impact on the public realm.</p>

Assessment		547	616	632
<p>Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?</p>	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Ampleforth School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.</p>
	<p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p>	<p>Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.</p>	<p>Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.</p>	<p>Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.</p>
	<p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p>	<p>Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>
	<p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>			
<p>Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?</p>	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</p>	<p>(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.</p>	<p>(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.</p>	<p>(++) The waste water treatment works are over 500 metres from the site.</p>
	<p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +</p>			
	<p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –</p>			
	<p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --</p>			

Assessment		547	616	632
Q. 52 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?	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 ++	(+). Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.	(+). Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.	(+). Development would not have any direct impact on community facilities.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +			
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -			
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --			
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	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 can be fully mitigated ++	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an 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 community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -			
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --			
Strong Economy				
Q53. (Town Centre uses only) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +			
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --			
Q.54 (Employment uses only) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	NA	NA	NA
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +			
Q.55 (Employment or retail uses only) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	NA	NA
	Up to 50 net jobs created +			
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -			
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --			

Assessment		547	616	632
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	NA	NA	NA
	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 --			

Stage 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) ++	Employment: Category I ++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +			
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -			
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	
	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?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	Unknown	
	Some contributions can be achieved +				
	Limited contributions can be achieved -				
	No contributions can be achieved --				
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	Unknown	
	No --				
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(+)	No response received	No response received	
	Site 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 --				