

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
<b>Stage 1 - Sift</b>							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)1.08ha	(++)0.83ha	(++)0.83ha	(++)1.08ha	(++)0.21ha	(++)2.59ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(--) employment	(++)	(++)	(++) site mostly built out	(++)	(++)
	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 and loss to heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 ++	(--) considered in SFRA as Flood zone 3B	(++)	(++)	(++) but Flood Zones 1,2 and 3.	(++)	(--) considered in SFRA as Flood zone 3B
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
<b>Stage 2 - Site Assessment</b>							
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 --					

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 –	(--)	(++)	(++)	Variable. The site incorporates Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 (the later is small)	(++)	(--) 3b
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3a Less vulnerable ++ More vulnerable + Highly vulnerable - Less vulnerable+ More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable --	(+) employment	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--)
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++ No --	(--) SFRA Flood zone 1,2 and 3. In the SFRA, the element of FZ3 is to be given Flood Zone 3b Status if undeveloped. Part of this site is undeveloped the other part would be FZ3a. FRA Required	(--) SFRA	(--) SFRA	(--) SFRA. Flood Zones 1,2 and 3. In the SFRA, the element of FZ3 is to be given Flood Zone 3b Status. FRA required	(--) SFRA	(++)
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 --	(--)	(++)	(++)	(-) Environment Agency advise: development be sited wholly in Flood Zone 1. FRA may be needed even if only in Flood Zone 1, and certainly needed in Flood Zone 2 and 3.	(++)	(--)
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and the Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++ 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 --	(-) County Highways Authority considered: Acceptable onto Main Street, but trees may need to be removed to achieve visibility. Traffic Impact Assessment and Travel Plan required.	(--) County Highways Authority considered: Access cannot be achieved, there are concerns regarding visibility	(-) County Highways Authority considered: Access onto Main Street (B1257) is acceptable, but must be located to address appropriate visibility. Will require a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. May require additional facilities and services.	No response from County Highways, but access onto Pasture Lane would be possible for the residual size of the site.	(-) County Highways Authority considered: Access onto Main Street (B1257) is acceptable, but must be located to address appropriate visibility. Will require a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. May require additional facilities and services.	(--) County Highways Authority considered: Site has no direct connection/frontage to and highway maintainable at the public expense. Major improvement works would be required to bring the access road up to an adoptable standard.
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK NVMNAs or	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++ Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Site comprises of farm complex. Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Allotments. Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Hedgerow and verge. Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Most of this site has now been built out, the residual area is moved soil, scrub-grassland. Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Hedgerow and verge. Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Allotments and grazed paddock (sheep). Were protected species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
affect ON, NTHMFA or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --	protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	species present, they would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	commensurate protection under the appropriate legislative framework.
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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>	(--)	(--) The site is allotments, and the development would cause the loss of an established green infrastructure unit in Hovingham.	(-) The development of this site would mean the loss of the hedgerow, which are a well-recognised form of green infrastructure. New hedging could be formed, using native species. The site also involves a garden/paddock area to the rear of properties	(-) there is a Public Right of Way which runs through the site. It's retention will be important to ensure that the community can continue to enjoy this part of Hovingham.	(-) The development of this site would mean the loss of the hedgerow, which are a well-recognised form of green infrastructure. New hedging could be formed, using native species.	(-) The paddocks have some hedging and fencing.
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>		(+) Retain eastern boundary hedge as its retention is important, and if possible the beech hedge along part of the northern boundary	(+) The beech hedge along the northern boundary should be retained and other boundaries of the development should be formed using the same species in the interests of uniformity.	(+) Important to retain existing, established boundaries.	(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: In this location at the entrance to the village, and in the interests of consistency with prevailing landscape features at the entrance to the village it would appear appropriate to retain the southern boundary hedge, in a lower form, trimmed to form the southern boundary of frontage development. The retention of some of the young plantation at the eastern end of the site would serve to form enclosure of the development at the entrance to the village.	(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: The site is formed by an irregular shaped parcel of land taking in a number of different land uses including agriculture and domestic gardens. The site has relatively open boundaries on all sides with a small number of mature/ semi-mature trees mainly concentrated along the boundaries of the site. Retention of these trees is desirable.
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	<p>Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++</p> <p>Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –</p> <p>Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --</p>	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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)?	<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>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>(-)This is a partly developed site. The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. Site within an established farmstead and separated from the village. Topography is low-lying, but open, within this part of the village.</p>	<p>(-)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. The land in this area is relatively elevated, and is on that transition between the variations in topography. The site looks out over the eastern side of the village. The site contains allotments and is open in character. Part of the site (western side) which is within the Howardian Hills AONB, is a paddock to the rear of existing properties.</p>	<p>(-)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. The site is a verge area, properties to the north of the site, grassed and hedgerow to the north. Indeed this site is just on the edge of the Howardian Hills AONB. As a verge site, any properties would need landscaping and careful orientation to ensure no adverse harm.</p>	<p>(+)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. Site has been almost fully developed, save land to south. The site is partly within the Howardian Hills AONB, and is on low-lying land which is already reasonably well screened, the boundary vegetation will further obscure development. It is considered that the topography is open and low lying in this area. The existing development currently is visible from distanced views, but this will diminish as the boundary hedging becomes established.</p>	<p>(-)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. The site is a verge area, properties to the north of the site, grassed and hedgerow to the north. Indeed this site is just on the edge of the Howardian Hills AONB. As a verge site, any properties would need landscaping and careful orientation to ensure no adverse harm.</p>	<p>(-)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. This eastern side of Hovingham is where the land flattens out. As a result, the topography means that the impact can be significant in the more immediate area. This is a relatively large site including allotments, modern farm buildings, and paddock, providing a rural edge to the village.</p>
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or the Howardian Hills AONB?	<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>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>(-)Site is not within the AONB but is proximal in abutting it, currently an established farm enterprise, but if it extends too far out it would create an intrusive limb, that would harm the character and setting of the village, which is relatively contained, and on the eastern edge on open, flat land. As such, in affecting the character and setting of the village to its detriment, this would in turn affect the special qualities of the AONB.</p>	<p>(-) Site within AONB in the western extent, land is currently allotments, access route and curtilages to properties along High Street. The site is elevated relative to the land to the north, and looks over the eastern side of the village. It is a site which would require careful consideration in development to ensure that the visual impact is minimised, but given the presence of the residential development to the immediate south of the site, this lessens the visual impact when viewed from the AONB.</p>	<p>(-)Verge area, properties to the north of the site, grassed and hedgerow to the north. As a verge site, any properties would need landscaping and careful orientation to ensure no adverse harm. Site abuts the boundary of the AONB.</p>	<p>(+) This site is partially within the AONB, and it is predominantly developed. It is considered that the further component of this site is unlikely in principle to adversely harm the AONB, as it is a modest extension to the existing developed site. The landscaping will be an important component to ensure that the impact is mitigated, and the height of the buildings will also be an important consideration.</p>	<p>(-)Verge area, properties to the north of the site, grassed and hedgerow to the north. As a verge site, any properties would need landscaping and careful orientation to ensure no adverse harm. Site abuts the boundary of the AONB.</p>	<p>(--)-This is a relatively substantial site, adjacent to the AONB boundary, and the Worsley Arms Listed Building Complex. The nature and scale of the proposal would be a significant incursion into open land to the east. The eastern edge of the village in this area, is currently large, single depth properties with substantial curtilages and a succession of outbuildings, and the Worsley Arms has a collection of listed buildings including a coach house, which provides a strong edge to the settlement. It is considered that development here would be an intrusive feature, and would detract from this part of the Hovingham Conservation Area. It is considered that development of this site has significant potential to adversely affect the setting of the AONB in this area, by harming the special qualities of the Conservation Area, and the setting of the Listed Buildings.</p>

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 ++	(-) From information submitted, the proposal is to have storage, car parking and office facilities. The Estate have intimated that they would be happy to provide landscaping as required. The nature of the extent of the proposal would be important. The land is open, and the site is separated from the village-proper.	(-) the elevation will mean the height of the properties will be a consideration.	(-) the site would need to create new boundary features, but with the row of properties to the north, the overall impact will be mitigated.	(+) no scheme has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that the existing hedgerows would need to be removed. The height of the properties could help to reduce the visual impact from longer distance views.	(-) the site would need to create new boundary features, but with the row of properties to the north, the overall impact will be mitigated.	(--) The site, by virtue of its open character, on this sensitive edge of Hovingham will not be able to use landscape features or mitigation measures which would lessen the harm to the character and setting of this part of Hovingham.
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –						
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --						
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(--)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 ++	(-) It is considered that the development of this site will present a challenge in terms of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the part of Hovingham's Conservation Area. The site forms part of an graduated entrance into the village from the north. Adjacent to the site is, land is lined with trees, and it is these trees in particular which are included within the Conservation Area designation.	(-) The site is adjacent to the grade II Listed properties of Lumley House, and the Worsley Arms Farmhouse and cottage, Hotel and Coach House. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM. The site is also adjacent to the Hovingham Conservation Area. It is considered that landscaping, and the height and nature of properties would require consideration, to mitigate impact, but that given the presence of linear development to the north which has already created a new 'direction' of development.	(+) This part of site 31 is much more separated from the curtilage of the listed Worsley Arms grouping, and screened by existing development. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+)The land is within the Hovingham Conservation Area. The development which has occurred in the majority of the site has filled the former collection of paddocks which forms part of the Conservation Area. The site is a small area with trees and scrub. It is considered that the residual of the site is capable of sensitive redevelopment. The site is to the rear of the Listed Malt and Shovel. Much of the site has been developed, with the remainder as scrub. It is not considered that this area of land contributes to the setting of the listed building. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) This site (like 31s) is much more separated from the curtilage of the listed Worsley Arms grouping. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM. It is proximal to the Hovingham Conservation Area, but it is considered that through appropriate design, scale and massing and boundary treatment, the development of this site would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and indeed there is an opportunity to enhance the area and the appearance of the existing collection of dwellings.	(--) This site represents a substantial incursion into the open paddock area to the rears of the following: grade II Listed properties of Lumley House, and the Worsley Arms Farmhouse and cottage, Hotel and Coach House and Stone House. The Worsley Arms complex and its setting could be significantly harmed by residential development, particularly of the scale this site would propose (northern part of the site may be acceptable in line with the extent of the curtilage of Stone House). The coach house and high walls give a strong sense of 'the edge' of Hovingham, development of either residential or commercial development could harm this. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +	There are a handful of properties in this area, and one of these properties is the grade II listed Pasture House, which is to the west of the site, on the opposite side of the road, and there is a clear physical break from the existing buildings on the site and the heritage asset. It is considered that development of this existing complex would not unduly harm the setting of the listed house, in that although it would depend on the nature and scale, and could be changing the context of how the property would be viewed, but not within its immediate situation. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.					
	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 --						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 the principle of development would not adversely affect the former Hovingham Station complex.	(-) The vast majority of Hovingham is within the village's Conservation Area. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site (32) has already been subject of a DBA, geophysical survey and trial trenching. We have recently had verbal reports that Bronze Age cremation burials have been found on site, so would advise that any further development here is subject to a programme of archaeological mitigation recording.	(+) The vast majority of Hovingham is within the village's Conservation Area. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site (32) has already been subject of a DBA, geophysical survey and trial trenching. We have recently had verbal reports that Bronze Age cremation burials have been found on site, so would advise that any further development here is subject to a programme of archaeological mitigation recording.	(+) The vast majority of Hovingham is within the village's Conservation Area. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site has already been subject of a DBA, geophysical survey and trial trenching. We have recently had verbal reports that Bronze Age cremation burials have been found on site, so would advise that any further development here is subject to a programme of archaeological mitigation recording.	(+) The vast majority of Hovingham is within the village's Conservation Area. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site (32) has already been subject of a DBA, geophysical survey and trial trenching. We have recently had verbal reports that Bronze Age cremation burials have been found on site, so would advise that any further development here is subject to a programme of archaeological mitigation recording.	(--) The open land is sensitive- it is adjacent to the existing sports facilities and the Listed Worsley Arms and associated out buildings and wall which are listed for group value. They form an attractive feature, and mark a district edge to the settlement (the walls are high and of substantial construction. The site is also identified as containing Strip Field systems, which are becoming increasingly rare nationally, and which are a distinctive feature of the edge of the vale of Pickering.
	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	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--)
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	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	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 ++	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area
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	No information	No information	No information	No information	No information
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						



Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however, only limited measures are achievable-</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No --</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	<p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++</p> <p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -</p> <p>Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --</p>	No information	No information	No information	No information	No information	No information
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	<p>Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++</p> <p>Site is up to 50% Brownfield +</p>	Greenfield in terms of planning definition(agricultural buildings are not Brownfield land). The complex has buildings and hard standing on it. Site is just over a hectare.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	Submitted as an employment 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. 17 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. 17 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. 5 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. 4 dwellings.	(--) This site has significant flood risk to the northern component of the site, covering c.50%. Factoring this in, applying a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 24 dwellings.

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 ++	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.
	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 ++	(-) 1.08 ha of grade 3. The site has development on it. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size.	(-) Allotments (grades 2 and 3). There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size.	(-) Roadside verge (grades 2 and 3). There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size	(-) Most of site has been developed (grade 3). There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size	(-) Roadside verge Grades 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size	(-) 2.59ha of grade 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size
	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 --						
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	(There is no evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out --						

<b>Assessment</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>31 N</b>	<b>31 S</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>374</b>
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 ++	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) on the basis that although within a mineral safeguarding area, the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(+) on the basis that although within a mineral safeguarding area, the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) on the basis that although within a mineral safeguarding area, the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(+) on the basis that although within a mineral safeguarding area, the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement.
	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 +	(+) the farm units are unlikely to cause inconvenience, given the site proposers intention.	(-) The site is in close proximity to the operational farm. There could be nuisance issues with noise and smells, which could fetter the operation of the farm.	(+) The site is not in close proximity to any activity that would generate noise, light or dust pollution which would adversely affect new residents, and conversely, given this site is proposed as a residential scheme this would adversely affect the amenity of existing residences.	(-) the site is adjacent to the rear of a public house, and this will require consideration in the layout and design of a residential scheme, although it is considered that mitigation of this will be achievable.	(+) The site is not in close proximity to any activity that would generate noise, light or dust pollution which would adversely affect new residents, and conversely, given this site is proposed as a residential scheme this would adversely affect the amenity of existing residences.	(-) The site is in close proximity to the operational farm. There could be nuisance issues with noise and smells, which could fetter the operation of the farm.
	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 farm units are unlikely to cause inconvenience, given the site proposers intention.	(+) 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 nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site.	(-) the site is adjacent to the rear of a public house, and this will require consideration in the layout and design of a residential scheme, to overcome any privacy/overlooking effects although it is considered that mitigation of this will be achievable.	(+) 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 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 the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
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 --						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++) Hovingham Beck is the source of flooding	(++)	(++)	(++)Hovingham Beck	(++)	(++)Hovingham Beck
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 --	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems
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 ++ 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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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 --	(--)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(--)

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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?	<p>Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++</p> <p>Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --</p>	No such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the village	(--) This site includes allotments. In their submission the Estate have intimated that they could provide alternative allotment gardens, but this may have to look outside the village envelope, and allotments take time to build up their productivity. It may not be of commensurate accessibility and quality.	No such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the village	No such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the village	No such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the village.	(--) Part of the site has no such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the Village. However, it is adjacent to sports facilities, which would need to protection and consideration. Also includes allotments are on the extreme south of the site. In their submission the Estate have intimated that they could provide alternative allotment gardens, but this may have to look outside the village envelope. Allotments take time to build up their productivity. It may not be of commensurate accessibility and quality.
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	Not required	Not required	Not required as the site is now below the threshold due to its development.	Not required	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	(+) The scheme proposes the use of the farm buildings for light industrial purposes. It is perpetuating the principle of economic development within the countryside. Although no details of the nature are submitted.	No details have been submitted regarding the housing mix, and the anticipated demographic profile of the development likely occupants, based on housing need, but there is no reason to suggest that such information could be provided.	No details have been submitted regarding the housing mix, and the anticipated demographic profile of the development likely occupants, based on housing need, but there is no reason to suggest that such information could be provided.	No details have been submitted regarding the housing mix, and the anticipated demographic profile of the development likely occupants, based on housing need, but there is no reason to suggest that such information could be provided.	No details have been submitted regarding the housing mix, and the anticipated demographic profile of the development likely occupants, based on housing need, but there is no reason to suggest that such information could be provided.	(+) The proposers have provided no details concerning the scheme, but mixed uses are proposed. There is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 --						
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 ++	The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. No details have been provided concerning the nature of the employment, and it is not to support an existing enterprise, and given the overall strategy it is unlikely that this site is capable of addressing the requirements of the ELR and update.	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.	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 ++	Not a residential scheme	The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 17 units, on-site affordable housing would be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 17 units, on-site affordable housing would be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	(--) <b>The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 5 units, on-site affordable housing or a commuted sum would be not be achieved.</b>	The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 4 units, on-site affordable housing would not be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. Commuted sum contribution only.	The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 24 units, on-site affordable housing would be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. The site could deliver 24 units (theoretically), and so affordable housing on site could be delivered, but the flood risk will impact upon this significantly.
	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 ++	Not a residential scheme	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).	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).	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 –						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --						



Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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 ++	No transport assessment has been produced	Not required	Not required	No transport assessment has been produced	Not required	(++)
	No- transport assessment required --						
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 ++						Developer's TA demonstrate 4 options for access, all of which they consider are feasible. Option A is the preferred approach because options B-D involve access within the curtilage of Listed Buildings, and it is considered that access from these properties could harm the setting of the listed buildings. (although they continue to suggest their potential for emergency access). March 2009
	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 ++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.
	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 current PROW, but no details submitted to about whether the scheme could incorporate some improvements to existing PROW.	(+) No current PROW, but no details submitted to about whether the scheme could incorporate some improvements to existing PROW.	(+) No current PROW, but no details submitted to about whether the scheme could incorporate some improvements to existing PROW.	(+) Both the residual land of site 32 and site 374 are linked to the PROW which runs down the side of the Village Hall and the Malt Shovel Public House, and beyond, eastwards, close to the tennis courts and bowling. Given that the PROW is between the two sites, it is unlikely that diversion or loss would be required.	(+) No current PROW, but no details submitted to about whether the scheme could incorporate some improvements to existing PROW.	(+) Both the residual land of site 32 and site 374 are linked to the PROW which runs down the side of the Village Hall and the Malt Shovel Public House, and beyond, eastwards, close to the tennis courts and bowling. Given that the PROW is between the two sites, it is unlikely that diversion or loss would be required.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +						
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --						

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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>	Not public realm. No proposals are submitted concerning the development of public realm, but there is no reason to suggest that it could not be incorporated, given the proposed employment uses.	Not public realm. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.	Not public realm per se but it is a verge, so is offers wider publicly-experienced amenity. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.	Not public realm, the existing development of Pasture Lane has no public realm.	Not public realm per se but it is a verge, so is offers wider publicly-experienced amenity. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.	Not public realm. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<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>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>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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.</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. Sewer present on the site, development will have to reflect site infrastructure or relocate sewer.</p>
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</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>	(-) Within 250 metres of WWTW	(++)	(++)	(-) Within 250 metres of WWTW	(++)	(-) Within 400 metres of WWTW

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374
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>	(++) The site does not provide an established community facility.	(-) Development would necessitate the loss of the allotments, and no firm proposals for their satisfactory relocation, at a commensurate level of accessibility or quality of provision has been provided.	(++) The site does not provide an established community facility.	(++) The site does not provide an established community facility.	(++) The site does not provide an established community facility.	(-) Development would necessitate the loss of the allotments, and no firm proposals for their satisfactory relocation, at a commensurate level of accessibility or quality of provision has been provided.
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>	(-) Within 250 metres of WWTW	(-) Concerned about the loss of the allotments.	(++)	(-) Within 250 metres of WWTW	(++)	(-) Concerned about the loss of the allotments.
Strong Economy							
Q53. 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	NA	NA	NA
Q.54 (employment uses) 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>	(++) would be a diversification of a farm enterprise	NA	NA	NA	NA	(+)
Q.55 (Employment and retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	<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>	No details have been submitted.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not identified.

Hovingham - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		30	31 N	31 S	32	373	374	
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	
	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 --							
<b>Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability</b>								
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 but site configuration issues	(++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA but site configuration issues	(++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in 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 ++	(+) Multiple ownerships identified, but are happy to continue through the process. Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) implications concerning the allotments. Multiple ownerships identified, but are happy to continue through the process. Subject to archaeological investigation	(--)concerned that site, given its is very linear narrow form is not capable of being developed in a meaningful manner. Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Multiple ownerships identified, but are happy to continue through the process. 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.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) 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 ++	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) 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 ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+) Residual site interest. 1-2 dwellings with access from Pasture Lane.	(+)	(+)	
	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		375	643
<b>Stage 1 - Sift</b>			
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha --	(++)0.74ha	(++)1.55ha
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 and loss to heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++ 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 --	(--) considered in SFRA as Flood zone 3B	(++) part of site in flood zone 2
<b>Stage 2 - Site Assessment</b>			
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 --	

Assessment		375	643
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 –	(--) 3b	(++) a small area of the site is in flood zone 2. The Environment Agency have stated that this area would need to be removed.
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 undertaken?	yes ++ No --	(--) SFRA Flood zone 2 and 3. In the SFRA, the element of FZ3 is to be given Flood Zone 3b Status. FRA required	(++)
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 --	(--)	(+) The Environment Agency have stated that the small north eastern corner of the site would need to be excluded from the site boundary. It is a very small area, and perhaps could form part of a garden (with restrictions on impermeable surfacing) or be part of a SUDs scheme for the site.
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and the Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++ 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 --	(-) County Highways Authority not considered site, but see response in connection with site 30: Acceptable onto Main Street, but trees may need to be removed to achieve visibility. Traffic Impact Assessment and Travel Plan required.	(-) County Highways Authority considered: Site has no direct connection/frontage to and highway maintainable at the public expense. Major improvement works would be required to bring the access road up to an adoptable standard. The site submission proposes that the access be off Mowbray Crescent, and an access appraisal has been undertaken, if alignment is required the land is within the ownership of the Estate.
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity			
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK NVMBA or	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++ Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +	(+) No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Site comprises of improved agricultural land (arable). Were protected species present, they would be afforded appropriate	(+)No designated sites of biodiversity importance. Allotments and grazed paddock (sheep). Were protected species present, they would be afforded appropriate protection under

Assessment		375	643
affect ON, NTHMFA or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --	would be afforded commensurate protection under the appropriate legislative framework.	commensurate protection under the appropriate legislative framework.
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --		

Assessment		375	643
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++	(-) This is currently an arable field. No proposals have been submitted to incorporate green infrastructure.	(-) The site contains some garden/allotment spaces. These have been described as land subject to garden licenses, and are not allotments
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --		
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(+ ) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advised: A roughly rectangular parcel of agricultural land at the northern end of the village immediately north east of Hall Farm. Long distance views of the site would be available from the PROW that links Slingsby to the village. The western boundary is formed by the domestic hedged boundary of the adjacent properties. Apart from low fencing, the remaining boundaries are open. The roadside frontage of the site is planted with one side of a mature lime avenue which extends around the eastern side of the site. These trees are outside of the boundaries of the submitted site but would serve to soften any development of the site when approaching from the south and on passing the site. The avenue of Limes should be retained.	(+ ) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advised on the larger site area: The site is formed by an irregular shaped parcel of land taking in a number of different land uses including agriculture and domestic gardens. The site has relatively open boundaries on all sides with a small number of mature/ semi-mature trees mainly concentrated along the boundaries of the site. Retention of these trees is desirable.
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –		
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--		
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 --		



Assessment		375	643
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 Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. This site is on open, low lying land which is cropped, and is bounded on the northern side by trees. Currently provides the edge of the settlement, and provides long distance views to the south, which are viewed through a line of mature trees, which provide a distinctive feature to the northern entrance to the village.	(-)The Landscape Character Assessment of this area considers that Hovingham and its surrounding environs is within the Howardian Hills Foothills, which although being outside the AONB is considered to be the transition between the Howardian Hills and the Vale of Pickering. This eastern side of Hovingham is where the land flattens out. As a result, the topography means that the impact can be significant in the more immediate area. This is a reduced area site, but includes allotments, modern farm buildings, providing a rural edge to the village.
	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 --		
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or the 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 ++	(-)Open, low lying land which is cropped, and is bounded on the northern side by trees. Currently provides the edge of the settlement. The site is adjacent to the AONB, and therefore has the capability to impact on the AONB, through loss of open character and linking the former station site and farm with the village proper were the site to be developed in its entirety.	(-)This is a site which is adjacent to the AONB boundary, and the Worsley Arms Listed Building Complex. The eastern edge of the village in this area, is currently large, single depth properties with substantial curtilages, with a success of outbuildings. It is considered that the scale of development will require careful consideration, as will the siting, scale and massing. It is considered that development of this site has significant potential to adversely affect the setting of the AONB in this area, by harming the special qualities of the Conservation Area, and the setting of the Listed Buildings.
	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		375	643
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 open, sweeping character of this site, with the extensive rural character mean that the existing landscape features do not offer the means to minimise the impact.	(-) This sensitive edge of Hovingham will require careful consideration of mitigation measures which would lessen the harm to the character and setting of this part of Hovingham.
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +		
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –		
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –		
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Hovingham is a settlement which is not vulnerable to coalescence with another settlement.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +		
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –		
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --		
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(--)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +		
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –		
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --		

Assessment		375	643
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 ++	(-) It is considered that the development of this site will present a significant challenge in terms of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the part of Hovingham's Conservation Area. The site forms part of a graduated entrance into the village from the north, it is lined with trees, and it is these trees in particular which are included within the Conservation Area designation. There are a handful of properties in this area, and one of these properties is the grade II listed Pasture House, which is to the west of the site, on the opposite side of the road. It is considered that development of this open space would be altering the context of how the property would be viewed within Hovingham, which is currently as a isolated property. It is considered there would neither be substantial harm to the building nor its curtilage. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) The site area has been reduced so that the site no longer extends to the north. This means that the development area is adjacent to the Grade II listed The Worsley Arms complex, but it does not surround the complex. The Worsley Arms and the coach house provided an entrance of status to the village, and would have been open to receive visitors from the rear. The heritage statement submitted deduces a slight to moderate impact on these designated assets, depending on the nature and scale of the development. The site still indeed has the potential to affect the setting of these Listed assets, particularly concerning the scale, density and massing of development. The site also abuts the Hovingham Conservation Area, and the area is defined by being edge of settlement, with a variation in building scale graduating in scale and status. The land straddles the Conservation Area, and the post war housing of Mowbray Crescent. It is not within the Conservation Area, and as the heritage statement identifies, the site has limited historical features, but does represent a site which has the potential to significantly affect the setting of the Conservation Area. It is a typical edge of village site, with allotments and farm buildings. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer 26975, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM. Historic England have noted the proximity of the Conservation Area and the Worsley Arms complex. In terms of these designated assets, an assessment is needed of the contribution of the site to the significance of these features. This has been undertaken and confirms that more detail of the scheme is needed to evaluate the impact on the designated assets.
	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		375	643
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 ++	(-) This open land contributes to the character and setting of Hovingham Village.	(-) The site is also identified as containing Strip Field systems, which are becoming increasingly rare nationally, and which are a distinctive feature of the edge of the vale of Pickering. However, the ability to read the features in the landscape is not possible. This area of land is semi-enclosed, with a mixture of uses. It is important to ensure that the overall form and character of Hovingham is not harmed by development in this location, the site is capable of being viewed at distance from wider vantage points.
	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 ++	(-)	(-) Impact on Conservation Area and Worsley Arms complex needs further consideration, and this is in terms of the evaluating the scale of the impact- as heritage survey explains dependent on nature of the scheme, as up to moderate impact.
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	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
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 ++	There are no such schemes in this area	There are no such schemes in this area
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	No information
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -		
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --		

Assessment		375	643
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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however, only limited measures are achievable-		
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction --		
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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	No information
	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 ++	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.	The site is Greenfield, but there are no Brownfield sites adjacent to the village.
	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 ++	(--) This site has significant flood risk to most of the site. Applying a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 15 dwellings, but this is considered not to be achievable due to the high flood risk which encompasses most of the site	(-) Applying a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 32 dwellings. However, there are particular sensitivities around the site's development in terms of settlement character. A reduced density (and consideration of building heights will be particularly important) The submission information indicates up to 30 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		375	643
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 ++	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.
	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 ++	(-) 0.74 ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size	(-) 1.55ha of grade 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as Grade 2 and 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of further best and most versatile land. The site is less than 5ha in size
	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 --		
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +		
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -		

Assessment		375	643
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --		

Assessment		375	643
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 --	(+)	(+) on the basis that although within a mineral safeguarding area, the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement.
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 + 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 --	(+) The north eastern part of the site is in close proximity to and established farm. It would be necessary to ensure any new residential development was considered for amenity implications on the immediate boundary.	(-) The site is in close proximity to the operational farm. There could be nuisance issues with noise and smells, which could fetter the operation of the farm.
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 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 --	(+) The development is unlikely to cause nuisance (in terms of privacy, overlooking, overbearing) 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 nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site.
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 --	(+)	(-)



Assessment		375	643
Flood Risk			
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)Hovingham Beck	(++)Hovingham Beck
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 --	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems	(--)Yes but not a critical drainage area. It is an 'Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding'. Environment Agency require no increase in surface water run off from the site. Emphasise use of Sustainable Drainage Systems
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 ++ 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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	(++) Proposed use of SUDs in principle
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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 --	(--)	(+) providing small area of flood zone 2 is excluded from the developable area, and SUDs are used.

Assessment		375	643
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 ++	No such existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the village.	(+ ) In their submission the Estate have intimated that they could provide alternative gardens, but this may have to look outside the village envelope. It may not be of commensurate accessibility and quality. Appropriate replacement should be identified. The Hovingham Estate have stated that the area is not subject to allotment status, but that they are under a garden license for domestic garden purposes, which makes legal what would otherwise be an unlawful. They are providing garden areas to Mowbray Close. The Estate has intimated that other land will be made available, including expanding the existing playground and the immediately to the south of Mowbray Crescent.
	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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Some of the specific requirements of SBD may not be appropriate for Hovingham's character, and therefore the implications of crime may be considered more generally.
	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 has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that 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 details have been submitted regarding the housing mix, and the anticipated demographic profile of the development likely occupants, based on housing need, but there is no reason to suggest that such information could be provided.	(+ ) The proposers have provided no details concerning the scheme, but mixed uses are proposed. There is no reason to assume that 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 -		

Assessment		375	643
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(+)	(-) no clear provision of replacement gardens
	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 --		
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 ++	The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. No details have been provided concerning the nature of the employment, and it is not to support an existing enterprise, and given the overall strategy it is unlikely that this site is capable of addressing the requirements of the ELR and update.	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 ++	The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. There are significant flood risk issues. The site could deliver 15 units (theoretically), and so affordable housing on site could be delivered, but the flood risk will impact upon this significantly.	(-)The proposal does not make reference to the provision of affordable housing. At a theoretical yield of 32units, on-site affordable housing would be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. Sensitivities concerning the site may impact upon the number of units, and accordingly the provision of affordable housing. The site submission proposes up to 30 dwellings. Whilst referring to the provision of smaller, family scale properties, there is not explicit commitment to the delivery of a plan-compliant level of affordable housing.
	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 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 -		

<b>Assessment</b>		<b>375</b>	<b>643</b>
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --		

Assessment		375	643
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, but supplied	(++)
	No- transport assessment required --		
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 ++	Developer's TA demonstrates that proposed access from the existing C.R Wainwright Hall Farm access point is suitable (subject to a further TA as part of the planning application). March 2009	Developer's TA for site 374 demonstrate 4 options for access, all of which they consider are feasible. Option A is the preferred approach because options B-D involve access within the curtilage of Listed Buildings, and it is considered that access from these properties could harm the setting of the listed buildings. (although they continue to suggest their potential for emergency access). March 2009
	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 ++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to suggest that this would not be possible.
	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 current PROW, but no details submitted to about whether the scheme could incorporate some improvements to existing PROW.	(+) Both the residual land of site 32 and site 374 are linked to the PROW which runs down the side of the Village Hall and the Malt Shovel Public House, and beyond, eastwards, close to the tennis courts and bowling. Given that the PROW is between the two sites, it is unlikely that diversion or loss would be required.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +		
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --		

Assessment		375	643
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 ++	Not public realm. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.	Not public realm. As a residential scheme there would be an expectation that there would be communal amenity space, and landscaping. A site-specific consideration.
	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 --		
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: no additional capacity required. 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. 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. 375mm sewer present on the site, development will have to reflect site infrastructure or relocate sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. 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. 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. Sewer present on the site, development will have to reflect site infrastructure or relocate 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 +		
	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 ++	(++)	(-) Within 400 metres of WWTW
	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 --		

Assessment		375	643
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 ++	(++) The site does not provide an established community facility.	(-) Development would necessitate the loss of the allotments, and no firm proposals for their satisfactory relocation, at a commensurate level of accessibility or quality of provision has been provided.
	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 ++	(++)	(-)Concerned about the loss of the allotments.
	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 -		
<b>Strong Economy</b>			
Q53.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
	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)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	(+)
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +		
Q.55 (Employment and retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	Not identified.
	Up to 50 net jobs created +		
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -		
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --		

Assessment		375	643
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	Not applicable	Not applicable
	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 --		
<b>Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability</b>			
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 2 Site in 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
	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 ++		(+)
	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.
	No --		
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++		(+)
	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 --		